

PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY AND CHALLENGES OF JUDGES IN CONTEMPORARY SOCIETY

Nana Makharadze

Iv. Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University,
Georgia

Abstract

The role of the judge in contemporary society significantly exceeds the mere adjudication of legal disputes and encompasses the reinforcement of a country's social, political, and legal stability. This paper examines the historical transformation of the judicial profession, which in earlier periods was primarily associated with the strict enforcement of law, whereas in the modern era it entails the protection of human rights, the promotion of gender equality, the prevention of discrimination, and the safeguarding of principles of justice.

The study also addresses the Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct and the Judicial Ethics Rules of Georgia, which define judicial independence, impartiality, and ethical standards. Particular attention is devoted to shielding the judiciary from political influence, ensuring freedom of judicial expression, assessing the impact of social media and traditional media, and analyzing the process of legal interpretation, including the potential use of the *contra legem* approach when necessary to render a fair decision.

Judicial activity requires a combination of high professional responsibility, adherence to ethical standards, and resilience to stress. The paper emphasizes that a judge constitutes a central figure in a democratic state, whose neutrality, impartiality, and ethical conduct are critical for maintaining legal stability and public trust. This reflects the judge's role not only in law enforcement but also in safeguarding democratic values and promoting the public interest.

The paper delineates the role of the judge from both theoretical and practical perspectives, highlighting the associated challenges. Special attention is given to the significance of legally reasoned decision-making, which demands from judges both professional accountability and a commitment to democratic principles, especially in the context of complex social issues and challenges.

Keywords: judicial role, fair decision-making, challenges, independence, impartiality, political influence.

Introduction

The role of the judge in contemporary society has gained particular significance, as it extends beyond the mere enforcement of law to encompass the determination of a country's legal stability, the functioning of democratic institutions, and public trust. In the modern era, judges are entrusted with high professional responsibility, as their decisions must remain impartial, objective, and protected from political or social pressures.

This topic is especially relevant because the independence and credibility of the judiciary directly influence the quality of a democratic state and the perception of justice. Alongside current social and technological challenges, judges assume additional responsibilities, including the protection of human rights, the prevention of discrimination, the promotion of gender equality, and the safeguarding of public interests. As international legal theorist Ronald Dworkin notes, a judge is not merely an adjudicator of disputes but an institutional mediator who ensures the enforcement of legal norms and the maintenance of societal legal stability.¹ From this perspective, judges are charged not only with delivering fair decisions in individual cases but also with reinforcing legal norms and sustaining public confidence.

¹ Dworkin, R., *Law's Empire*, Harvard University Press, 1986. p. 230.

The aim of this study is to analyze the systemic, ethical, and legal dimensions of judicial activity in order to determine how judges can uphold justice and ensure public trust in a contemporary environment full of challenges. The primary objectives of this research are to examine the historical transformation of the judicial profession, investigate the components of its modern role, analyze the practical application of the Bangalore Principles and the Judicial Ethics Rules of Georgia, assess the practical challenges to judicial independence and impartiality including under political and media pressures and conduct a comparative analysis with international standards and case law. Furthermore, the study seeks to identify methods for delivering independent and fair decisions, including an evaluation of the practical applicability of the *contra legem* approach.

Accordingly, the research methodology is based on a normative-dogmatic approach, integrated with comparative legal analysis. The study provides a detailed examination of both international judicial decisions and Georgia's national legal framework. This comprehensive scientific approach combines normative-dogmatic analysis, comparative legal evaluation, and practical examples. Normative analysis draws upon Georgia's Judicial Ethics Rules, the Bangalore Principles, constitutional norms, and European conventions to delineate judicial functions, ethical standards, and legal obligations. Comparative legal analysis examines international practice, including judicial decisions and normative documents, to assess the role of judges in different legal systems and identify best practices. Court acts, decisions, and public reports were analyzed to evaluate the impact of judicial activity on case outcomes and public trust. The collected data were integrated into a unified analytical model that illustrates the multi-layered significance of the judge's role in the contemporary context and identifies challenges and practical recommendations.

This methodology provides a holistic perspective, linking theoretical, normative, and practical aspects, thereby enabling a systematic, ethical, and legal examination of the judicial role, while also highlighting practical outcomes, problems, and potential solutions.

1. Transformation from the Past to Modern Society: A General Overview

The role of the judge has undergone significant transformation over time. In earlier periods, their primary function was the strict enforcement of the law and the determination of truth. In contemporary society, however, their role is far more multifaceted, encompassing not only legal but also social, political, and cultural dimensions. Historically, judges primarily acted according to the literal text of the law and its strict rationale.² Their decisions often relied solely on the rigid content of legislation, with minimal consideration of societal or ethical developments, even when interpreting legal precedents.

Modern judges, by contrast, are required to employ a more flexible and context-sensitive interpretation, which accounts not only for the text of the law but also for contemporary social and ethical demands. They now address critical issues such as human rights, gender equality, the elimination of discrimination, and the protection of individual freedoms-matters that were far less prominent in earlier times. Differences are also evident in terms of political influence. Historically, judicial decisions were often dependent on state authorities, undermining judicial independence. Judges frequently acted as representatives of the state, executing the directives of political elites.³ In contemporary society, judicial independence is of critical importance. Judges are expected to render decisions free from political or social pressure. While such pressures persist, one of the primary responsibilities of a democratic state is to safeguard the judiciary from undue influence.

Historically, courts were often insular and elite institutions, characterized by limited public access. In the modern era, however, courts have become significantly more open, transparent, and accessible to the wider public. Today, judges consider a broad spectrum of disputes. A key distinction lies not only

² Gogiashvili, G., *Judicial Law*, Tbilisi, 2014. p. 44.

³ Sillen, J., *The concept of 'internal judicial independence' in the case law of the European Court of Human Rights*. *European Constitutional Law Review*, 15(1), This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, 2019. p.104.

in accepting cases but also in rendering impartial decisions. The structure of modern states demands that judges perform their roles in a manner consistent with democratic principles. Decisions must be made independently, regardless of the parties involved or the sources from which cases are presented.

Technological progress has profoundly changed judicial practice. In earlier periods, technology was far less developed, and courts relied primarily on physical evidence.⁴ Today, judges must engage with digital data-including emails, video recordings, information disseminated via social media, and other forms of electronic evidence. This shift requires specialized knowledge and skills.

In earlier times, media lacked the power and influence it wields today, and court decisions were generally less transparent. Today, interaction with the media and consideration of public expression have become essential. Judicial decisions are frequently the focus of public attention, and judges must navigate media pressure while maintaining impartiality. Contemporary judges are inseparable from society, social networks, and media, yet the dissemination of information and public opinion must not influence their decisions.⁵ Judges bear the responsibility of preserving the independence of the judiciary and maintaining public trust. Balancing these responsibilities has become increasingly complex and challenging in modern legal practice.⁶

2. The Judge's Significant Role Considering the Bangalore Principles and Georgia's Judicial Ethics Rules

The work of a judge is grounded not only in the enforcement of the law but also in accountability to society and adherence to ethical standards. The Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct and the Judicial Ethics Rules of Georgia constitute the fundamental frameworks that define the ethical norms and professional boundaries guiding judicial behavior.

The Bangalore Principles, issued in 2002,⁷ represent an international standard establishing the ethical conduct expected of judges. They serve to promote judicial independence, impartiality, and the fair administration of justice. The principles emphasize several key aspects: judicial independence forms the foundation of a judge's work. Judges must be free from political, economic, or other external pressures, ensuring that their decisions are based solely on the law and objective facts. Judges should not have personal interests that could influence the outcome of a case. Complete impartiality must be maintained in every matter. Judges are required to regulate their own emotions, personal opinions, and humane approaches so that no external interference or pressure can compromise their decisions.

Georgia's Judicial Ethics Rules are grounded in both domestic legislation and international standards. The Code is designed to define the ethical requirements for judges, ensuring the effectiveness of the judicial system and maintaining public trust. The core principles of Georgia's Judicial Ethics, when outlining the judge's role, closely mirror the Bangalore Principles. Specifically, these rules firmly establish judicial independence, prohibiting any dependence on external pressures or personal interests.⁸ Additionally, the rules condemn behaviors that could undermine the authority of the judiciary or compromise the fairness of judicial proceedings. Judges are obligated, in all decisions, to avoid influence from personal opinions, political pressures, or social factors. Furthermore, the demonstration of empathy and humanity during judicial proceedings plays a significant role in maintaining public confidence and the authority of the judicial system.⁹

⁴ Robert, C., *Violence and the Word*, Yale Law School, 1986, p.44.

⁵ Romana, M., International Bar Association's Human Rights Institute, "International Bar Association's Human Rights Institute condemns harassment of Judge Tuleya and urges Poland to cease arbitrary proceedings against him", 2020. <https://www.ibanet.org/article/11be06a4-a4b6-4af4-a13d-3ed545b1dbb2> [L. s. 13.11.2025].

⁶ Zambakhidze, T., Gasitashvili, E., Kordzakhia, I., Loria, A. Meskhi, K., Moliterno, J., Khubuluri, T., *Legal Ethics*, Collective of Authors, Tbilisi, 2021. P. 502.

⁷ The 2001 draft Code of Judicial Conduct of Bangalore (hereinafter referred to as the "Bangalore Principles") was adopted by a group of judges with the aim of strengthening the unity of the judiciary. It was subsequently reviewed in November 2002 in The Hague during a roundtable meeting of Chief Justices of Supreme Courts.

⁸ Curry, T., Fix, M., Romano M., *Examining the Interconnectedness of State High Court Twitter, State Politics & Policy Quarterly*, Cambridge University Press & Assessment, 2024. p. 12.

⁹ European Court of Human Rights, 10 October 2023, CASE OF TULEYA v. POLAND, Nos. 21181/19 and 51751/20, par.55.

The role of the judge, both in contemporary society and within the legal domain, is crucial for achieving justice for present and future generations. Analysis demonstrates that both legal instruments cover broad aspects of judicial activity. However, for the purposes of this study, two critical aspects are emphasized separately: independence and impartiality. Examining these two elements highlights the central role of the judge in modern society.

2.1. Judicial Independence and Impartiality

Judicial independence and impartiality are essential for establishing a fair and transparent judicial system. These principles are not merely personal virtues but primarily systemic and institutional norms designed to protect the judiciary from influence exerted by political, economic, or social forces.

According to paragraph 1.1 of the Bangalore Principles, independence requires that the judiciary make decisions solely in accordance with the law, relying exclusively on evidence and without being subject to external pressure. Under Article 3 of Georgia's Judicial Ethics Rules, judges are obliged to inspire public confidence in the independence, fairness, and impartiality of the judiciary.¹⁰

Paragraph 2.1 of the Bangalore Principles defines impartiality as the requirement that a judge must not make decisions based on personal interests, discrimination, subjective views, or favoritism. Judges must remain free from affiliations with any particular party or influential group. Similarly, Articles 1 and 6 of Georgia's Judicial Ethics Rules stipulate that judicial reasoning must be grounded solely in law, facts, and evidence relevant to the case.¹¹ When a judge acts impartially, the judicial process is safeguarded against predetermined outcomes that could compromise fairness.

In any case, the court must provide a reasoned justification for its decision. The principles of fairness and impartiality should not depend solely on a single judge. It is crucial that the legal system is balanced to prevent undue influence from one individual. For example, evaluating the legitimacy of a judicial system solely based on the behavior of one judge may produce a misleading assessment. However, even a single judge, through repeated or severe misconduct, can undermine the independence and impartiality of the entire judiciary.¹² This was exemplified in Poland, where disciplinary misconduct by one judge led to the revocation of their authority to prevent a loss of public trust in the judicial system. Nonetheless, the European Court did not uphold this decision, emphasizing that judges enjoy immunity.

Only judges themselves can establish a judiciary that meets the standards of a democratic state, and they require appropriate working conditions to do so. The type of law and the nature of judicial institutions in a country ultimately depend on the judiciary. In essence, judges serve as guarantors of a fair legal system, representing one of the fundamental elements of a fully functional democratic state.

2.2. Distancing the Judiciary from Political Processes

An independent judiciary establishes a platform where decisions are made not according to partisan interests, but solely on the basis of law and constitutional principles. Judicial independence ensures that the law plays a meaningful role not only in the courtroom but also in everyday life. According to Article 3 of Georgia's Judicial Ethics Rules, the public must be confident that their cases will be adjudicated objectively and impartially, free from interference by the authorities. Similarly, Articles 6 and 18 of the European Convention on Human Rights stipulate that democracy guarantees not only the protection of individual freedoms but also fairness and public trust.¹³

A judge's independence from political influence constitutes a fundamental principle of the rule of law. When a judge is free to make decisions without dependence on any political force, this ensures both the

¹⁰ Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct, 27/08/2002.

¹¹ European Court of Human Rights, 30 January 2023, CASE OF JUSZCZYSZYN v. POLAND, No. 35599/20, par.43.

¹² Tyler, P., *Social but Not Too Social: Judicial Social Media Ethics*, 2023. p. 56.

¹³ European Convention on Human Rights, November 4, 1950.

administration of justice and public confidence in the judiciary.¹⁴ A politically independent judge relies solely on law and evidence.

Paragraph 2.2 of the Bangalore Principles provides that a judge must execute the law while maintaining personal conduct both within and outside the courtroom. Judicial independence, together with the guarantees that protect judges from political and economic pressures, represents a crucial aspect of ensuring that courts operate based on legislative norms and principles of justice.¹⁵ According to Article 2 of Georgia's Judicial Ethics Rules, the judiciary must remain detached from political processes; avoiding interference in political matters is necessary for the effective and impartial fulfillment of its functions.

Politics often involves interests that may not serve the public good, but rather pursue partisan goals and strategies. In such circumstances, the judiciary, as an independent institution, serves as a sphere where the influence of political processes is constrained, thereby safeguarding the principles of law. Accordingly, the role of the judge is to maintain distance from political influence, preventing the judiciary from acting as an intermediary for political power or subordinating itself to political parties or groups.¹⁶

3. Freedom of Expression, Responsibility, and Ethical Conduct of Judges

The freedom of expression for judges represents one of the most sensitive issues within judicial practice. Although a judge, as a citizen, enjoys freedom of expression under Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights, this right is necessarily limited by professional ethical standards. A judge must maintain a balanced position, ensuring that personal opinions do not compromise the neutrality of the judiciary. The public closely monitors every word spoken by a judge; therefore, any statement made publicly must not undermine trust in the objectivity of the judicial system.¹⁷

Despite the high standards expected of a judicial professional, a judge remains, first and foremost, an individual whose feelings, thoughts, and rights must not be disregarded. While judges are expected to exercise restraint and emotional stability, this does not permit the public to impose unfair criticism or restrict their freedom of expression.¹⁸ Judges may defend and express their views on social, political, or other matters, but this must occur within the framework of ethical standards and professional responsibility. In line with the requirements of the contemporary legal environment, judges remain independent and objective, capable of assessing situations realistically, upholding ethical principles, and ensuring fair decision-making, even in the face of criticism or misinformation.¹⁹

Modern society, while simplifying aspects of life, has simultaneously introduced greater challenges and responsibilities for the law. Any personal opinion expressed by a judge, whether on political, social, or cultural issues, must not influence their judicial work. As public figures, judges must clearly distinguish between their personal and professional lives, as any public statement may significantly affect their work and the reputation of the judiciary. Public trust in a judge's objectivity presupposes that personal views do not impede their ability to make independent and fair decisions.²⁰ The credibility and reputation of the judicial system are directly tied to the responsibility demonstrated by its members,

¹⁴ Zambakhidze, T., Gasitashvili, E., Kordzakhia, I., Loria, A. Meskhi, K., Moliterno, J., Khubuluri, T., Legal Ethics, Collective of Authors, Tbilisi, 2021. p. 553.

¹⁵ Wojciech, C., Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights, "Disciplinary Chamber of the Supreme Court revokes the suspension of Judge Juszczyszyn", 2022. <https://archiwum.hfhr.pl/en/disciplinary-chamber-of-the-supreme-court-revokes-the-suspension-of-judge-juszczyszyn/index.html> [L. s. 14.11.2025].

¹⁶ Blenman, L., Doha Declaration, Safeguarding Judicial Integrity in the Age of Social Media and Artificial Intelligence: A Perspective from Belize, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2025. P. 67.

¹⁷ Constitutional Court of Georgia, Decision of 28 December 2021. Case No. 3/2/1478.

¹⁸ Venice Commission – European Commission for Democracy through Law, Judges' independence and impartiality, 2010.

¹⁹ Babicka, K., International Court of Justice, "European Court of Human Rights: International Court of Justice welcomes a landmark decision upholding judicial independence in Poland", 2023. <https://www.icj.org/european-court-of-human-rights-icj-welcomes-a-landmark-decision-upholding-judicial-independence-in-poland/> [L. s. 13.11.2025].

²⁰ Zambakhidze, T., Gasitashvili, E., Kordzakhia, I., Loria, A. Meskhi, K., Moliterno, J., Khubuluri, T., Legal Ethics, Collective of Authors, Tbilisi, 2021. p. 563.

including judges. If the public perceives bias or partiality in a judge's expressed opinions, this can adversely affect the functioning of the judicial system and erode public confidence.

Therefore, judges must be able to express their opinions, but they bear full responsibility for the consequences that may arise from the public communication of their views. Judicial expression must adhere to values and professional standards that promote the administration of justice and maintain public trust in the judiciary.

4. Contemporary Challenges Regarding Media and Social Networks

Today, the media and social networks exert a significant influence on the judicial system. Television, online media, and social platforms frequently cover court cases and, at times, create public pressure on judges. In the modern world, media and social networks impact not only public opinion but also the conduct of judicial proceedings and the role of the judge. Judges, along with the broader judiciary, continuously interact with media outlets and engage with social platforms, creating both new opportunities and challenges.²¹ Media influence can potentially compromise the objectivity of judicial proceedings and frame issues of fair process in an unethical or distorted manner.

Court decisions must be rendered solely on the basis of the law and must not be swayed by media trends or public sentiment. Modern judicial proceedings increasingly involve digital evidence, which may include information disseminated via social networks. Photos, videos, emails, and other documents originating from social media are often presented as evidence in courts.²² Judges must assess the reliability of such information and determine whether it is substantiated and legally admissible. This task is particularly challenging, as managing and evaluating digital evidence continues to present difficulties for judicial systems.²³

The role of judges regarding freedom of expression on social networks is especially complex. On these platforms, where individuals frequently share their opinions on various issues, judges must exercise exceptional caution. Every comment, reaction, like, share, or post has the potential to influence public perception. Judges, like all citizens, have the right to express their views and participate in public discourse, but certain boundaries exist. While their words and actions may not be explicitly linked to judicial decisions, they may nonetheless reveal personal views that could shape public opinion. Maintaining public trust in judicial proceedings is therefore essential. Judges' presence and expression on social networks must align with the ethical standards expected by society.

As clearly indicated in decisions of the Supreme Court of Georgia, public statements by judges must not create the impression of a pre-established position or personal bias, as such perceptions can influence not only the adjudication of individual cases but also broader public opinion about the judiciary. Judges must exercise responsibility when engaging on social media, as every statement reflects on their professional role and the institution they represent.

Social networks particularly affect public opinion, as people increasingly rely on these platforms to access information and express their views. Social media environments often encourage users to post opinions, which may, intentionally or unintentionally, impact the judiciary. In this context, the judge's role remains critically important to ensure that judicial proceedings and decisions are not subject to public or social media influence. Platforms such as Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram provide judges with opportunities to engage with public sentiment, but they also introduce multiple challenges. Social networks often become arenas of stress, where various parties express opinions on specific cases. Judges may become targets of criticism or discussion online, which can affect their independence and impartiality. Furthermore, information from social networks is frequently inaccurate or distorted, creating risks of misrepresenting judicial processes.²⁴

²¹ Jorbenadze, S., Law of Social Media: Current Issues, Georgian Bar Association, Journal "My Lawyer", No. VI, Tbilisi, 2021. p. 20.

²² The Opinion no. 3 of the Consultative Council of European Judges, on the principles and rules governing judges' professional conduct, in particular ethics, incompatible behaviour and impartiality, para. 31, Strasbourg, 19 November 2002.

²³ Disciplinary Chamber of the Supreme Court of Georgia, Decision of 26 March 2019, Case #SSD-06-19.

²⁴ Disciplinary Chamber of the Supreme Court of Georgia, Decision of 21 March 2019, Case #SSD-04-19.

Media freedom is a fundamental principle in a democratic society, but it can conflict with judicial independence. As illustrated in the decision of the Constitutional Court of Georgia (July 27, 2013, Case N1/4/1394, Zviad Kuprava v. Parliament of Georgia), the Constitution protects an individual's right to direct opinions or criticism at specific recipients. According to Constitutional Court practice, the judiciary is no exception and may be subject to scrutiny.²⁵ Television coverage of court proceedings can be concerning if it serves as a primary channel for undermining the judge's role. Judges must remain independent and neutral, and they must not be insulted or influenced by information disseminated through media channels.

The role of the judge in contemporary society is increasingly complex, particularly given the proliferation of media and social network information sources and the growing public reliance on them. For judicial actors, the central challenge is ensuring that all content appearing on social networks or in the media does not compromise judicial proceedings or the independence of the judiciary.²⁶ Modern judges must exercise prolonged and deep analysis, maintain strong psychological resilience, and uphold professionalism to ensure that, despite public pressure, cases are adjudicated objectively, impartially, and fairly.

5. Interpretation of Legal Norms and the Use of Contra Legem in Modern Law

In his 1986 work *Violence and the World*,²⁷ Robert Cover asserts that legal interpretation operates within the domain of pain and death. Acts of legal interpretation signal and facilitate the imposition of violence on others. A judge, through the articulation of their understanding of a legal text, can cause someone to lose their liberty, property, children, or even life. Interpreters also provide justification for violence that has already been committed or is in the process of being executed. Cover highlights the potential negative consequences of improper or unjust interpretation of legal norms. Nevertheless, without interpretation, a norm cannot exist.

Interpretation of a norm encompasses both potential negative outcomes and possible positive benefits, and the responsibility for this rests squarely with the judge in contemporary society.²⁸ Judges possess not only professional authority but also professional responsibility, which requires them primarily to pursue justice and to avoid arbitrary or subjective misuse of legal norms through unfair interpretations.

In civil law jurisdictions, where formal justice is commonly applied, legal norms often exhibit a high degree of abstraction. This abstraction allows judges to consider each case individually and to apply legal norms more flexibly. Abstraction thus provides greater scope for interpretation and the rendering of just decisions. Ronald Dworkin, in his work *Law's Empire*,²⁹ emphasizes that judges should not be constrained by legal positivism in the process of interpretation. Dworkin advocates for creative interpretation, whereby judges actively construct the legal order in the pursuit of justice.

A judge is primarily an interpreter of the law, not a lawmaker, and must act in accordance with legal provisions. However, there are cases in which judges must "discover" new norms.³⁰ The principle of *contra legem* refers to interpreting a legal provision in a manner contrary to its literal text. This approach is applicable when a literal interpretation would lead to an unjust result. The use of *contra legem* is exceptional and rare, and the authority to apply it rests solely with the judge. It is regarded as a necessary instrument in the implementation of law, particularly when the literal meaning of a provision fails to achieve a just outcome.³¹

²⁵ Constitutional Court of Georgia, Decision of 27 July 2013, Case No. N1/4/1394.

²⁶ Tsikharishvili, K., Judicial Independence, Accountability, and Views of Supreme Court Candidates, *Journal of Constitutional Law Review*, No. 14, 2020. p.22.

²⁷ Robert, Cover, *Violence and the Word*, Yale Law School, 1986. p. 189.

²⁸ Blenman, L., Doha Declaration, Safeguarding Judicial Integrity in the Age of Social Media and Artificial Intelligence: A Perspective from Belize, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2025. p. 13.

²⁹ Dworkin, R., *Law's Empire*, harvard university press, 1986. p. 220.

³⁰ Committee Meijers, rule of Law Update, "The European Commission publishes the sixth annual Rule of Law report", 2025. <https://euruleoflaw.eu/rule-of-law-update-september-2023> [L. s. 16.11.2025].

³¹ Khubua, G., *Theory of Law*, Tbilisi, 2015. p. 200.

The judge's primary objective is the realization of justice, and interpretations that undermine this objective are sometimes considered impermissible, even by the law itself. In this context, the role of the judge is crucial, as it entails the precise, consistent, and systematic explanation of the content of legal norms. No single interpretive method can be deemed universally authoritative. Often, multiple interpretive approaches must be applied cumulatively, reflecting the complexity of the norm's meaning.³² This process demands high professional responsibility and a reasoned, reflective approach, grounded in philosophical, logical, and hermeneutic skills. Accordingly, the ultimate goal of any interpretive method must be to ensure an interpretation that is just, transparent, and consistent with the systemic principles of the law.

Conclusion

Judges, as creators of precedent through the interpretation of law, their application, and the exercise of discretionary powers, shape legal directions that are relevant to contemporary society, ensuring that the judicial system adapts to modern challenges. They perform their duties while remaining impartial, making decisions based solely on legal norms and constitutional rights.

The study demonstrates that the role of a judge extends beyond managing courtroom proceedings. It encompasses safeguarding the legal stability of society and upholding democratic values. Problematic factors, such as political influence, media coverage, and the impact of social networks, can undermine judicial independence. Therefore, it is essential that judges possess high levels of professional competence, ethical judgment, and the ability to manage stress.

It is recommended that judges maintain control over their conduct and expression, as their actions significantly influence both public perception and trust in the judiciary. Only professional integrity, internal conviction, and methodological expertise can ensure the effective functioning of judges in high-pressure and complex environments. Recommendations tailored to judges emphasize the importance of adhering to the Bangalore Principles, Georgia's Judicial Ethics Rules, international standards, and practical experience to protect justice and maintain public confidence.

The challenges and issues discussed in this study are inherent to judicial activity in contemporary society and can only be addressed through qualified, objective, and principled judges. Judges have only one path: to articulate and justify their decisions thoughtfully and with reasoned argumentation. No alternative exists. Therefore, it is through personal values, internal conviction, integrity, professionalism, and resilience that judges can overcome the challenges outlined in this study, as no conference or training program can fully prepare a judge for the stressful environment in which they must carry out their duties.

³² Epstein, L., Shvetsova, O., Knight J., Cambridge University Press, "The Role of Constitutional Courts in the Establishment and Maintenance of Democratic Systems of Government", 2024. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/law-and-society-review/article/abs/role-of-constitutional-courts-in-the-establishment-and-maintenance-of-democratic-systems-of-government/34E9DF79785EBACEFE74CABBEE8562E9> [L. s. 16.11.2025].

Bibliography

1. Judicial Ethics Rules of Georgia, 18/05/2020;
2. Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct, 27/08/2002;
3. European Convention on Human Rights, November 4, 1950;
4. United Nations Basic Principles on the Independence of the Judiciary, 1985, United Nations General Assembly Resolution 40/32;
5. Venice Commission, European Commission for Democracy through Law, Judges' independence and impartiality, 2010;
6. Gogiashvili, Giorgi, Judicial Law, Tbilisi, 2014;
7. Zambakhidze, Tamar, Gasitashvili, Ekaterine, Kordzakhia, Irakli, Loria, Ana, Meskhi, Ketevan, Moliterno, James, Khubuluri, Tamar, Legal Ethics, Collective of Authors, Tbilisi, 2021;
8. Khubua, Giorgi, Theory of Law, Tbilisi, 2015;
9. Tsikharishvili, Kakha, Judicial Independence, Accountability, and Views of Supreme Court Candidates, Journal of Constitutional Law Review, No. 14, 2020;
10. Jorbenadze, Sergi, Law of Social Media: Current Issues, Georgian Bar Association, Journal "My Lawyer", No. VI, Tbilisi, 2021;
11. Blenman, Louise, Doha Declaration, Safeguarding Judicial Integrity in the Age of Social Media and Artificial Intelligence: A Perspective from Belize, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2025;
12. Cover, Robert, Violence and the Word, Yale Law School, 1986;
13. Curry, Todd, Fix, Michael, Romano, Michael, Examining the Interconnections of State High Court Twitter, State Politics & Policy Quarterly, Cambridge University Press and Assessment, 2024;
14. Dworkin, Ronald, Law's Empire, Harvard university press, 1986;
15. Fine, Anna, Berthelot, Emily, Shawn, Marsh, Behavioral Sciences, Public Perceptions of Judges' Use of AI Tools in Courtroom Decision-Making, 2025;
16. Sillen, Joost, The concept of 'internal judicial independence' in the case law of the European Court of Human Rights. European Constitutional Law Review 15 (1), 2019;
17. The Opinion no. 3 of the Consultative Council of European Judges, on the principles and rules governing judges' professional conduct, in particular ethics, incompatible behaviour and impartiality, para. 31, Strasbourg, 19 November 2002;
18. Parker, Tyler, Social but Not Too Social: Judicial Social Media Ethics, 2023;
19. Constitutional Court of Georgia, Decision of 27 July 2013, Case No. N1/4/1394;
20. Constitutional Court of Georgia, Decision of 28 December 2021, Case No. 3/2/1478;
21. Disciplinary Chamber of the Supreme Court of Georgia, Decision of 21 March 2019, Case #SSD-04-19;
22. Disciplinary Chamber of the Supreme Court of Georgia, Decision of 26 March 2019, Case #SSD-06-19;
23. European Court of Human Rights, 30 January 2023, CASE OF JUSZCZYSZYN v. POLAND, No. 35599/20;
24. European Court of Human Rights, 10 October 2023, CASE OF TULEYA v. POLAND, Nos. 21181/19 and 51751/20;
25. Committee Meijers, rule of Law Update, „The European Commission publishes the sixth annual Rule of Law report“, 2025. <https://euruleoflaw.eu/rule-of-law-update-september-2023> [Last seen 16.11.2025];
26. Babicka, Karolina, International Court of Justice, „European Court of Human Rights: International Court of Justice welcomes a landmark decision upholding judicial independence in Poland“, 2023. <https://www.icj.org/european-court-of-human-rights-icj-welcomes-a-landmark-decision-upholding-judicial-independence-in-poland/> [Last seen 13.11.2025];
27. Epstein, Lee, Shvetsova, Olga, Knight Jack, Cambridge University Press, „The Role of Constitutional Courts in the Establishment and Maintenance of Democratic Systems of Government“, 2024. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/law-and-society-review/article/abs/role-of-constitutional-courts-in-the-establishment-and-maintenance-of-democratic-systems-of-government/34E9DF79785EBACEFE74CABBEE8562E9> [Last seen 16.11.2025];
28. Wojciech, Chaber, Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights, „Disciplinary Chamber of the Supreme Court revokes the suspension of Judge Juszczyszyn“, 2022. <https://archiwum.hfhr.pl/en/disciplinary-chamber-of-the-supreme-court-revokes-the-suspension-of-judge-juszczyszyn/index.html> [Last seen 16.11.2025];
29. Romana, Matthew, International Bar Association's Human Rights Institute, „International Bar Association's Human Rights Institute condemns harassment of Judge Tuleya and urges Poland to cease arbitrary proceedings against him“, 2020. <https://www.ibanet.org/article/11be06a4-a4b6-4af4-a13d-3ed545b1dbb2> [Last seen 13.11.2025].