

**THREE-STEP MODEL OF PREVENTION OF VIOLATIONS:
GENERAL-SPECIAL-RELATIONSHIP OF SINGLE MECHANISMS**

Khursandov Alisher Suyunovich

©The independent researcher of the University
of Public Safety of the Republic of Uzbekistan.

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18628337>

Annotation. *This thesis analyzes the theoretical foundations of the Prevention of violations in a systematic approach and reveals the functional relationship between the mechanisms of general, special and single prevention. General prevention is justified as a set of universal measures aimed at improving the social environment and lowering risk factors; while special Prevention is characterized as a mechanism of action through targeted programs in relation to certain types of offenses or risk groups. Single Prevention provides for the implementation of targeted work, rehabilitation and control measures on high-risk individuals according to an individual plan. The thesis shows on a scientific basis that the conceptual fragmentation within the framework of national legislation (laws of 2010 and 2014), the “transition criteria” between types of prevention are not clearly defined, and the institutional mechanisms of interagency cooperation and accountability are not sufficiently strengthened.*

Also conceptually substantiated are the risk assessment standard, case management, and proposals to increase the addressing and consequentiality of prevention through a single electronic system.

Keywords: *general prevention; special Prevention; single prevention; risk assessment; risk group; Case Management; interagency cooperation; e-prevention; procedural guarantees.*

It is not a secret that today in the science of criminology, the general prevention of crime and offenses is understood as a comprehensive system of social, economic, legal and organizational measures aimed at preventing the causes of the origin of crime on the scale of society. In the law of the Republic of Uzbekistan dated May 14, 2014 “on the Prevention of offenses”, general prevention is defined as “activities carried out by the body carrying out and participating in the Prevention of offenses and institutions to prevent offenses, identify and eliminate the causes and conditions of their occurrence.”[1] This concept includes such large-scale preventive measures as strengthening immunity to crime in all aspects of social life, upbringing, employment, spiritual and educational work of young people.

For example, UN and international experts say that reducing the factors leading to crimes such as poverty, unemployment, drug abuse in society, promoting a healthy lifestyle to young people are among the most effective general preventive measures. Italian enlightener Ch.Becceria noted two centuries ago that “preventing crimes is preferable to punishing them.” Even today, many criminologists believe that general prevention is the most priority and effective way to combat crime. In particular, the Russian scientist A.I. Dolgova noted that general prevention refers to a set of economic and social measures aimed at reducing crime in the long term-strengthening the economy, providing the population with jobs, reducing poverty and unemployment, enlisting young people in education and sports, and propaganda against alcohol and drugs are among them.

Therefore, general prevention is a preventive policy carried out on a community-wide scale, in which all structures of government, civil society institutions, neighborhoods and educational institutions are involved.[2] S.B. Khojakulov calls general prevention the first stage of the Prevention of offenses, describing its purpose as “the creation of legal conditions for people to live a decent life in society, the formation of compliance of citizens with the law.”[3]

In fact, the more general preventive measures are successful, the less the tendency to commit an offense among young people.

Special prevention (or criminological prevention), on the other hand, refers to specific types of crime or systematic measures aimed at preventing individual group offenses. According to the legislation, special prevention is a set of separate programs and activities aimed at eliminating the causes and conditions of their occurrence, in relation to certain types of offenses or certain categories of persons, by the bodies that directly carry out the prevention of violations. For example, special programs for the prevention of juvenile delinquency or the prevention of drug offenses are developed. Within the framework of special prevention, the subjects of prevention work with representatives of the identified risk group, take complex measures against the increase in crimes of a certain type.

Also, in criminological theory, special preventive measures are divided into two directions – early warning (high probability of a crime and interference with individuals earlier than their occurrence), as well as direct warning (neutralization of already formed criminogenic factors).[4]

At the moment, special prevention also includes the development of special strategies against crimes of particular types of crime – for example, corruption, theft, hooliganism. In the experience of many foreign countries, special inter-sectoral programs occupy an important place.

For example, there are federal and statewide "computerized surveillance and analysis" programs to reduce violence among minors in the United States, where law enforcement, probation, education, and health agencies work cooperatively. [5] According to Russian criminalist scholars, measures within the framework of special prevention are aimed at specific types of crime and concrete criminogenic groups, in the implementation of which many subjects, state and non-state, specialized and non-specialized, participate in cooperation.

Single (individual) prevention, on the other hand, represents mechanisms aimed at targeted work with specific individuals who are most likely to commit an offense. The object of such a type of prevention is individual persons who are prone to an offense or have already committed an offense. [6] Single (individual) Prevention, on the other hand, represents mechanisms aimed at targeted work with specific individuals who are most likely to commit an offense. The object of such a type of prevention is individual persons who are prone to an offense or have already committed an offense. In the scientific literature, the term “individual prevention” mainly refers to educational, corrective and control measures carried out in relation to a particular person. In particular, Ch. Beccaria's work, “Crime and punishment”, states that “crime prevention is true jurisprudence in a developed society”. Also from local legal scholars I.Ismailov, Q.R. Abdurasulova, I.Yu. Fazilov argues that” crime prevention is understood as a system of legal, educational-preventive, socio-economic, spiritual-moral, medical, psychological, organizational and other measures of general, special, individual and victimological prevention of crimes “and

that” based on the analysis of national legislative norms, crime prevention consists of the following types: 1) general prevention; 2) special prevention; 3) individual prevention; 4) victimological prevention”. [7] Also, N.T. Ismailov studies the problems of individual prevention of juvenile delinquency, suggesting that prevention of juvenile delinquency should be divided into general and single prevention. For example, conducting preventive interviews with a person under probation, N.T. Ismailov also studies the problems of individual prevention of juvenile delinquency, suggesting that prevention of juvenile delinquency should be divided into general and single prevention. For example, conducting preventive interviews with a person under probation supervision, placing minors prone to violations on the “preventive account” of internal affairs bodies, conducting psychological and social consultations with them – these are single methods of prevention. Also, N.T. Ismailov noted that in addition to general prevention, separate individual preventive work is very important in the Prevention of juvenile delinquency, which is aimed at correcting the behavior of juvenile offenders through direct educational influence. Ismailov noted that in addition to general prevention, separate individual preventive work is very important in the Prevention of juvenile delinquency, which is aimed at correcting the behavior of juvenile offenders through direct educational influence. In criminal law theory, the concept of solitary prophylaxis is also often associated with the goal of preventing the repetition of a crime committed through the execution of punishment. For example, the Criminal Code of Uzbekistan establishes that the purpose of prescribing punishment is to morally correct a person and prevent the commission of a new crime by him. It actually represents the special (individual) preventive function of punishment in relation to the individual. The Criminal Code of Uzbekistan establishes that the purpose of prescribing punishment is to morally correct a person and prevent the commission of a new crime by him. It actually represents the special (individual) preventive function of punishment in relation to the individual. In particular, criminologists E. Q. Ferry and other scientists use the term “special Prevention” (specific deterrence) to refer to achieving that a particular individual does not commit a repeat crime by giving a ratio of exactly individual prevention. In this sense, solitary prophylaxis is a system of changing the personal behavior of the offender in a positive way, re – education and social rehabilitation. An important role in the conduct of individual prevention of violations among minors is played by the Internal Affairs preventive inspectors, pedagogical-psychologists and juvenile commissions.

As can be seen from the above concepts, general, special and individual prevention are different stages and levels of the prevention of violations systems can be seen from the above concepts, general, special and individual prevention are different stages and levels of the prevention of violations system. Although each of them has separate tasks and methods, it is actually complementary and inextricably linked. In particular, a healthy environment and legal consciousness created through general (social) prevention sets the stage for the effectiveness of special and individual preventive measures. Special prevention, in turn, reinforces the achievements of general prevention and eliminates specific sources of danger. Single prophylaxis, on the other hand, penetrates deeply into individual cases where the general and special prophylaxis is “ignored” or there is no benefit from them. Single prophylaxis, on the other hand, penetrates deeply into individual cases where the general and special prophylaxis is “ignored” or

there is no benefit from them. Therefore, in the scientific literature, it is emphasized that general and special prophylaxis are “mutually complementary types of activities.” For example, in western criminology, it is accepted to divide crime prevention measures into primary, secondary and tertiary prevention levels, in which the primary (general) level is the social prevention aimed at the entire population; secondary (special) level refers to measures aimed at risk groups and specific areas; while tertiary level refers to the content of ensuring that individuals who commit crimes do not commit repeated crimes (single prevention). It turns out that only when all three levels are applied in a holistic way will the expected result – a stable decrease in crime and a decrease in the susceptibility of young people to offenses be ensured. In the U.S. experiment, a greater emphasis was placed on the role of society and local communities in preventing criminal behavior, and multidisciplinary cooperation was established through “community policing” and “youth justice councils”. Specifically, the U.S. Office of juvenile justice and crime prevention recognizes that “communities play a leading role in crime prevention”. And in European countries, the concept “of community policing” (police activities in cooperation with society) is widely introduced, preventive inspectors in neighborhoods communicate directly with citizens, harmonizing general and individual measures of prevention. As can be seen from the above concepts, general, special and individual prevention are different stages and levels of the prevention of violations systems.

Although each of them has separate tasks and methods, it is actually complementary and inextricably linked. In particular, a healthy environment and legal consciousness created through general (social) prevention sets the stage for the effectiveness of special and individual preventive measures.

In the legal system of Uzbekistan, norms related to the prevention of offenses are embodied in two main laws. In particular, the laws of September 29, 2010 “on the Prevention of uncontrolled and violations among minors” and May 14, 2014 “on the Prevention of violations”.

Although these laws are similar in content and focus on the same area, their lack of coordination has created legal gaps and duplication problems. The law of September 29, 2010 was adopted as a separate special law on the Prevention of minors, and in it the concept of Prevention only “individual preventive work” was singled out separately. Article 3 of this law comments on the way “prevention of uncontrolled and violations among minors-a system of measures aimed at identifying and eliminating factors that cause uncontrolled and neglect, carried out in conjunction with individual preventive work.” Note that even in this definition, General (Social) prophylaxis and single prophylaxis were mentioned together, and the term special prophylaxis was not used at all.

And in the general law adopted on May 14, it is mentioned that there are general, special, individual and victimological types of prevention of offenses, but in the norms of the law, the powers of special entities are mainly stated in the framework of general and special Prevention.

For example, while Section 22 of this Act establishes the concepts and foundations of general prevention, Section 24 of special Prevention, the concept of “single prevention” is not revealed in a separate article or chapter. The special law of September 29 2010 is aimed only at minors, in which single prophylaxis is emphasized separately.

Also, the law of May 14, 2014, was more general in scope and had a more complete count of preventive types, but lacked consistency in their regulation.[8]

The above situation has been recognized at the parliamentary and government levels,

In 2020-2022, an initiative was put forward to consolidate and improve these two laws. In September 2020, a new draft law “on the Prevention of violations”, developed by the Ministry of Internal Affairs, was put into discussion, which provided for the unification of the two current laws into a single document. The project expanded the scope of basic concepts in the field of prevention, introducing new terms such as “social prevention”, “preventive conversation”, “protection order”.[9] Also, the tasks, principles and types of prevention were clearly outlined, and the powers of the subjects of prevention were distributed in detail. It was proposed that the role of interdepartmental commissions in the implementation of the Prevention of violations should be determined in a separate chapter. However, during the discussion of this new bill, objections were raised regarding the inconsistency of certain norms with other laws. In December 2022, the Senate of the House of Commons considered this draft law and discussed a new revision of 8 chapters, 88 articles. Senators argued in the text of the act that a number of norms contradict other applicable laws. Senators argued in the text of the act that a number of norms contradict other applicable laws. For example, the project provided for “prevention of alcohol and tobacco consumption among minors” among the tasks of health authorities in the field of prevention, whereas the law “on limiting the distribution of alcohol and tobacco products” established that such preventive measures should be applied to persons under the age of 21, that is, there is a discrepancy in the age category .

As a result of the above scientific theoretical views and scientific analysis of current laws, it became clear that although Uzbekistan has the form of a regulatory framework governing the Prevention of violations, a number of systemic problems remain in its internal logical coherence and mechanism of application. In particular, the types of General-specific-single prevention are named in the legislation and are defined at the level of general concepts, but the transition points between them, specific criteria and decision-making standards (risk assessment, minimum level of evidence, reevaluation deadlines, conditions for the cancellation or strengthening of the measure) are not sufficiently regulated. For this reason, preventive measures in practice are repeated in some cases, without fully complying with the principle of “addressability”, or, conversely, individuals and environments of a particular category are left out of the preventive effect. In addition, as a result of the 2010 special juvenile Prevention Act and the 2014 general law's lack of uniform harmonization of conceptual approaches and procedures, normative uncertainty arises in clearly defining the model of preventive subjects' powers, limits of responsibility, and interagency cooperation.

So, in the coming analysis, it is scientifically justified to highlight these legal and methodological gaps, collisions and their practical consequences as a system of problems.

The above scientific and theoretical views, as well as the content-logical analysis of the norms of current legislation, show that although reforms aimed at improving the Prevention of violations continued politically and legally consistently, in practice a number of systemic problems remain that affect the effectiveness of preventive mechanisms.

These problems are explained first of all by the fact that the legal–institutional “bridges” that provide a functional connection between the general–special-individual types of prevention are not sufficiently strengthened, and concepts and procedures are not put to a uniform standard. In this sense, it can be assessed that the directions promoted in the proposals (institutional unification, clear determination of powers, digitization, strengthening legal guarantees and the implementation of foreign experience) are aimed precisely at eliminating the following problems:

First, there is the problem of fragmentation of legislation in the field of prevention and lack of conceptual uniformity. Since the apparatus of concepts, age criteria, content and legal boundaries of types of prevention are not expressed in the same way in separate legislation regulating one area in practice, different interpretations arise in the practice of law enforcement.

As a result, the general, special and individual mechanisms of Prevention do not manifest themselves as a “single whole system”, but in some cases as a complex of mutually recurrent or non-complementary measures. The general, special and individual mechanisms of Prevention do not manifest themselves as a “single whole system”, but in some cases as a complex of mutually recurrent or non-complementary measures. This adversely affects the institutional stability of preventive activities, contrary to the requirements of legal accuracy and forecasting.

Secondly, there is an uncertainty in the distribution of powers between preventive subjects and an institutional weakness of interdepartmental cooperation. While prevention is a complex socio-legal policy, in practice, " who is responsible for what?" may not be equally resolved in the cross section of territories. In conditions where the status of regional coordinating structures (councils/commissions), mechanisms for ensuring the execution of decisions, accountability and control procedures are not sufficiently legally strengthened, preventive measures are subject to inter-sectoral integration, in most cases, inter-departmental fragmentation. As a result, on the one hand, measures are repeated in certain directions, on the other hand, the likelihood of the formation of an institutional vacuum on the preventive effect in certain “risk points”increases.

Thirdly, the problem of insufficient formation of criteria for assessing the addressability and effectiveness of preventive measures remains relevant. In practice, preventive activities can in most cases get into the appearance of a list of activities performed for the report, while the real social result of the impact may remain unmeasured. The fact that no clear indicators of the assessment of the result (for example, a decrease in repeated infractions in a particular category, dynamics in the composition of the risk group, a percentage of early identified cases) are introduced moves the preventive policy away from the criteria of evidence-based management (evidence-based governance). This limits the ability to allocate resources effectively, assign responsibilities fairly, and scientifically compare the effectiveness of measures.

Fourth, the legal and organizational base of digitization and information sharing necessary to modernize the preventive process is not sufficiently standardized. The consistent operation of unified information systems, electronic monitoring, interagency integration and databases is decisive for determining risks at the early stage of prevention. However, in conditions where data exchange procedures, access rights, data confidentiality, and personal data protection standards are not subject to sufficiently specific legal regulations, digital Prevention may not rise to the level of

a “system” and remain at the level of separate local initiatives. This weakens the analytical, predictive, and reassessment functions of prevention.

Fifth, there is the problem that human rights guarantees are not professionally adequately regulated, especially within the framework of single prevention. When preventive accounting, warning, control measures are used, their rationale, deadlines, the procedure for informing the citizen, the mechanisms of appeal against the decision and the fact that the exact limits of control subjects (such as prosecutor/judicial control) are not fully-systematically stated increases the risk of abuse. This condition is not preventive effectiveness, but, on the contrary, can reduce social confidence, cause stigmatization and legal disputes. Therefore, the preventive effect is not on the restriction of rights and freedoms, it is necessary that the system of guarantees is strong so that it serves protection and rehabilitation within the framework of the law.

Sixth, it is evident that early intervention and diversion mechanisms are not sufficiently developed at the institutional level in Juvenile Delinquency Prevention. In particular, the functioning of Educational, Psychological Service, Social Protection and law enforcement structures in the principle of “one case — one team”, the mechanisms associated with individual rehabilitation and support programs in each case are not uniformly established in all regions. As a result, some young people at an early stage of their predisposition to an offense increase the risk of getting into the contour of control or punishment more quickly, without being covered by socio-supportive measures. This makes it difficult to achieve the result of the main goal of Prevention — re-socialization and stable formation of legal behavior.

In order to eliminate the systemic problems identified by the scientific and theoretical analyzes described above, the following scientifically based proposals and recommendations are put forward, including:

first, it is proposed to supplement Article 3 of the law “on the Prevention of offenses ” with the following concepts:

"risk assessment" - the procedure for assessing the likelihood of committing an offense and its level of social danger on the basis of a set of indicators;

"risk group — - individuals (or, it is proposed to supplement Article 3 of the law” on the Prevention of offenses ” with the following concepts:

"case management “ — the procedure for conducting work on the principle of ”one case — one plan-one coordinator" in interagency cooperation on a person included in the risk group;

"keys-manager” coordinator) — - the person responsible for maintaining the keys, forming an individual plan and coordinating the execution in the manner prescribed by this law

"early intervention" - early identification of risk factors and application of social support measures before the formation of delinquency;

"diversion" is a mechanism for directing an individual (especially a minor) into social rehabilitation, mediative, or educational measures for first-time, socially at-risk behaviors without including them in the outline of punishment/Justice.

Secondly, it is proposed to include in the law ”on the Prevention of violations “ article 231, which is called the new” risk assessment standard and criteria for the transition between general–special–single prevention”.

“Article 23¹. Risk assessment standard and criteria for transition between general–specific–individual prevention

The choice of preventive measures is based on the results of the risk assessment and is carried out in proportion to the level of risk (principle of proportionality).

Risk assessment is carried out on the basis of a single standard. In the single standard, the following are mandatory:

- a) list of indicators and their balance (points), including personality, environment and wiktimological factors
- b) risk levels (low/medium/high) and minimum score limits for each level;
- c) minimum evidence criterion for decision making and acceptable sources of evidence;
- d) reevaluation deadlines, reevaluation fundamentals and monitoring procedure;
- e) the responsible subjects carrying out the assessment, the interagency coordination procedure and the decision-making algorithm;
- f) form of formalization of the results of the assessment (statement/conclusion), the shelf life and the procedure for maintaining an account.

The order of “transition” of preventive measures according to the level of Risk is determined as follows:

- a) low risk - general preventive measures (socio-educational, legal promotion, environmental wellness
- b) medium risk-special Prevention Plan (package of targeted measures, measures to eliminate certain risk factors, term monitoring);
- c) high risk — individual prevention (keys opening, coordinator appointment, individual plan and interagency execution).

Within the framework of individual prevention:

- a) the Coordinator responsible for maintaining the keys is determined;
- b) an individual prevention plan is developed;
- c) the performance results will be re-evaluated within the specified deadlines.

Approval, permanent renewal and implementation of the Risk standard is provided by the Cabinet.

The result of the risk assessment and the decision on preventive measures must be informed to the person (if a minor — to the legal representative); the right to appeal this decision in the prescribed manner is guaranteed.

When applying this article, personal data and information exchange issues are provided in accordance with the requirements of privacy and protection established by the legislation.

A written decision is made to open a case on a person (if a minor — along with his family and environment) in the event of a high risk being identified according to the outcome of the risk assessment, as well as in cases based on the case of middle risk.

A keys manager (coordinator) is appointed at the same time as Keys Opens.

Coordinator:

- a) forms an individual prevention / rehabilitation plan;
- b) coordinates tasks and deadlines in the participatory subject cross section;

- c) defines the result indicators;
- d) constitutes a periodic reassessment on keys.

In the case of minors, case management is carried out with the participation of a legal representative and an educator-psychologist.

The Keys-management regulation is approved by the Cabinet of Ministers and establishes the keys opening/closing framework, coordinator powers, interagency information exchange procedure, privacy, accountability and control mechanisms.

"In cases where the risk has been reduced or is no longer necessary, the case should be mitigated or closed."

It is proposed to include in the law "on the Prevention of violations "a new Article 351" assessment of Preventive outcome.

The activities of preventive subjects are assessed on the basis of performance indicators (KPI), which reflect the effectiveness of prevention. The KPI system serves to assess the address, proportionality and rehabilitation results of preventive measures.

The mandatory minimum KPI for youth prevention consists of:

- a) dynamics of the degree of repeated infringement (relapse);
- b) proportion of early identified risk cases;
- c) positive dynamics in the structure of the risk Group (risk Reduction);
- e) keys closure results (rehabilitation effect)
- fd) social outcomes such as return to education/attendance, employment referral.

KPI indicators are calculated in a normalized form, taking into account the population size, demographic composition, and criminogenic risk characteristics of the region; dynamics (trend) are used as the main criterion for assessment.

The KPI calculation methodology, Reporting Format, Data Validation and audit procedure are approved by the Cabinet of Ministers.

The results of the KPI are linked to the accountability of territorial leaders and responsible subjects.

Restrictions on human rights and freedoms, stigmatization and falsification of information are not allowed in order to ensure the KPI".

It is proposed to include in the law "on the Prevention of violations " article 381, which is called the new "unified electronic information system of prevention".

In a single electronic information system, the following are mandatory:

- a) role - based access rights and powers level;
- b) the principles of purposefulness in data collection and processing and minimization of data;
- c) the terms of data storage and the procedure for archiving/deleting them;
- g) audit logs on all actions performed (Who, when, what information entered / changed);
- d) privacy and personal data protection requirements)
- e) validation and information security measures to ensure the reliability and integrity of data.

Interdepartmental exchange of information shall be carried out only within the framework of the grounds, scope and procedure established by this Law and the regulations approved by the Cabinet of Ministers. The regulation clearly specifies the purposes of information exchange, the composition of the subjects, the types of information, access rights, and measures of responsibility.

In the event that a recommendation (analytical or algorithmic) is made based on data generated in a single electronic information system, the final decision to apply a preventive measure is made only by the authorized official, who is personally responsible for the decision.

In the use of this system, it is not allowed to unreasonably limit the rights and freedoms of citizens, illegally disseminate information and use it out of purpose”.

The law on the Prevention of violations was called the new ”correctness of information in the unified electronic information system, the procedure for correction and complaint”

For the validity, completeness and relevance of the information being entered into a single electronic information system, the authorized official who entered and approved it is personally responsible.

Data in a single electronic information system must be reviewed on a term basis. The periodicity of the review is determined by the level of risk and case, and is reflected in the relevant regulation.

A person (or his/her legal representative, if a minor) must be notified in the prescribed manner that preventive measures have been taken based on his/her personal data, except as provided by law.

A person (or legal representative) has the right to apply to the competent authority to correct, update, or delete information about themselves if they believe that the information in the system is incorrect or outdated.

From the date of receipt of the application, the Competent Authority is obliged to check the information, compare it with the relevant documents and make a reasoned decision within fifteen days. In cases of necessity, the period for conducting additional examinations may be extended in accordance with the procedure established by the regulations, with the applicant being notified.

If the information is found to be incorrect, the competent authority shall correct (update) it, re-evaluate the relevant preventive decisions, and, if necessary, mitigate or reverse the preventive effect.

The procedure for implementing the provisions of this article, the forms of information use, the volume of data viewing, privacy restrictions and technical mechanisms are established in the Regulation approved by the Cabinet of Ministers”.

It is proposed to include in the law”on the Prevention of violations “article 291, which is called the new ”procedural guarantees in the application of individual preventive measures.”.

Individual preventive measures are applied only if there are legally established grounds and in accordance with the principles of proportionality and minimal intervention.

A written decision is made to apply a single preventive measure. The resolution must contain the following:

- a) the legal basis for applying the measure and the brief status of the case;

- b) evidence list and risk assessment result (risk level);
- c) purpose, type and causes of application of the measure
- d) the duration of the measure, the date of review and the conditions for re-evaluation;
- e) the responsible executor(s) and the control procedure.

The decision is handed over to a person (a minor — his legal representative) in exchange for a signature or conveyed in the manner prescribed by law. The content of the decision must be explained.

In the case of single preventive measures, the risk level is reevaluated within the established deadlines. In the event that the Risk is reduced or there is no need to apply the measure, the measures must be relaxed or canceled; a written decision is made about it.

When individual preventive measures are used against minors:

a) "not allowing labeling (stigmatization)", the priority of the child's interests and the principles of minimal intervention are strictly ensured a) "not allowing labeling (stigmatization)", the priority of the child's interests and the principles of minimal intervention are strictly ensured;

b) preventive actions are carried out with the participation of a legal representative, an educator-psychologist, if necessary;

c) measures are directed primarily to education, upbringing, rehabilitation and social support.

In the process of applying individual preventive measures, the requirements for the protection of personal data, privacy and targeted use of information are ensured."

These proposals will serve to transform the scientific concept, which in the future will be based on the topic "theoretical foundations of Prevention: the relationship of general–special–single preventive mechanisms", into a normative mechanism that works in practice in full. In the use of this system, it is not allowed to unreasonably limit the rights and freedoms of citizens, illegally disseminate information and use it out of purpose". In the use of this system, it is not allowed to unreasonably limit the rights and freedoms of citizens, illegally disseminate information and use it out of purpose".

List of Used literature:

1. "Crime prevention" // <https://ru.wikipedia.org/>
2. Криминология: Учебник для вузов / Под общ. ред. А. И. Долговой. 3-е изд., перераб. и доп. М., 2007. С. 437; Криминология: Учебник / Под ред. В. Н. Кудрявцева, В. Е. Эминова. 3-е изд., перераб. и доп. М., 2005. С. 265; Криминология: Учебник/Под ред. Б. В. Коробейникова, Н. Ф. Кузнецовой, Г. М. Миньковского. М., 1988. С. 161; Криминология. М., 1979. С. 123; Курганов С. И. Криминология. М., 2007. С. 80.
3. Simonova S.S. "Theory and practice of crime prevention" // [//https://docs.vlgr.ranepa.ru/Crime_prevention](https://docs.vlgr.ranepa.ru/Crime_prevention) // <https://spravochnick.ru/lektoriy/preduprezhdenie-prestupnosti/>
4. Mirziyoev Sh.M. PQ"on measures to further improve the system of prevention of offenses and combating crime"
5. N.T. Ismailov N.Issmailov N.T. Problems of individual prevention of juvenile delinquency: Legal. science. nomz. ... dis. –ons, Article 7 // <https://lex.uz/mact/-111453>

6. Strengthening discipline and responsibility, strengthening the environment for crime prevention are key factors in the effectiveness of crime prevention // <https://president.uz>
7. *M C Stafford; M Warr* “Reconceptualization of general and specific deterrence” // <https://www.ojp.gov/>
8. The two laws on the Prevention of offenses are combined into one // the project is developed by the Ministry of Internal Affairs and combines the current laws No. 263 “on the Prevention of offenses” No. 371 and No. 29.09.2010 “on the Prevention of uncontrolled and violations among minors” No. 263 of the Ministry of Internal Affairs.