



FORENSIC ASPECTS OF INTERROGATING CORRUPTION SUSPECTS: MODERN TACTICS AND PROFILING

Sakhodulla Shomirzaev

Associate Professor of Law Enforcement Academy of the Republic of Uzbekistan, PhD in Law

Article history:	Abstract:
Received: 8 th March 2026 Accepted: 7 th April 2026	This study examines the forensic, psychological, and procedural aspects of interrogating individuals suspected of corruption-related crimes in Uzbekistan, drawing on modern investigative interviewing models and international best practices. The research aims to determine which interrogation tactics are legally acceptable, practically applicable, and effective in corruption investigations within the national context. A mixed-methods approach was applied, combining comparative legal analysis with an empirical assessment conducted through a focus group of 15 experienced investigators. Participants evaluated 17 interrogation methods widely used in foreign practice, rating their applicability under Uzbek law. The results show strong support for ethical, evidence-based approaches such as the PEACE model, the KREATIV model, profiling, kinesic interviewing, and the use of technical means, particularly video recording. Conversely, coercive or deceptive techniques—including leading questions, provocation, deception, and the Reid method—were assessed as largely incompatible with legislative requirements. The study proposes amendments to the Criminal Procedure Code to align interrogations with international human-rights standards, enhance procedural safeguards, and improve the reliability of suspect testimony. The findings highlight the importance of adopting modern interviewing tactics to ensure lawful, effective, and rights-based interrogation in corruption cases.

Keywords: corruption offences; interrogation tactics; forensic interviewing; PEACE model; KREATIV model; profiling; suspect behaviour; criminal procedure; investigative interviewing

INTRODUCTION

In many countries around the world, investigative authorities utilize various forensic methods and tactics during the interrogation process, particularly in the questioning of suspects. Among the most prominent and effective models are the REID technique in the United States and Israel, the PEACE model in the United Kingdom, the PHASE model in Canada, and the KREATIV model in Norway. At the 14th United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, held from March 7 to 12, 2021, the "Kyoto Declaration on Advancing Crime Prevention, Criminal Justice and the Rule of Law: Towards the Achievement of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development" was adopted. This declaration recommends the promotion and widespread adoption of lawful and evidence-based methods of interrogation (investigative interviewing) to improve the investigative process. Investigative interviewing, in turn, is based on the Mendez Principles." (Ray Bull, 2018).

It is essential to examine whether these interrogation models can be effectively applied in cases of corruption-related crimes, to identify their specific features, and to assess their compatibility with national legislation. This is especially relevant given that corruption crimes are

often latent, making them difficult to detect and prove. In such cases, suspect testimony plays a vital role in uncovering other forms of evidence, including physical evidence.

While respecting current legal frameworks during suspect interrogation, attention must also be paid to identifying the causes and consequences of such crimes and to developing effective practical measures to eliminate them in a timely manner. In countries with well-developed judicial systems, there has been a decisive shift away from torture-based interrogation practices. Instead, strict adherence to the Miranda rule and the full protection of suspects' rights during criminal proceedings are prioritized. In accordance with the principle of the presumption of innocence, a suspect is not considered guilty until proven so by a court verdict that has entered into legal force. Consequently, modern interrogation approaches emphasize treating suspects not as criminals but as human beings, leading to the development of new tactics and methodologies in the interrogation process.

In the context of Uzbekistan's Development Strategy for the New Uzbekistan, which aims at fundamental reforms in all spheres of state and societal life, establishing justice and the rule of law has been



recognized as a key and necessary condition for progress. Objective 14 of the Strategy calls for ensuring the rule of law and constitutional legality, with human dignity as the main criterion of this process. Objective 17 envisions creating a new image of law enforcement agencies, with a focus on protecting the interests, dignity, rights, and freedoms of citizens.

Tasks related to these objectives include the consistent improvement of criminal, criminal-procedural, and penal legislation; the incorporation of humanitarian principles in the criminal punishment and enforcement system; the development of preventive mechanisms to combat torture and the adoption of a special law in this field; strengthening oversight over operational-search and investigative activities; and implementing effective mechanisms to protect the dignity and freedoms of citizens.

According to the Anti-Corruption Agency of the Republic of Uzbekistan, there has been a downward trend in corruption-related crimes in recent years due to measures taken to combat corruption. In 2023, a total of 4,128 criminal cases related to corruption were adjudicated by the courts, which represents a decrease of 479 cases or 11 percent compared to 2022 (4,607 cases). Furthermore, 6,535 individuals were held criminally liable for corruption-related offenses in 2023, a decrease of 879 persons or 12 percent compared to 2022 (7,414 individuals) - (<https://anticorruption.uz/ru/agentlik-hisobotlari>).

To further reduce the incidence of corruption crimes in Uzbekistan, it is crucial to organize thorough and high-quality investigations of such offenses. The goal should not only be to prove the guilt of the suspects but also to identify the underlying causes, circumstances, and contributing factors during the interrogation process. For example, the rehiring of previously convicted individuals into public service roles has facilitated recidivism. In 2023 alone, 1,146 previously convicted individuals committed corruption-related crimes, nearly half of whom—566 individuals—had prior convictions for corruption offenses.

Theoretical analysis of methods of interrogation of suspects in corruption offences

Articles 26–29 of the new Constitution of the Republic of Uzbekistan declare that human dignity and honor are inviolable. No one may be subjected to torture, violence, or other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment. When a person is detained, the reasons and their rights must be explained in a language they understand. All doubts concerning guilt that cannot be eliminated must be resolved in favor of the suspect, accused, defendant, or convicted person. A suspect, accused, or defendant is not required to

prove their innocence and may exercise the right to remain silent at any stage of the proceedings. Any evidence obtained in violation of the law is inadmissible in court. The gravity of a corruption offense does not justify the violation of these constitutional principles.

It is worth noting that the application of modern, torture-free interrogation tactics during investigative procedures—particularly in the interrogation of suspects—should aim to obtain truthful testimony that helps establish new evidence and allows the suspect to voluntarily and knowingly petition for a plea agreement. One of the priority areas of activity for law enforcement agencies remains the fight against economic crimes of a corrupt nature, such as abuse of official position, giving and receiving bribes, mediation in bribery, abuse of authority, commercial bribery, or other unlawful use by an individual of their official position contrary to the legitimate interests of society and the state in order to obtain benefits in the form of money, valuables, other property or services of a property-related nature, or other property rights for themselves or for third parties, as well as the illegal provision of such benefits to the aforementioned individual by other individuals. This also includes committing such acts on behalf of or in the interest of a legal entity.

At the same time, the investigation of each type of corruption-related crime presents certain difficulties and takes place in the context of conflict situations. Interrogation, in turn, is one of the most complex investigative actions and has its own specific features. As analysis of investigative and judicial practice shows, much of this is related to the individual characteristics of the person being interrogated (level of education, intellectual development, ability to perceive the object, etc.). The complexity of interrogation is noted in the research of many forensic scientists. In practice, during the investigation of corruption-related crimes, interrogation takes up about 40% of the investigator's working time, and most of them experience difficulty in choosing tactical methods and techniques that allow them to establish psychological contact and obtain reliable information from the interrogated person.

The forensic essence of interrogation lies in the investigator obtaining from the interrogated person information relevant to the investigated event, in a form established by criminal procedural legislation.

The interrogator must understand the importance of the introductory statement, the differences between open, closed and direct questions, and indicators of truthfulness and deception (Kenichi Kiyono, 2013).

There are a number of tactical methods of interrogation used in the investigation of corruption-related crimes. These methods, developed by forensic science and



applied in practice, vary in content and purpose, but in any case, must not contradict the norms of the Criminal Procedure Code. The interrogation of a suspect (accused) presents the greatest complexity in all respects, requiring the investigator to thoroughly prepare for its conduct.

During the interrogation of suspects in criminal cases of the mentioned category, the following methods may be used: a) creating conditions that convince the interrogated person of their inevitable exposure; b) creating an exaggerated impression of the evidence available to the investigation; c) "allowing a legend" (i.e., letting the suspect offer a false version for strategic purposes); d) "distraction or indirect interrogation," among others. [Y.Voloshina, 2024]

Another important feature of interrogating suspects in corruption-related crimes is the assessment of their psychological state. For this category of interrogated individuals, on the one hand, there is a confidence in their own innocence, a negative attitude towards state structures in general and the investigator in particular, knowledge of the law and their rights; on the other hand, there is a feeling of fear and anxiety due to the inability to accurately foresee and control the situation, and a lack of knowledge about the evidence in the case. It should be noted that since a significant portion of suspects in corruption-related crimes are individuals with higher (and sometimes multiple) degrees and since their actions in preparing for the commission of the crime were carefully planned, obtaining reliable information is a complex task for the investigator. At the same time, establishing psychological contact between the suspect and the investigator is not in itself a guarantee of a successful interrogation.

This situation necessitates the development of techniques aimed at exposing false alibis and counteracting possible interference with the investigation (M. Milovanova, 2020).

An effective tactical method is also the use of video recording during interrogation. With its help, it is possible to refute attempts to discredit the investigator and to challenge the results of the interrogation. The use of technical means during interrogation serves as a deterrent for the interrogated person from exercising the right to refuse to testify or to change their testimony.

O date, a number of interrogation tactics and methods developed in various foreign countries have been used during the questioning of suspects. Although these methods are generally intended for individuals suspected of various types of crimes, they have also been applied in the interrogation of persons involved in corruption-related offenses. Certain versions of these

tactics can still be observed in practice within post-Soviet states. It is important to emphasize that "giving testimony is a right, not an obligation, of a suspect or accused." (T.A. Sedova, 2019)

One such method known among specialists is the "Canadian" technique, also referred to as "Mr. Big" developed by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. The purpose of this tactic is to obtain significant information from a suspect who, despite being linked to a crime through available evidence, refuses to admit guilt or cooperate with law enforcement in exposing other criminals. It is often viewed as a last resort measure to elicit testimony relevant to the case. [S.Shomirzaev, 2024]

In practice, "there is often no absolute certainty that the suspect committed the crime, hence the initial questioning is investigative in nature, aiming to clarify the suspect's profile, circumstances, arguments, and the information he is willing to provide." (E.P. Ishchenko, 2019)

Another well-known technique is the classic "good cop, bad cop" approach. In this method, the "bad cop" first interrogates the suspect with aggression and arrogance. Once the suspect resists admitting guilt, the "good cop" intervenes, reproaches the other officer for harshness, and takes over the questioning in a seemingly more empathetic manner. [S.Shomirzaev, 2024]

"Leading and loaded questions" represent another tactic, though one that is prohibited in many legal systems. In Uzbekistan, for instance, Article 102 of the Criminal Procedure Code forbids the use of suggestive questions — those that directly or indirectly prompt the expected answer. [S.Shomirzaev, 2024]

Interrogators cannot always keep suspects in custody and may instead conduct "field interview", which are informal and not bound by a strict protocol, placing greater responsibility on the interviewing officer's discretion.

There is also the kinesic interview technique, which emphasizes observing the suspect's behavior during questioning.

"Minimization and maximization" techniques involve persuading the suspect that the offense is minor and the punishment light (minimization), or exaggerating the gravity of the offense and potential consequences (maximization).

In the "deception" technique, investigators are allowed to lie during interrogation — for instance, falsely claiming that they have fingerprint or DNA evidence or eyewitnesses. This tactic is often used to push the suspect to confess.



Currently, modern investigative interviewing models such as the British PEACE model and Norway's KREATIV model have gained prominence. Hybrid models include the REID technique (U.S.), PHASE model (Canada), and cognitive interviewing. These approaches are widely used for interrogating suspects and are considered effective in corruption investigations. The core goal remains to obtain factual information about the suspect's identity, connections, abuse of authority, and acquisition of illicit benefits or services. [S.Shomirzaev, 2024]

One of the most globally recognized techniques is the Reid Technique, primarily used in the United States and Israel. It is a complex, lengthy procedure that incorporates multiple strategies. It begins by confronting the suspect with evidence but does not initially accuse them of the crime.

A distinguishing feature of the Reid Technique is the monologic nature of the interrogation: the investigator controls the conversation, not allowing the suspect to interrupt or defend themselves until a confession is likely. The suspect, in turn, tries to demonstrate innocence, often leading to a confession.

The Reid Technique consists of three stages:

Factual analysis;

A non-accusatory behavioral interview to gather investigative and behavioral data;

The main Reid interrogation, comprising nine structured steps, built on prior analysis and interviews.

However, the Reid Technique has been heavily criticized for being coercive and prone to eliciting false confessions, especially due to the extensive use of deception. According to critics (R.I. Sednev, E.A. Shatalov, 2020), it can easily result in wrongful admissions of guilt.

Several European countries prohibit the use of the Reid Technique, particularly in cases involving minors, where suspects must not be misled with false claims of evidence. In German criminal procedure law, threats and deceit are prohibited during interrogation. Moreover, Germany's requirement that suspects be informed of their right to silence fundamentally contradicts the Reid approach.

This aligns with Uzbekistan's legal standards, particularly Article 28 of the Constitution, which states that a suspect or defendant is not obligated to prove their innocence and may remain silent at any time. According to Article 100 of Uzbekistan's Criminal Procedure Code, a suspect must be informed of their rights and obligations, including the right to refuse to testify and the understanding that their testimony may be used against them as evidence (Article 48).

Additionally, the alternative-answer questions used in the Reid Technique may fall under the category of leading questions, which are explicitly banned under Article 102 of Uzbekistan's Criminal Procedure Code.

As an alternative, the PEACE technique is widely recognized for promoting dialogue between investigator and suspect. In 2015, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police officially adopted a PEACE-based standard.

While the UK refers to this as the PEACE model, Norway developed a similar framework called KREATIV. Both follow the structure of procedural interviewing and share similar goals.

The PEACE acronym stands for:

Planning and Preparation

Engage and Explain

Account, Clarify, and Challenge

Closure

Evaluation [Ray Bull, 2018]

The Planning and Preparation stage is critical, as its quality directly influences the success of the interrogation. The investigator sets the structure and objectives, gathers background information, anticipates complications, and creates a comprehensive plan.

During the Engage and Explain stage, the suspect is introduced to the procedure, their rights are clarified, and the interrogation's purpose is explained. This transparency helps to reduce the suspect's stress and anxiety.

The Account, Clarify, and Challenge phase consists of three sub-stages:

Encouraging the suspect to give a free narrative of events;

Asking open-ended follow-up questions for clarity and expansion;

Addressing missing but relevant information not mentioned in the narrative.

In the Closure phase, the interrogation concludes in a structured and non-abrupt manner, ensuring the suspect feels they were treated fairly. This increases the likelihood of cooperation in future investigative actions and contributes to the quality of further information.

The final Evaluation stage involves assessing the accuracy and relevance of the information obtained and the overall performance of the interviewer.

Using the PEACE technique in interrogations can achieve the following outcomes:

Obtain detailed, crime-related information without the use of coercion;

Collect reliable data on suspects and their networks;

Verify and locate physical evidence;

Encourage the suspect to recognize that confession is the most rational decision. [Methodology of procedural interview. Analytical note, 2022]



The PEACE model, with its ethical and dialogical approach to suspect interrogation, has proven highly effective in countries such as the United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia. As noted by Michael Boyle and Jean-Claude Vuille, "A large body of research shows that torture and inhumane treatment do not produce reliable information, nor do they serve the ultimate goal of police interrogations" (Juan Mendez, 2023).

In modern times, profiling methods have become applicable across various fields and are increasingly essential and beneficial for public officials who interact with different individuals in their daily activities. The term "profiling" is derived from the English word "profile," meaning to determine or assess the parameters of a person. Broadly, it refers to a set of methodologies and psychological techniques for predicting and evaluating a person's behavior based on their appearance, verbal and nonverbal cues, and other distinctive indicators.

The term "profiling" was initially used to construct the psychological portrait of an unknown individual based on traces left at a crime scene. One of the pioneers in this field was British surgeon Thomas Bond. The systematic development of criminal profiling was spearheaded in the United States Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) by P. Brooks and R. Ressler, particularly to solve cases involving violent serial offenders. This initiative led to the development of the Violent Criminal Apprehension Program (VICAP). [S.Asyamov, 2022]

In Austria and Germany, similar systems exist under the name VICLAS (Violent Crime Linkage Analysis System), which was originally developed by Canadian police forces. These programs serve as databases containing all information about traces left at crime scenes, with the primary goal of assisting investigations by constructing psychological profiles that reflect behavioral characteristics rather than personal traits. This approach later became known as criminal profiling. [M.Kodirov, 2021]

At the FBI National Academy, the Behavioral Sciences Unit (BSU) was established to develop methods for constructing the psychological profile of a criminal. This involves analyzing criminal activity and hypothesizing about the perpetrator's psychological traits based on such analyses. [S.Asyamov, 2022]

Key Features of Profiling Include:

Observing individuals who may pose a threat, asking questions, conducting rapid psychological diagnostics, and identifying deviations from behavioral norms.

Modeling the actions of individuals who may be preparing for illegal interference, identifying signs of such preparations, classifying potential perpetrator

types (profiles), and determining each person's likelihood of involvement.

Profiling requires specialists skilled in visual psychodiagnostics, rapid interviews, neuro-linguistic programming techniques, and some investigative tactics.

Visual-behavioral profiling includes analysis of a person's dominant clothing style, mood, nature of interpersonal relationships, movement dynamics, and amplitude. Since profiling is a relatively new methodology, there are differing views among scholars regarding its stages. For example, experts in the US and UK break it down into observation and interrogation stages, each with distinct techniques.

In the observation stage, three primary factors influence effectiveness:

Intuition – a natural, inborn ability or sensory sensitivity that helps the profiler sense internal signals.

Experience – gained from working in the same area or field for many years, allowing familiarity with local patterns of criminal behavior.

Knowledge and broad worldview – although listed last, a well-educated officer with a broad perspective can succeed in any field, even without the previous two traits.

Most police detectives consider criminal case profiling highly useful. For instance, over 90% of investigators in the UK expressed a desire to consult profiling experts during investigations. Similar results were reported in the US, Germany, and the Netherlands (S. Asyamov, 2022).

The Purpose of Profiling in Interrogation: The aim is to determine whether a suspect is guilty or innocent through the analysis of personality, behavior, and verbal/nonverbal cues. This process also prepares the investigator to present key evidence in follow-up or supplementary interrogations. The success of profiling during interrogation relies on timely and correct application of interview techniques.

Several psychological personality types of corrupt individuals can be identified:

Individuals with leadership and organizational abilities: These individuals often demand discipline and procedural compliance from subordinates in the execution of their duties.

Individuals with a disregard for personal actions: Such individuals tend to lack moral and ethical principles, and they do not analyze the consequences of their actions.

Individuals lacking analytical and forecasting abilities: They are incapable of critically evaluating their behavior and typically adapt their conduct to align with their superiors' behavior. [S.Shomirzaev, 2024]



METHOD AND RESULTS

In order to assess the applicability of modern tactics for interrogating suspects of committing corruption-related crimes in the practice of investigative bodies of Uzbekistan, we held a focus group, which involved 15 experts from different cities of Uzbekistan. The purpose of the discussion was to assess the degree of applicability of the Interrogation of suspects in corruption offences methods. Before the focus group, a conversation was held with the participants, in which they were reminded of 17 main interrogation methods used in foreign investigative practice. Then they were asked to discuss and jointly assess the applicability of

each method in the practice of investigating corruption crimes in the Republic of Uzbekistan. Applicability was to be assessed by the focus group participants, including taking into account the requirements and restrictions of the legislation of the state of Uzbekistan. Upon completion of the group work, each participant independently assessed each of the 16 methods on the following scale:

- 1) applicable
- 2) applicable in individual cases
- 3) not applicable

The results are presented in Table 1

Table 1

Assessment by experts on the applicability of interrogation methods for suspects in corruption offences

№	interrogation methods for suspects in corruption offences	Количество ответов (N=15 экспертов)		
		applicable	applicable in some cases	not applicable
1	creating conditions that convince the person being interrogated of the inevitability of his exposure	13	2	0
2	creating an exaggerated impression of the evidence available to the investigation	10	5	0
3	"allowing a legend" (i.e. giving the suspect the opportunity to make a false version for strategic purposes)	5	10	0
4	"distraction or indirect interrogation"	2	8	5
5	Use of technical means (video recording)	15	0	0
6	"Canadian" technique, also called "Mr. Big"	4	11	0
7	"good cop, bad cop".	5	10	0
8	"Leading and provocative questions"	0	3	12
9	Field interrogations	4	11	0
10	kinetic interview method	14	1	0
11	"Minimization and maximization" methods	3	9	3
12	Deception methods	0	1	14
13	British PEACE model	13	2	0
14	Norwegian KREATIV model	13	2	0
15	Hybrid models including the REID technique (USA), the PHASE model (Canada) and cognitive interviewing	0	10	5
16	REID method		10	5
17	Profiling	13	2	0

As can be seen from Table 1, methods numbered 4, 8, 11, 12, 15, 16 are assessed as inapplicable in the investigation of corruption in Uzbekistan. Experts consider methods 1, 2, 5, 10, 13, 14, 17 to be the most applicable.

Thus, it can be concluded that all experts unanimously approved and stated the method of using of technical means, especially, video recording can be used. In

addition, it is possible to create conditions that convince the interrogated person of the inevitability of his influence, and to use interrogation methods such as the British PEACE model and the Norwegian CREATIVE model.

On the contrary, many experts have found that leading and provocative questions and deception methods should not be used, as this not only hinders the



establishment of the truth, but can also lead to the conviction of an innocent person.

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the interrogation tactics mentioned above and examples from foreign practices, it can be concluded that caution and a non-superficial approach are required when interrogating individuals who have committed or are suspected of committing corruption-related crimes. An effective interrogation of a suspect is essential not only for proving their guilt or innocence but also for identifying the actual perpetrators and the organizers who systematically orchestrate such crimes. In this process, it is necessary for the suspect to trust the interrogating official and to sense the inevitability of punishment.

From this standpoint, and in line with international standards, it is advisable to introduce the following amendments to the national criminal procedural legislation of the Republic of Uzbekistan:

Reformulation of Article 47 of the Criminal Procedure Code (CPC) of the Republic of Uzbekistan as follows:

A suspect is a person against whom a criminal case has been initiated in the prescribed manner and on appropriate grounds, or who has been detained in the prescribed manner, or who has been informed of being suspected of committing a crime, but has not yet been formally charged.

Insertion of the following provision into Article 913 of the CPC:

The interrogation of a suspect via videoconference shall be carried out by the investigator (or inquiry officer) at the suspect's location on the basis of a written assignment issued by the investigator (or inquiry officer) conducting the case.

Clarification of the procedure outlined in Article 914 of the CPC, particularly:

Within 24 hours, a transcript of the interrogation should be sent to the investigator or inquiry officer who issued the instruction, along with attached documents and materials, including the warrant of the defense attorney, if one participated.

A fundamental revision must be made to dissociate the interrogation of the suspect from the stage of criminal case initiation. From the moment a report or complaint of a crime is registered, the individual should be recognized as a suspect. This recognition should be documented in a unified registry of criminal prosecution, in a specific procedural format. The decision to treat someone as a suspect must be made by an authorized official and coordinated with the prosecutor.

The use of prohibited interrogation techniques, especially when questioning suspects, must be explicitly listed in the procedural legislation.

An additional clause should be included in Article 951 of the CPC (as point 7), stating: If a suspect's testimony, obtained without legal counsel or after waiving the right to legal defense, contradicts their statements during trial, such testimony shall not be admissible as evidence.

Furthermore, during investigations of corruption-related crimes, particularly when interrogating suspects in disputed circumstances, the following techniques should be employed: re-interrogation, restating specific questions, techniques that give the impression that the investigator is fully informed, indirect questioning, and presenting the suspect with incriminating evidence. These methods ensure that the testimony is timely verified, discourage the giving of false statements, and help obtain truthful information using irrefutable evidence.

For each corruption-related crime as stipulated in the Criminal Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan, specific versions should be developed and systematized into interrogation plans. These structured plans will enhance the effectiveness of suspect interrogations, ensuring that timely questions yield necessary testimony.

Regardless of the type of crime, the interrogation of a suspect should incorporate investigative interviewing techniques, especially the PEACE model, and profiling-based interrogation methods. Establishing psychological rapport with the suspect through these methods has proven highly effective in foreign practices for obtaining truthful statements. The consistent and contextually appropriate application of such techniques is therefore crucial.

CONCLUSION

This research is based on the analysis and comparative study of international experience and national legislation. It outlines the use of modern methods and tactics in the interrogation of suspects in corruption-related crimes, emphasizes the need to apply such methods in accordance with national legal requirements, and identifies existing issues within the criminal and criminal procedural legislation of Uzbekistan, proposing necessary recommendations for their resolution. In this regard, it is important to examine the Constitution of the Republic of Uzbekistan, the criminal and criminal-procedural codes, and relevant subordinate legislation. It is also essential to analyze the problems associated with interrogating individuals suspected of corruption offenses and to



determine how to align modern interrogation tactics with national legal norms.

REFERENCES

1. Decree the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan "On the Development Strategy of the New Uzbekistan for 2022-2026" dated January 28, 2022, No.DP-60. Retrieved May 1, 2025 from <https://lex.uz/uz/docs/6968143>
2. <https://anticorruption.uz/ru/agentlik-hisobotlari>
3. Juan Mendez. Principles of Effective Interviewing during Investigation and Information Collection. 2019
4. Kyoto Declaration on Advancing Crime Prevention, Criminal Justice and the Rule of Law: Towards the Achievement of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development
5. M.Kodirov. Customs profiling. Tashkent. 2019.
6. M.Milovanova. K voprosu o ponyatii i sodержanii alibi v protsesse rassledovaniya. Pravo i pravoporyadok v fokuse nauchnih issledovaniy. Vipusk 1. Sbornik nauchnih trudov, Xabarovsk - 2020.
7. Methodology of Procedural Interview. Analytical Note. – Almaty, 2022
8. Ray Bull. PEACE-ful Interviewing/Interrogation. August 2018, DOI: 10.1002/9781119362081.ch10
9. S. Asyamov. Criminal Profiling: Monograph. – Tashkent: "YURPSI", 2022
10. S.Shomirzaev. Kriminalistik aspects of interrogation of suspects. Dissertation. Tashkent – 2024,
11. T.A. Sedova et al. Criminalistics: Textbook. – Moscow: "Jurisprudence", 2019.
12. Y.Voloshina. Dopros. Poryadok provedeniya, takticheskiye priyemi, tipichnie situatsii. <https://zakon.ru/blog/2024/3/15/>