AGORA International Journal of Juridical Sciences, http://univagora.ro/jour/index.php/aijjs
ISSN 1843-570X, E-ISSN 2067-7677
Vol. 19, No. 2 (2025), pp. 120-130

PARTICULARITIES OF LEGAL ACTION FOR COMPENSATION OF DAMAGES CAUSED TO THE ANIMAL KINGDOM

E. GUGULAN

Evghenia Gugulan
Private Law Departament, „Stefan cel Mare" Academy of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Moldova
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5960-1164, E-mail: gugulan.eugenia@gmail.com

Abstract: *The legal regulations concerning the procedural aspects of compensating for damage caused to the animal kingdom establish the normative framework and mechanisms through which harm to wildlife is assessed and remedied. These regulations include provisions from civil, administrative, and, in some cases, criminal law, aiming to protect biodiversity and ensure accountability for those responsible for damages. The damage compensation procedure follows several stages, including identifying the harm, determining the form of legal liability, assessing the impact on the ecosystem, and implementing compensatory or ecological restoration measures. This study aims to analyse the legal regulations applicable to the compensation for damage to the animal kingdom, highlighting both theoretical aspects and practical challenges encountered in their implementation. Additionally, it will examine the procedural mechanisms involved in damage assessment, liability determination, and the application of compensatory or ecological restoration measures.*

Keywords: *animal kingdom, environmental damage, judicial competence, court decision, civil action, compensation, monetary equivalent.*

1. INTRODUCTION

The protection of the animal kingdom represents a crucial component of environmental law, with significant implications for the balance of ecosystems and biodiversity. Damage to wildlife, whether caused by economic activities or through negligent human actions, necessitates the adoption of clear legal regulations regarding the prevention, documentation, and remediation of environmental harm.

In this context, the national and international legislative framework establishes specific mechanisms of legal liability, guiding principles, and administrative and judicial procedures aimed at restoring affected ecosystems and compensating for the damages caused.

2. Materials and methods

The present research is a scientific-applied study on the legal aspects related to compensating for damages caused to the animal kingdom. Consequently, the analysis method, the comparative method, and the deduction method were applied in a compiled manner. Additionally, the methods of systematization and generalization have a significant impact on the proposed study.

3. Material and territorial juristiction ofe the court over actions for compensation of damage caused to the animal kingdon

The administration of justice is possible when the competencies and responsibilities of courts are clearly delineated. This necessity arises due to the existence of multiple judicial bodies, requiring the precise definition of their duties so that their activities do not overlap with those of other institutions and to ensure that no legal areas remain unaddressed.

As stated in specialized legal literature: *"(T)he competence of a judicial body represents, therefore, what the law determines that it can and must do in the capacity with which it is entrusted; it defines the limits within which its regular and normal activity can extend, and it constitutes its legal aptitude to perform certain acts, particularly to exercise a specific portion of its jurisdictional function"* (Boroi G. Stancu M. (2023). p.176).

Consequently, actions for damage compensation fall within the jurisdiction of the district court, as it is the court of first instance.

Previously, procedural civil legislation assigned jurisdiction over cases involving damage to the animal kingdom to the **Courts of Appeal**. For instance, Article 33 of the **Civil Procedure Code of the Republic of Moldova**, in its version prior to 2012, established that the Courts of Appeal, as courts of general jurisdiction, adjudicated in the first instance civil cases concerning the protection of the rights and interests of the state and administrative-territorial units related to environmental protection (Civil Procedure Code of Republic of Moldova. art. 33).

Today, lawsuits and claims regarding damages resulting from matters related to the use and protection of the animal kingdom fall under the jurisdiction of the courts.

Additionally, current legislation upholds the rule that actions for compensation of damages caused to the animal kingdom are to be resolved by the court in the jurisdiction where the defendant is located (Civil Procedure Code of Republic of Moldova.art.38). Furthermore, Article 39 of the Civil Procedure Code of the Republic of Moldova grants the claimant the option to choose the competent court within the limits set by law.

In the same vein, Article 40 of the Civil Procedure Code of the Republic of Moldova establishes specific regulations regarding exclusive jurisdiction, as follows:

Lawsuits concerning rights over land, subsoil resources, forest strips, perennial plantations, isolated water resources, houses, premises, constructions, and other immovable properties, as well as possessory actions related to these goods and actions for the removal of sequestration from goods, shall be filed in the court where these goods are located. If the goods subject to the action are situated within the jurisdiction of multiple courts, the claim may be filed in any court within whose territorial jurisdiction a part of the goods is located (Civil Procedure Code of Republic of Moldova.art.38, para.1). Regarding lawsuits for damages caused to the environment, such actions shall be brought against the owners (or possessors) of equipment in the court where the equipment is installed, except in cases where it is installed abroad (Civil Procedure Code of Republic of Moldova. art.38).

We believe that although the Civil Procedure Code of the Republic of Moldova contains clear and rigid regulations concerning territorial jurisdiction, the rules should be reconsidered when it comes to damages affecting wildlife.

In this regard, we are of the opinion that the legislator should reconsider the procedural stance and establish the rule according to which the place for examining the case concerning the damages caused to the animal kingdom should be determined by the place where the damage occurred. Such an approach would not pose a difficulty for the plaintiff in terms of traveling to the defendant's location. Moreover, it would serve as a deterrent to the perpetrator. Furthermore, we consider that an alternative solution could be to establish a regulation whereby the issue of the location for examining the case related to the repair of damages caused to the animal kingdom would be left to the discretion of the plaintiff. In such a case, the plaintiff could even choose the court from their place of residence.

Thus, we would propose supplementing Article 38 of the Civil Procedure Code with a new paragraph with the following content: *"(3) The action regarding the repair of damages caused to the environment may be filed, at the discretion of the plaintiff, at the court in the territorial jurisdiction of the plaintiff's domicile (registered office), the defendant's domicile (registered office), or the place where the damage occurred."*

In this way, the plaintiff, filing an action regarding the repair of damages caused to the animal kingdom, will be able to choose, depending on their interest, whether the case will be examined at the court in the location of their domicile or registered office, at the domicile or registered office of the defendant, or at the court in the place where the damage occurred.

If the claims are made regarding several defendants, the territorial jurisdiction of the court concerning the location of the defendant, the plaintiff will choose it depending on the location of any of the defendants (Trofimov I. Gugulan E. (2023). p. 43-54).

4. The parties in the action for damages

The existence of a civil case cannot be conceived without the court and, at least, two parties with opposing interests involved in the case: on one side, the "*claimant*," who usually formulates the claim, and on the other side, the "*defendant*," who comes to defend themselves in court against the claims made – *"actus trium personarum: iudicis, actoris atque rei*." (Boroi G. Stancu M. (2023). p. 88).

*The Civil Procedure Code of Romania (*Cornu G. Foyer J. Procédure civile. (1996).p.496) uses the notion of "*party*" or "*parties*" for the individuals between whom a conflict has arisen, but it does not specify the legal content.

Establishing the content of the notion of "party" is more of a doctrinal task, but approaching it in a simplistic way would constitute a major error (Leș I. Ghiță D. Lozneanu V. (2020). p.86).

Thus, in specialized French legal literature, some authors categorically state that the notion of "party" is a "procedural notion." (Cornu G. Foyer J. Procédure civile. (1996).p.496). The characterization of the concept of "party" provided by Gérard Cornu and Jean Foier is significant and entirely valid in our law as well: "parties must be considered only the persons between whom the process is initiated, **the parties in the case**, just as other persons are parties in a contract." (Vincent J. Guinchard S. (1999). p. 351).

More recent formulations are provided by Loïc Cadiet and Emmanuel Jeuland, who in turn consider the notion of "party" as one of the most delicate issues of judicial law. They

observe that the claimant is the one who initiated the action, and the defendant is the one against whom the claim was made (Leș I., Ghiță D., Lozneanu V. (2020). p. 86).

A group of authors argue that, understanding this concept is of interest for determining the rights and obligations of the procedural participants. This is because, on the one hand, some rights and obligations are provided by law only for the parties, and on the other hand, the judicial decision will produce direct effects only for the persons who participated in the judicial activity as parties (Savva A., Tihon V., Gugulan E., Mariț M. (2025). p. 99).

Consequently, before discussing the parties involved in the action to repair the damage caused to the animal kingdom, it is necessary to make a remark, namely that we must distinguish between the parties and participants in procedural relations, where the parties are those participants who invoke and claim the defence of a specific right, while other participants, other than the parties, usually cannot invoke a personal interest.

The general rule, which we are accustomed to referring to when talking about the parties in the legal relationship of liability for damages caused to the animal kingdom, is that the parties in the liability relationship for damage caused to the animal kingdom are the state and administrative-territorial units on one hand, and the natural and legal persons who caused the damage, on the other hand. However, it must be understood that this formula is general and sometimes even incorrect, as the combinations of participation in the liability relations for damages caused to the animal kingdom can be quite diverse.

This is because the perception that the state or, as the case may be, administrative-territorial units can only have the status of the claimant is a mistaken perception. The same applies to natural and legal persons in relation to their exclusive status as offenders. Thus, not only natural and legal persons can have the status of offenders (wrongdoers), but also the State, as well as the administrative-territorial units.

The state can cause damage to the animal kingdom, which represents the area of interest for the administrative-territorial unit, and vice versa. In the same sense, the state can cause damage to the animal kingdom, thus disturbing the interests of natural or legal persons, including private ones.

Therefore, we will not refer to a specific quality from the perspective of the subject's legal status, but we will analyze the range of possibilities and duties provided by law for the parties in the process of examining disputes related to damages caused to the animal kingdom, without referring to the type of subject.

Thus, in accordance with the provisions of Article 55 of the Civil Procedure Code of the Republic of Moldova, the participants in the process are considered to be: the parties, interveners, representatives, the prosecutor, persons who, in accordance with Article 7 Civil Procedure Code of the Republic of Moldova paragraph (2), Articles 73 and 74 Civil Procedure Code of the Republic of Moldova, are authorized to address the court with requests to defend the rights, freedoms, and legitimate interests of other persons or who intervene in the process to submit conclusions in defence of the rights of other persons, as well as persons interested in cases with special procedures (Trofimov I. Gugulan E.(2023).p. 43-54).

Taking into account the public nature of the interest pursued through liability mechanisms for the damage caused to the animal kingdom, the claimant can invoke an action

for repairing the damage caused to the animal kingdom only if another person has not made such a claim, as well as if the amount and extent of the claims do not differ.

If such a claim has already been made, the claimant can only join the process. They may request the supplementation of the claims without repeating those already made.

In fact, as previously mentioned, the claimant can file multiple claims. However, the court will examine them separately and will not apply distinct conditions and procedures. All the claims will be examined in the same process, as they have the same subject – the concrete damage caused to the animal kingdom.

It is important to note that often the damage caused to the animal kingdom is associated with damage to other environmental elements. For example, the death of fish in a water basin is usually associated with pollution of the water basin. In such cases, the claimant does not file separate actions for the repair of each category of polluted natural resources. On the contrary, the comprehensive approach to the situation allows the court to examine both the evidence proving the damage and the causal relationship between the polluting phenomena.

In this sense, each claim, although it may refer to different natural resources, will still be examined in the context of the interdependence of the phenomena.

Similarly, an important subject in this regard is the issue related to the succession of the right to claim damages caused to the animal kingdom.

Although it has been previously mentioned that damages caused to the animal kingdom are subject to succession according to the general rules, starting from the provisions of Article 37 of the Constitution of the Republic of Moldova, once any person is the subject of the environmental interest, the necessity of succession of such a right is not necessarily justified. At the same time, it should not be considered that addressing the subject related to the succession of liability for damage caused to the animal kingdom is entirely meaningless (Lupan E. (2003). p. 238).

In this regard, the logic of the succession of responses is grounded in the fact that the successor can oppose all the exceptions raised by the deceased claimant against the defendant. Thus, in the case where the successor, during their time, could have intervened in the process against the perpetrator but did not do so due to the absence of a real interest, and in fact did not intervene, they acquire the possibility to intervene as a result of the opening of the inheritance and identify a real interest. Therefore, they can support all the claims and requests that the deceased claimant had. At the same time, the successor substitutes the deceased claimant in the process and takes over all the procedural opportunities missed by the claimant due to their initial non-intervention in the process.

As previously mentioned, if the damage results from the actions of multiple individuals, they are jointly liable. However, the claimant can file the action without being obligated to name all the perpetrators, having the possibility to submit claims against any of the perpetrators. These claims can be made in relation to the full damage. In turn, the defendant who lost the case is entitled to approach the court for recourse (Trofimov I. Gugulan E. (2023). p. 43-54).

It should be noted that if the defendant, summoned to court to answer jointly for the actions of multiple perpetrators who caused harm to the animal kingdom, is liable according

to environmental responsibility rules, in the recourse action, the defendant who lost the case will be held liable according to the rules of joint debtor responsibility under civil law provisions, without the possibility of invoking environmental law responsibility. In other words, if the one who is jointly liable for the act causing harm to the animal kingdom, committed by several people, does so on the basis of objective responsibility – regardless of fault, then in recourse, the joint perpetrators will be liable to this defendant based on principles of subjective responsibility, grounded in fault.

It should be mentioned that in recourse, the court will examine not the issue of the harm caused to the animal kingdom, but rather the issue concerning the manner of executing the monetary obligation in relation to the harm caused to the animal kingdom.

5. Proof of the right to compensation and the subject of the action for damage repair through monetary equivalent caused to the animal kingdom

Evidence plays a crucial role in civil proceedings. In order to issue a judgment, the judge must know all the details related to the relationships between the parties, the facts that gave rise to the conflict of interest brought before the court, and then apply the corresponding legal norm to these facts. Since the dispute cannot be resolved solely based on the statements of the parties, which are usually contradictory, it follows that evidence is indispensable for establishing the factual situation, representing the means by which the competent court can become aware of the material legal relationships under judgment.

Therefore, the parties must support the claims they make regarding the claims filed and the defenses against these claims, and the judge will form their conviction and issue the judgment based on the evidence presented in the case – *da mihi factum, dabo tibi ius* ("give me the facts, I will give you the law"– a maxim meaning that the parties to a dispute must present evidence to the court, which will make a legal decision based solely on the evidence provided by the parties).

In the examination of the case regarding the compensation for damage caused to the animal kingdom, the plaintiff must prove the presence of the conditions established by law in order for the defendant's liability for the damage caused to the animal kingdom to be invoked.

Here, in the absence of a separate regulation, we conclude that both regarding the burden of proof and the means of evidence, the general rules applicable to the civil process of examining civil cases shall apply (Trofimov I. Gugulan E. (2023). p. 43-54).

Thus, Article 117 of the Civil Procedure Code of the Republic of Moldova stipulates that: "...(e)vidence in civil cases consists of factual elements, obtained in the manner prescribed by law, that serve to establish the circumstances justifying the claims and objections of the parties, as well as other circumstances important for the fair resolution of the case." (Civil Procedure Code of the Republic of Moldova.art.117). As evidence in civil cases, elements of fact are admissible, such as explanations from the parties and other persons interested in the resolution of the case, testimonies from witnesses, documents, material evidence, audio-video recordings, and expert opinions. The legislator mentions that data obtained in violation of the law do not have probative value and cannot be used by the court based on its ruling (Civil Procedure Code of the Republic of Moldova. art.117).

As mentioned, in terms of evidence, in the regular civil procedure, the burden of proof lies with the plaintiff. This means the plaintiff must prove the illicit nature of the act, the presence of damage to the animal kingdom, must demonstrate the value and extent of the damage caused to the animal kingdom, as well as the causal link between the damage and the defendant's (perpetrator's) act (Trofimov I. Gugulan E. (2023). p.43-54).

We further clarify that proving guilt is not an issue for examination in the process of liability for damage caused to the animal kingdom, and therefore, the plaintiff is not required to prove (evidence) this matter.

At the same time, such a general approach makes it difficult for individuals who invoke harm caused to the environment during the legal process. The difficulty arises from the fact that the defendant would have a more favourable position, including due to the fact that time 'works' in favour of the wrongdoer.

Thus, in our opinion, regarding the damage caused to the animal kingdom, the legislator's stance should be revised, and as a result, these cases should be treated distinctly, where the claimant should not be placed in a more unfavourable situation.

We believe this could be achieved by establishing the principle of reversing the burden of proof for cases related to the repair of damage caused to the animal kingdom.

Therefore, we believe that the claimant should prove the existence and extent of the damage caused to the animal kingdom, the causal link between the damage and the defendant's (wrongdoer's) action, while proving the legality of the action should fall on the defendant.

When the law, in order to facilitate the victim's situation, establishes a legal presumption in their favour, there is either a shift in the object of evidence or a breakdown of the object of evidence.

In accordance with the principle of objective liability established *in Article 3 of the Law on Environmental Protection (8)*, a person harmed by the actions of a minor child, a student, or an apprentice does not have to prove their fault, just as the illegality of their actions is not required. The finality of patrimonial liability for damage caused to the animal kingdom, presumptively, should be conditioned by the present financial capacity.

Here, we are not addressing the issue of parents' liability for the damage caused by their minor child, because, otherwise, the injured person would have to prove the general conditions of civil liability, namely the damage, the unlawful act of the minor child, and the causal relationship between the minor’s act and the damage suffered, as well as two special conditions: the child must be a minor and must live with their parents, as well as the parents' fault in not properly educating the child (Trofimov I. Gugulan E. (2023). p. 43-54). Also, in the case of liability of the principals for the acts of the subordinate, the legislator has removed fault from the set of actions that give rise to the right to compensation, this liability being, alongside that for things and animals under guard, an objective liability. Regarding the categories of evidence admitted to confirm the damage caused to the animal kingdom, we believe that there are no restrictions in this area, where the injured party has the possibility to appeal to any means of proof not prohibited by law.

6. The Court Ruling on Compensation and Its Effects

Article 243 of the Civil Procedure Code of the Republic of Moldova stipulates that when the court issues a ruling to collect a sum of money, it must specify in the judgment the amount and currency in which it is to be paid, as well as any late payment interest that the debtor must pay (Civil Procedure Code of the Republic of Moldova. art.243).

Article 246 of the Civil Procedure Code of the Republic of Moldova regulates the effects of the ruling, stating that when the asset is awarded in kind, the court specifies its equivalent value in the judgment. In the legal literature, the role and importance of the court ruling are discussed in detail. It represents the court's dispositive act regarding the claims that the parties have brought before the court, thus being the final act of the trial (Boroi G. Stancu M. (2017). p. 616).

In the case of a decision on a request for compensation for damage caused to the animal kingdom, the court may order at least three basic types of actions through which it will oblige the perpetrator to repair the damage (Trofimov I. Gugulan E. (2023). p. 43-54):

1. The first refers to compensating the damages caused.
2. The second refers to covering the expenses related to the treatment of the animal or another representative of the animal kingdom.
3. The third refers to taking concrete actions to restore the living environment of the fauna elements.

The specificity of the judicial decision granting compensation, as a result of holding responsibility for the damage caused to the animal kingdom, is relevant to our topic through some of its effects.

The first effect is related to the value of the act as the authority of res judicata or *"the power of the judged thing."* This reflects a principle that governs the administration of justice. Moreover, the power of res judicata is attributed not only to judicial decisions but also to transactions in which the parties in the dispute agree on a solution regarding the way and conditions for resolving the dispute.

Regarding the court decision, once it resolves a dispute, the dispute, within its limits, forms, and content, can no longer be the subject of a new trial. The legislator clearly establishes the rule according to which: *"...(the) case having the same subject, the same cause, and the same parties cannot be examined by the court, constituting the basis for the cessation of the initiated civil process."* (Lupan E. (2003). p. 265). Similarly, the scope of res judicata is limited only to those contentious issues that were the subject of the dispute and which were resolved by the final decision. Thus, in another case, the decision that resolves the same issues raised by one of the parties will be opposable to the person, as a matter of res judicata, and also to those with identical effects as the disputed object requested.

Regarding the court decision obliging compensation for damages caused to the animal kingdom, it should be noted that the claimant can also request additional compensation for costs or damages that have become noticeable after the finality of the decision.

Although the requirements regarding future damages can be modified throughout the entire trial, including due to their later occurrence, namely the fact that even after the moment when the decision became final, such claims can also constitute the subject of repair claims. And, although these damages occurred later, with a beginning in the matter already ruled by

the court, in our opinion, the court will rule on these new circumstances based on the already pronounced final decision.

These changes in the scope of the damage can be, for example, the death of the animal, which occurred due to the harmful act of the defendant, and which had not yet occurred at the time the court decision became final. This is because, in this case, the relationship between the damage and the obligation to compensate is no longer maintained by the effect of the irrevocable decision. Therefore, since the resulting damage is no longer covered by the compensation provided by the irrevocable decision, pronouncing a different solution in the case becomes a pressing necessity.

However, the important issue is whether such an examination should be carried out through a new procedure or only through a revision procedure.

In our opinion, conducting this operation is not rational to be exercised through the perspective of a new procedure, since there are new circumstances that have occurred entirely in relation to the circumstances already examined, but which appeared afterward and could not have been known to the parties until the moment the decision became final.

This situation fits perfectly within the conditions outlined by Article 449 of the Civil Procedure Code of Republic of Moldova, according to which: "... (r)evision is declared when certain essential circumstances or facts of the case become known, which were not known and could not have been known to the party seeking revision, provided that they prove they have taken all measures to discover the essential circumstances and facts during the previous trial of the case."

In such a case, the plaintiff may request either an increase in the amount of monetary compensation, as the irrevocable decision only refers to that part of the damage known at the time of the decision, and which the court acknowledged at that moment, or a modification of the method of repairing the damage (Cernomoreț S. Nastas A. (2023). p. 303).

For example, a case might be where the plaintiff only requested the reimbursement of the animal’s treatment costs, while the animal was undergoing such treatment; however, as the animal perished, the plaintiff would be entitled to request not only the costs related to the animal's treatment but also the amount of compensation for the unlawful exclusion of the animal from its natural environment.

Although, in essence, the procedural route for additional requests could be approached as a new civil action, even if previous compensation has been granted by the court, we must still understand that repairing the damages caused to the animal kingdom must be faster, as nature cannot "wait." In the specialized literature, the issue of justifying a revision of irrevocable decisions, which awarded global compensation, has been addressed to the extent that these solutions also cover future damages (Nastas A. Cernomoreț S. (2024). p. 11).

In our opinion, such an approach, which is characteristic of solutions concerning civil actions within a criminal process, would be one of the options that, at first glance, would be very advantageous. At the same time, offering a solution that does not state the exact amounts of the compensation obligation creates new obstacles in the realization of the compensation process. In this way, the claimant will be forced to provide additional evidence to confirm the amount of the damages, evidence that can be challenged by the debtor, even though the creditor (the claimant) holds an irrevocable court decision. At best, the claimant will resort to

a new trial, aimed at determining the amount of the damages. However, such an exercise would undermine the applicability of the principle of expedience, and the claimant would be forced to engage in another trial, with all the steps required by law, just to obtain a decision on this matter.

In our opinion, we should return to the procedure of examining cases related to environmental damage in just two stages – the merits and the appeal. At the same time, procedural deadlines should be significantly shortened, so that a procedure would not last about 30 days. Only under such conditions can we truly speak about a process aimed at protecting the environment, and especially the animal kingdom.

The issue of changes in the extent of damage is not always limited to the case of new circumstances related to the actual expansion of the damage, which consists of new consequences for the animal kingdom. Sometimes, the increase in the extent of the damage is determined by the subsequent occurrence of other consequences, excluding those directly affecting the animal kingdom. We specifically refer to inflationary processes, to which the law often links the possibility for the parties to request a revision of the monetary amount of compensation.

It has been argued in doctrine that the requirements for damage compensation in monetary equivalent can be modified if changes occur that are dictated by the decrease in the purchasing power of currency. Here, it should be noted that the amount of damage does not increase, nor does it decrease, but rather, there is a fluctuation in the value of the currency in which the compensation is made.

Thus, because the legislator is aware that, from the moment the damage occurs to the moment the compensation is made, inflationary phenomena can arise that will significantly affect the equivalence and completeness of the reparation.

This is because, in doctrine, inflation is regarded as the over-saturation of the circulation arteries with a quantity of paper money that exceeds the real needs of the economy, leading to the devaluation of money (Didier M. (1994). p. 285). Therefore, inflation does not imply the expansion of the value of the damage, but only the reflection of this damage value in the currency amount. Moreover, in the judicial practice of the Republic of Moldova, the concept of admitting a claim for damage repair is fully adopted according to the evaluations at the time of the ruling, even if, at the time the damage occurred, such damage had a different monetary evaluation.

7. Conclusions and Recommendations

As a result of the analysis of the regulatory framework regarding certain legal aspects of compensating damages caused to the animal kingdom, we deduced the following conclusions:

- The clarification and updating of regulations concerning the compensation for damages caused to the animal kingdom is commendable, as it would allow for a more efficient and coherent application of legal norms.
- The proposal to allow lawsuits to be filed at the court located where the damage occurred would facilitate access to justice and discourage harmful actions.

- It must be acknowledged that both private and public entities can be held accountable for damages caused to the animal kingdom, which necessitates the establishment of a transparent legal framework for liability.
- In the case of disputes concerning compensation for damages caused to the animal kingdom, the perpetrator must demonstrate the legality of their actions in order to balance the procedural position with that of the claimant.
- Reducing the duration of procedures and establishing flexible review mechanisms would facilitate a quicker and more appropriate compensation process for damages.

REFERENCES

1. Boroi G. Stancu M. (2023). Procedural civil law. General part. Trial before the first instance. Vol. I. 6th edition, revised and added. Bucharest: Hamangiu. ISBN 978-606-27-2360-6.
2. Boroi G. Stancu M. (2017). Procedural Civil Law. 4th edition, revised and added. Bucharest: Hamangiu. ISBN 978-606-27-0875-7.
3. Cernomoreț S. Nastas A. (2023). Comparative Analysis of Cybercrime in the Criminal Law System, Monografie, ADJURIS – International Academic Publisher, Bucharest, Paris, Calgary. p.11, ISBN 978-606-95862-1-1.
4. Civil Procedure Code no. 225 of 30.05.2003. In: Official Gazette of the Republic of Moldova, 12.06.2003, no. 111-115.
5. Cornu G. Foyer J. Procédure civile, 3-e Ed., P.U.F., 1996. ISBN 2-13-048036-5.
6. Didier M. (1994). Economia: Rules of the game, Bucharest: Humanitas. ISBN 973-28-0451-3.
7. „Give me the facts, I will give you law." A maxim meaning that the parties to a dispute must present evidence to the tribunal, which will arrive at a legal decision based on the parties' evidence alone. Retrieved from: https://www.oxfordreference.com/display/10.1093/acref/9780195369380.001.0001/acref-9780195369380-e-480 .
8. Law on Environmental Protection: no. 1515 of 16.06.1993. Published: 30.10.1993 in Official Gazette no. 10.
9. Leș I. Ghiță D. Lozneanu V., (2020). Treatise on civil procedural law. General principles and institutions. Trial before the first instance. Vol. I. 2nd edition, revised and added. Bucharest: Universul Juridic. ISBN 978-606-39-0721-0.
10. Lupan E. (2003). Civil liability. Cluj-Napoca: Accent. ISBN 973-8445-28-0.
11. Nastas A. Cernomoreț S.(2024).Criminologie:Tratat.București:ProUniversitaria. p.303.ISBN 978-606-26-1562-8.
12. Savva A. Tihon V., Gugulan E., Mariț M., (2025). Civil procedural law. 2025, Bons Offices, Chisinau. 316 p. ISBN 978-5-36241-560-0.
13. Trofimov I. Gugulan E., (2023). Legal-Applicative Regulation Of The Damages Caused To The Animal Kingdom. In: FIAT IUSTITIA, Dimitrie Cantemir Faculty of Law Cluj Napoca, Romania, vol. 17(1), p. 43-54. May.
14. Vincent J. Guinchard S. (1999). Procédure civile, 25e éd. Dalloz, Paris.