DOI: https://doi.org/10.54477/LH.25192353.2024.2.pp.26-35

# THEORETICAL AND MODERN APPROACHES TO THE SEARCH FOR A SUSPECT

**Ganna Sobko**
Department of Criminal Law and Criminology
Odesa State University of Internal Affairs
65000, 1 Uspenska Str., Odesa, Ukraine
e-mail: g-sobko@edu.cn.ua
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9147-2625

**Irina Tesliuk**
Department of Postgraduate (Adjunct) and Doctoral Studies
Odesa State University of Internal Affairs
65000, 1 Uspenska Str., Odesa, Ukraine
e-mail: Irinatesliuk@gmail.com
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8081-2743

**Abstract**

The article is devoted to changes in the legislation on the search for a suspect which may occur in accordance with the specific needs of society caused by current trends and problems. Such changes may take into account technological progress, international standards, human rights and other factors. Established individual identity of the wanted person is a mandatory condition. It is the established individuality of the wanted object that serves as the main criterion for distinguishing between wanted and search (when the individuality of the object has not yet been established), since it makes it possible to clearly identify the object and narrow the scope of the investigator's search activities. The author proves that investigation is a comprehensive system of detective, investigative and other procedural actions, operational and search activities based on criminal procedure, operational and search legislation and bylaws, which is carried out by the subjects authorized by law and is aimed at locating known objects. The article examines both theoretical and modern means of searching for a suspect, and considers the possibility of introducing a special warrant for collecting electronic evidence. Another important innovation of this institution is the definition of clear deadlines for making a decision on the execution of a European arrest warrant: the decision on execution must be made within 60 days after the arrest of the wanted person, and in rare cases this period may be extended to 90 days. If the detained person consents to the transfer, the relevant decision to execute the European Arrest Warrant must be taken within 10 days after the consent is received. This provision of the Framework Decision has definitely contributed to the improvement of the timing of the execution of the European Arrest Warrant. In addition, the European Union legislation establishes deadlines for the transfer of a wanted person, which should be carried out as soon as possible, determining the date agreed between the relevant authorities. Nevertheless, such a person must be handed over no later than ten days from the date of the final decision to execute the warrant. If the transfer of the person becomes impossible within this period due to force majeure, the judicial authorities shall agree on a new date for the transfer of the person. However, the scientific literature has expressed the opinion that the legal regulation of covert activities in the implementation of the European Investigative Warrant should be considered unsatisfactory. This is due to the fact that the rules governing this activity do not include minimum procedural standards and requirements for its conduct, and the conclusions drawn regarding the development of ways to search for a suspect. At the present stage, with the development of information technology and mass data

collection, the search has become a more systematic and automated process. The use of biometric technologies, the analysis of large amounts of data, and cooperation between countries play a key role in modern search methods.

**Keywords:** search; suspect; wanted persons; special procedure; international standards.

## 1. Introduction

The search for suspects in criminal investigations is a complex process that combines theoretical foundations, legal frameworks, and modern technological advancements. As crime evolves in an increasingly interconnected world, law enforcement agencies face new challenges that require innovative approaches to locating and apprehending individuals who evade justice. Traditional methods of suspect searches, rooted in established legal doctrines, now operate alongside cutting-edge tools and strategies that enhance the effectiveness of investigations. The search for a suspect is a critical component of criminal investigations, requiring a blend of theoretical knowledge and practical techniques. Over the years, traditional methods of suspect identification and apprehension have evolved significantly, driven by advances in technology, forensic science, and investigative strategies. This article explores both theoretical foundations and modern approaches to suspect search, examining how classical theories inform contemporary practices. The evolution of these approaches has led to more sophisticated methods, integrating psychological profiling, data analytics, and artificial intelligence to enhance the efficiency and accuracy of suspect identification. Theoretical frameworks such as criminology, behavioral science, and investigative psychology provide the groundwork, while modern tools like facial recognition software, digital forensics, and social media analysis offer powerful means to track and apprehend suspects. Having considered the theoretical approaches to the definition of the concept of “wanted”, it is necessary to pay attention to how “wanted” is enshrined in the current legal provisions. An analysis of the criminal procedure law leads to the conclusion that this concept is used in different meanings.

Firstly, search means the activities of the investigator and, on the basis of his/her order, the investigating authority, aimed at identifying suspects and accused persons whose whereabouts are unknown or who have disappeared. This is what, in our opinion, the legislator means when establishing the obligation of the investigator in such cases to take measures to establish their whereabouts or search for them. Secondly, search is used as a synonym for “detection” in the sense of the result of activities in relation to. Thus, the use of the term “search” in either of these meanings is legitimate.

As for the definition of a European arrest warrant, it is a judicial decision issued by a Member State for the purpose of detaining and transferring a wanted person to another Member State. This decision serves to conduct criminal prosecution or to execute a sentence of imprisonment or detention. According to V. V. Zuev, the European Arrest Warrant is a legal basis for the detention of a suspect, accused or convicted person in respect of whom a court decision similar to domestic counterparts has already been adopted and entered into force (Zuiev, 2018).

This article delves into the intersection of traditional and modern techniques, highlighting key strategies and innovations that shape current suspect search methodologies. By understanding these approaches, law enforcement agencies can improve their ability to identify suspects quickly and effectively, ensuring that investigative processes keep pace with the complexities of modern crime. By analyzing the strengths and limitations of current practices, the article aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the strategies used to locate and apprehend suspects, emphasizing the need for continued adaptation in the face of new challenges in criminal justice.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.54477/LH.25192353.2024.2.pp.26-35

## 2. Modern approaches to the search for a suspect

The search for suspects in criminal investigations has significantly evolved with the integration of modern technologies and innovative methods. Traditional techniques, such as physical surveillance and witness interviews, remain essential; however, the incorporation of advanced technologies has greatly enhanced the efficiency, accuracy, and speed of identifying and apprehending suspects. This chapter explores the key modern investigative tools and approaches that law enforcement and security agencies employ today.

One of the most powerful tools in modern suspect search is the use of electronic databases. These information technology resources allow for the collection, storage, and rapid analysis of vast amounts of data concerning individuals. Key databases include those that hold passport information, driver's license details, criminal records, fingerprints, photographs, and other biometric data. Access to these databases enables investigators to cross-reference data points quickly, facilitating the identification of suspects through patterns or matching specific identification details. Electronic databases are often interconnected, allowing for the seamless sharing of information across agencies and jurisdictions. For example, law enforcement agencies can compare fingerprints from a crime scene against national and international fingerprint databases, leading to the rapid identification of suspects who may have committed crimes in different locations.

The proliferation of video surveillance cameras in public and private spaces has revolutionized the suspect search process. Cities worldwide are equipped with extensive networks of cameras installed in streets, public transport stations, airports, and other key locations. These cameras continuously capture video footage, documenting the movements and actions of individuals in real-time. Video surveillance systems serve as an invaluable tool in tracking the movements of suspects before, during, and after a crime. By analyzing footage, investigators can piece together a suspect's route, associates, and behavior patterns. Moreover, in cases of high-profile crimes, video evidence often provides crucial leads that direct law enforcement to potential suspects.

Facial recognition technology has become an increasingly prominent tool in modern policing. This technology analyzes facial features captured in video recordings or live camera feeds, comparing them against a database of known individuals. Facial recognition systems are used at critical points such as airports, border crossings, and public events, where rapid identification of suspects is essential for public safety. The technology has proven particularly effective in identifying suspects who attempt to evade capture by altering their appearance or using false identification documents. By matching facial features with high precision, even in challenging conditions, facial recognition systems offer a powerful means of locating and confirming the identity of suspects.

Biometric technologies encompass a range of identification methods that rely on unique physical or behavioral characteristics. Key biometric tools include fingerprint analysis, handwriting recognition, iris scanning, and DNA profiling. These technologies are essential in the search for suspects because they provide highly accurate identification, often linking individuals directly to crime scenes. For instance, DNA traces left at crime scenes can be matched against national DNA databases, aiding in the identification of repeat offenders. Similarly, fingerprint databases allow law enforcement to connect suspects to multiple crime scenes or confirm the identity of detained individuals with criminal histories.

Satellite technology plays a critical role in suspect searches, especially in cases involving cross-border crime or remote areas. Satellites equipped with high-resolution imaging capabilities can monitor vast geographical areas, enabling the tracking of suspect movements. Law enforcement agencies can utilize satellite data to pinpoint a suspect's location, monitor escape routes, and gather real-time intelligence in high-stakes situations such as manhunts. Additionally, satellite technology can assist in mapping suspect activity by identifying the movement of vehicles or other objects of interest, providing law enforcement with a strategic advantage in planning and executing capture operations.

The use of mobile applications has introduced new avenues for public involvement in the search for suspects. Mobile apps designed for law enforcement and public safety can disseminate information about wanted individuals, including photographs, descriptions, and last known locations. These apps often allow citizens to report sightings or tips directly to authorities, enhancing the scope of search efforts. Moreover, mobile location data and communications can be critical in tracking suspects. With appropriate legal permissions, investigators can access call records, GPS data, and other digital traces left on mobile devices, aiding in the rapid identification and apprehension of suspects.

The digital footprint left by individuals on social media platforms, forums, and other internet resources provides a wealth of information for suspect searches. Investigators often monitor online activity to gather insights into a suspect's whereabouts, connections, and behavior. Social networks are particularly useful for identifying associates, tracking movements, and uncovering evidence of criminal intent. Internet investigations also involve digital forensics, where investigators analyze devices seized from suspects to extract valuable data such as emails, messages, and location history. This digital evidence can be crucial in constructing a comprehensive profile of a suspect's activities and movements.

In addition to technological tools, large-scale interrogation and investigation operations remain a cornerstone of modern suspect searches. These operations involve deploying significant resources to conduct widespread searches, canvassing neighborhoods, interviewing potential witnesses, and engaging the public through media appeals. Such efforts are especially critical in cases where immediate information is needed to prevent further criminal activity or locate a suspect on the run. Public outreach and collaboration play a pivotal role in these operations, as community tips and witness testimonies often provide the missing pieces needed to locate suspects. The combination of traditional investigative techniques with modern technology enhances the effectiveness of these large-scale operations, making them indispensable in the pursuit of justice.

The search for suspects has been fundamentally transformed by the integration of modern technologies and methodologies. Tools such as electronic databases, biometric technologies, and social media investigations have not only streamlined the investigative process but also significantly improved the accuracy and speed of suspect identification. As these technologies continue to evolve, law enforcement agencies are better equipped than ever to tackle complex criminal investigations and ensure the swift apprehension of those who pose a threat to public safety.

### 3. Harmonization of criminal law in the EU: European warrants and cross-border cooperation

The newest stage also includes the emergence of harmonization processes in the European Union's legislation, which is tracked in the main EU documents, namely the Maastricht and Amsterdam Treaties. According to these treaties, the EU member states undertook to develop cooperation in the criminal law area and provide legal assistance in criminal cases. The subsequent period was marked by the adoption of a number of important regulations in the field of cooperation in criminal matters. One of these acts is the EU Council Framework Decision on the European Arrest Warrant and the Extradition Procedure between Member States, adopted on June 13, 2002 (Council Framework Decision No 2002/584/JHA..., 2002). Criminal law cooperation - the European Arrest Warrant. This warrant provided for a unified procedure for the detention and transfer of a wanted person to another Member State for criminal prosecution or for the execution of a sentence or security measures related to deprivation of liberty.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.54477/LH.25192353.2024.2.pp.26-35

It is important to note that in 2008, a framework decision was adopted that provided for the introduction of a European Evidence Warrant (Council Framework Decision 2008/978/JHA..., 2008), although this instrument facilitated transnational evidence collection, its practical implementation was accompanied by significant shortcomings, and, as a result, it was canceled in 2016.

Moreover, the possibility of introducing a special warrant for the collection of electronic evidence is being considered. In 2018, a proposal for a Regulation on a European warrant for the production and preservation of electronic evidence in criminal proceedings was presented (Proposal No 52018PC0225..., 2018).

This proposal includes rules that would allow judicial and law enforcement authorities of one EU Member State to send requests directly to a provider in another EU Member State to obtain certain data.

1) The features of European warrants can be defined as follows:

2) Acting on the basis of the principle of mutual recognition of judgments in criminal matters, which has a legal basis in Article 82 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.

3) Mandatory participation of two entities - the state issuing the warrant and the state executing the warrant, usually referred to as the "requesting party" and the "requested party". Each EU Member State may independently determine the authorities that will be authorized.

4) Variety of entities issuing and executing the warrant. For example, a European investigation warrant may be issued not only by a court or prosecutor, but also by any other authority authorized to conduct pre-trial investigations under the national law of a Member State, such as the police.

5) Specific purpose for issuing the warrant, for example, a European arrest warrant is issued for the detention and surrender by another Member State of a wanted person for criminal prosecution or the execution of a custodial sentence or security measures.

6) A defined and limited list of grounds for refusal to execute a warrant. Each warrant has its own grounds for refusing to recognize and execute it, as well as specific time limits for execution.

7) The existence of a unified form of the European warrant, which is usually provided in an annex to the relevant legal act establishing the legal basis for a particular warrant. For example, the form of the European Investigation Warrant is set out in Annex A to the European Investigation Warrant Directive (Directive No 2014/41/EU..., 2014).

This instrument is based on the Council Framework Decision No. 2002/584/EC on the European Arrest Warrant and Extradition Procedures between Member States (Council Framework Decision No 2002/584/JHA..., 2002). The said decision was amended and supplemented by the Framework Decision No. 2009/299/PVD of February 26, 2009, which concerned the trial of missing persons (Directive No 2014/41/EU.., 2014). One of the key novelties of this decision was the addition of a new ground for refusing to execute the warrant - the absence of a person at the court hearing.

A European warrant is a procedural decision issued by a national court or other competent authority of an EU member state and intended to be executed in the territory of another EU member state to achieve a specific purpose set out in the warrant, such as conducting investigative actions, obtaining evidence or protecting a person. The features of European warrants include:

1. Acting on the basis of the principle of mutual recognition of judgments in criminal matters based on Article 82 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.
2. Mandatory participation of two subjects - the state that issues the warrant and the state that executes the warrant.
3. Diversification of the subjects of issuing and executing the warrant, including various bodies authorized to conduct pre-trial investigation.

4. The existence of a specific purpose for issuing the warrant, such as detention and transfer of a person for criminal prosecution or execution of a sentence.
5. An exhaustive and limited list of grounds for refusal to execute the warrant.
6. Specified timeframe for execution of the warrant, in particular for the European investigation warrant, no more than 30 days from the date of receipt by the competent authority of the requested state.
7. The existence of a unified form of the European warrant, which is usually represented by an annex to the relevant legal act establishing the legal basis for a particular warrant.

## 4. Efficiency and challenges of European warrants: Execution deadlines and legal safeguards

Another important innovation of this institution is the definition of clear deadlines for making a decision on the execution of a European arrest warrant: the final decision on execution must be made within 60 days after the arrest of the wanted person, and in rare cases this period may be extended to 90 days. If the detained person consents to the transfer, the relevant decision on the execution of the European arrest warrant must be taken within 10 days after the consent is received.

This provision of the Framework Decision has clearly contributed to the improvement of the timing of the execution of the European Arrest Warrant. In 2018, the average time between the arrest and transfer of a person was 45 days in case there was no consent to the transfer (van Ballegooij, 2020).

In addition, the legislation of the European Union sets deadlines for the transfer of a wanted person, which should be carried out as soon as possible, determining the date agreed between the relevant authorities. Nevertheless, such a person must be handed over no later than ten days from the date of the final decision to execute the warrant. If the transfer of the person becomes impossible within this period due to force majeure, the judicial authorities shall agree on a new date for the transfer of the person.

However, the scientific literature has expressed the opinion that the legal regulation of covert activities in the implementation of the European Investigative Warrant should be considered unsatisfactory. This is due to the fact that the rules governing this activity do not include minimum procedural standards and requirements for its implementation (Kostoris, 2018). We consider it appropriate to support this position.

Based on a systematic interpretation of the provisions of the Directive, we can identify specific features of the European investigation warrant

- clear time limits for execution of the warrant are set - 30 days;
- the possibility of obtaining all types of evidence within the framework of international cooperation between EU countries is enshrined;
- an exhaustive list of grounds for refusing to execute the warrant has been defined;
- standardized the form and procedure for sending the warrant to the requested party;
- can be used both for carrying out procedural actions on the territory of another EU state and for obtaining evidence located on the territory of another EU member state (Klymkevych, 2020).

Based on the analysis of the main provisions of the Directive, the definition of the European Investigation Warrant contained in Article 1 of the Directive appears to be incomplete and does not take into account the main characteristics of this legal institution. Taking into account the systematic interpretation of the provisions of the Directive, the following definition of the concept of a warrant can be offered: a European investigation warrant is a request from the authorities competent to conduct pre-trial investigation and judicial proceedings of one EU Member State to the relevant competent authorities of another EU Member State to conduct investigative (search) actions and certain covert investigative actions aimed at collecting and transferring evidence or requesting the receipt of evidence located in another Member State. However, despite these advantages of this institution, there are certain problematic aspects of its legal regulation.

One of the important problems is the lack of legal regulation of ensuring the rights of a person during the execution of the warrant (Klymkevych, 2019). Despite the fact that the Directive is based on the principle of respect for human rights, as confirmed by paragraph 19 of the preamble to the Directive, which states that "the creation of a space of freedom, security and justice within the Union is based on mutual trust and the presumption that other Member States will respect Union law, including fundamental rights of the individual", this presumption is not absolute.

In addition to the right to a legal representative, minors have the right to a defense counsel, which is enshrined in Article 6 of the Directive. EU Member States must provide minors with a lawyer without undue delay from the moment they become aware that they are suspected or accused of a criminal offense. The Directive establishes the cases when a defense counsel is mandatory for minors:

- before interrogation by pre-trial investigation authorities, other judicial or law enforcement agencies;
- before carrying out investigative (detective) actions or other actions aimed at collecting evidence by pre-trial investigation authorities;
- immediately after deprivation of liberty;
- when summoned to a court that has jurisdiction to consider criminal proceedings, in advance of their appearance in court.

However, these cases of mandatory involvement of a defense counsel for a minor are not absolute. European law provides for certain exceptions to this rule. The Directive indicates only two such grounds, namely: the existence of an urgent need to prevent adverse consequences that may threaten the life, liberty and physical integrity of a person, and when urgent actions of pre-trial investigation bodies are necessary to prevent a significant threat to criminal proceedings in cases of serious crimes.

However, there has been no legal act that would establish minimum standards for the rights of victims of criminal acts. Therefore, in order to establish a comprehensive approach to solving this problem and to ensure minimum standards of protection of the rights of victims in criminal proceedings, in 2001 the European Parliament and Council adopted the Framework Decision on the Status of Victims in Criminal Proceedings No. 2001/220/PVD (Council Framework Decision No 2001/220/JHA..., 2001).

One of the peculiarities of this institution is that there is no need to apply new security measures to a person; instead, the existing measures applied to a person in the territory of another EU member state are continued. Among the advantages of the legal regulation of the European protection order are the existence of a unified form of the order and clear grounds for refusing to execute the order. However, this institution is not doomed to be without certain disadvantages, among which it is important to note the absence of a time limit for the execution of the protection order.

## 5. Challenges and legal frameworks in the search for suspects in Ukraine: Procedural gaps and "in absentia" investigations

The practice of law enforcement agencies shows that in most cases, when a person hides from pre-trial investigation authorities and does not live at the place of registration or actual residence, this fact is confirmed by a report of a district or operational officer. In practice, there are no specific reasons for people's decision to hide from the investigation.

It should be noted that the current Criminal Procedure Code of Ukraine does not have a specific mechanism for searching for persons who evade pre-trial investigation and court. The law does not define the list of special measures in the search process. The responsibility for the organization and effectiveness of the search, as emphasized, lies with the investigator.

Instructing investigators to conduct a search for persons hiding from pre-trial investigation bodies to operational units of the National Police of Ukraine is considered the most effective way to proceed. In practice, it is often the operational units that use their capabilities to conduct the search. It is also worth noting that the tax police units of the State Fiscal Service of Ukraine are engaged in the search for persons who violate tax laws.

Operational and investigative measures in the search for persons evading pre-trial investigation are based on the provisions of Article 6 of the Law of Ukraine "On Operational and Investigative Activities". It is noted that the grounds for conducting operational and investigative activities are the availability of sufficient information that needs to be verified through these measures regarding persons hiding from pre-trial investigation authorities, investigators, judges or evading criminal sentences.

The procedural execution of the order to search for persons hiding from the pre-trial investigation authorities is regulated by a separate order of the investigator, which contains the necessary information about the wanted person, the chosen preventive measures, places of possible location and other important details (Klymchuk, 2015).

In accordance with the Criminal Procedure Code of Ukraine, the subjects of search by law enforcement agencies are authorized officials, i.e. persons who are granted the right to detain by a special law. Unlike the CPC of Ukraine of 1960, the modern criminal procedure legislation allows not only inquiry bodies and investigators to conduct search operations. An important innovation is the possibility for citizens to conduct criminal procedural searches (anyone who is not an authorized official) under Article 207 of the CPC of Ukraine. In fact, citizens could search for and detain offenders even before the CPC of Ukraine came into force in 2012, but this process was not regulated by the provisions of the criminal procedure law. Since there may be a situation when the personal data of a wanted person remains unknown for various reasons, it gives the authorized official the opportunity to carry out the detention procedure with mandatory observance of the lawful procedure, which is important in the context of the requirements of the European Convention on Human Rights and national criminal procedure legislation. The introduction and further improvement of non-personal data recording in the criminal procedural detention procedure is necessary and timely, since the absence of personal data of a wanted person should not prevent compliance with the lawful search and detention procedure.

The organization of the search for persons evading pre-trial investigation and prosecution is characterized by various problems, including regulatory, organizational and technical aspects. The adoption of the Criminal Procedure Code of Ukraine in 2012 and changes in many aspects of pre-trial investigation have created a number of problems in practical application. For example, Article 281 of the Criminal Procedure Code of Ukraine stipulates that if the whereabouts of a suspect are unknown during the pre-trial investigation, the investigator or prosecutor must put the suspect on the wanted list. However, the process of putting an accused person on the wanted list is regulated by the provisions of Article 335 of the Criminal Procedure Code of Ukraine, and the legislator does not take into account the motives and reasons for evading the authorities.

In particular, there are shortcomings in the current criminal procedure legislation, as well as problems related to the organization of law enforcement agencies, the level of corruption in the judicial system, and other factors.

The Law of Ukraine No. 1689-VII dated October 7, 2014, which amended the Criminal Code and the Code of Criminal Procedure, introduced the "in absentia" procedure. This procedure applies to crimes within the competence of the Security Service of Ukraine, such as crimes against national security, public safety, peace, human security and international law and order. The "in absentia" procedure is a special procedure for conducting criminal investigations and trials in Ukraine in the absence of the suspect or

DOI: https://doi.org/10.54477/LH.25192353.2024.2.pp.26-35

accused. This type of criminal proceedings is used in such countries as France, Germany, the Netherlands, Austria, Denmark, Bulgaria, Moldova, Estonia and others.

A special investigation is conducted in cases where the suspect has been evading investigation and trial for more than six months in order to avoid criminal liability or is outside Ukraine in the temporarily occupied territory.

It is important to note that Ukraine already has precedents of conducting special investigations "in absentia", in particular, case No. 225/1957/21. In this context, the Supreme Court determined that the pre-trial investigation authorities additionally took measures to inform the suspect, including the publication of information in the media and the Internet.

Compliance with international standards, in particular Article 6 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and the practice of the European Court of Human Rights in ensuring the participation of a defense counsel in criminal proceedings "in absentia" play an important role.

Summarizing the above, in the context of the conflict, the judicial system of Ukraine develops judicial practice that complies with international conventions, and criminal proceedings "in absentia" are conducted in accordance with high standards to ensure justice and inadmissibility of evasion of punishment.

## 6. Conclusion

The search for suspects remains a critical component of criminal investigations, influenced by both traditional theoretical foundations and the rapid evolution of modern technologies. While theoretical approaches provide the legal and procedural bedrock, modern tools—such as biometric identification, electronic databases, and satellite tracking—have transformed the landscape of suspect searches, enabling law enforcement agencies to operate with unprecedented efficiency and precision. The analysis shows that hiding perpetrators of criminal offenses is aimed at avoiding responsibility and delaying the possibility of conducting a pre-trial investigation. The problems of organizing the search for such persons are caused by imperfect legislation and insufficient efficiency of law enforcement agencies. Criminalistics recommendations and research in this area are also insufficient.

In the European Union, harmonized legal frameworks, such as the European Arrest Warrant and European Investigation Warrant, have greatly enhanced cross-border cooperation. These instruments establish clear guidelines and timelines that ensure suspects can be swiftly detained and transferred between member states, thereby reflecting a commitment to upholding justice across national boundaries. However, these advancements are not without challenges, as procedural gaps, organizational inefficiencies, and the need for standardized safeguards to protect fundamental rights continue to pose significant obstacles.

In Ukraine, the search for suspects is marked by a complex interplay of legal constraints, practical limitations, and ongoing reforms. The absence of specific mechanisms within the Criminal Procedure Code and reliance on operational units highlight the need for improved legal frameworks and coordinated efforts among law enforcement agencies. Additionally, the implementation of "in absentia" procedures has provided a crucial tool for prosecuting suspects who evade investigation and trial, although these measures must be continually refined to align with international human rights standards.

Based on the above analysis, conclusions can be drawn regarding the development of ways to search for a suspect:

At the present stage, with the development of information technology and mass data collection, the search has become a more systematic and automated process. The use of biometric technologies, the analysis of large amounts of data and cooperation between countries play a key role in modern methods of search.

This development reflects the efforts of society and law enforcement agencies to improve and effectively use methods of searching for suspects in order to ensure law and order and security.

The current state of the art utilizes electronic databases, video surveillance systems, facial recognition systems, biometric technologies, satellite technologies, mobile applications and technologies, social media and internet investigations, and large-scale interrogation and investigation operations.

**Referencese**

Council Framework Decision No 2001/220/JHA "On the standing of victims in criminal proceedings". (2001). Retrieved from: https://www.eumonitor.eu/9353000/1/j9vvik7m1c3gyxp/vitgbgi8vbys

Council Framework Decision No 2002/584/JHA "On the European arrest warrant and the surrender procedures between Member States – Statements made by certain Member States on the adoption of the Framework Decision". (2002). Retrieved from: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex%3A32002F0584

Council Framework Decision No 2008/978/JHA "On the European evidence warrant for the purpose of obtaining objects, documents and data for use in proceedings in criminal matters". (2008). https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX%3A32008F0978

Directive No 2014/41/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 3 April 2014 regarding the European Investigation Order in criminal matters. OJ L 130. 1.5.2014. P. 1–36

Klymchuk, M. P. (2015). Execution of orders as a form of interaction between investigative and operative units in criminal proceedings. *Herald of Criminal Justice, 1,* 46–50.

Klymkevych, R. (2020) Yevropeiskyi order na provedennia rozsliduvannia. *Visegrad Journal on Human Rights, 1(*1), 88–92

Klymkevych, R. (2019). European warrant for investigation in the context of criminal justice reform. In: Krasnytsky I. V. (Ed) T*heoretical and applied problems of legal regulation in Ukraine* (363–368). Lviv: LvDUVS.

Kostoris, R.E. (2018). *Handbook of European Criminal Procedure*. London: Springer International Publishing AG, 445 p.

Proposal No 52018PC0225 for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on European Production and Preservation Orders for electronic evidence in criminal matters. (2018). Retrieved from https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=COM%3A2018%3A225%3AFIN

van Ballegooij, W. (2020). European implementation assessment 2004–2020 on the European arrest warrant. *Eurocrim, 2,* 149–154

Zuiev, V.V. (2018) Simplified issuance procedure: European experience. *Pre-trial investigation: Current problems and ways to solve them, 10(iuvil.)*, 60–64.