



中国法院

的

司法改革

2013—2022

中华人民共和国最高人民法院

Judicial Reform of Chinese Courts

人民法院出版社

图书在版编目（CIP）数据

中国法院的司法改革. 2013—2022 / 中华人民共和国最高人民法院编. — 北京：人民法院出版社，2023. 1

ISBN 978-7-5109-3694-4

I. ①中… II. ①中… III. ①司法制度—体制改革—研究—中国—2013-2022 IV. ①D926. 04

中国国家版本馆CIP数据核字(2023)第000356号

中国法院的司法改革（2013—2022）

中华人民共和国最高人民法院 编

责任编辑 丁丽娜
出版发行 人民法院出版社
地 址 北京市东城区东交民巷27号（100745）
电 话 （010）67550608（责任编辑） 67550558（发行部查询）
65223677（读者服务部）
客 服 QQ 2092078039
网 址 <http://www.courtbook.com.cn>
E-mail courtpress@sohu.com
印 刷 大厂回族自治县德诚印务有限公司
经 销 新华书店

开 本 787×1092毫米 1/16
字 数 160千字
印 张 11.25
版 次 2023年1月第1版 2023年1月第1次印刷
书 号 ISBN 978-7-5109-3694-4
定 价 68.00元

版权所有 侵权必究

目 录

前 言	1
一、中国法院制度和改革历程	2
二、全面落实司法责任制	7
三、推进法院组织体系和管理体制改革	14
四、推进诉讼制度改革	18
五、强化人权司法保障制度机制	24
六、扎实推进“基本解决执行难”	29
七、完善司法便民利民制度机制	33
八、深化司法公开和司法民主	40
九、推行司法人员分类管理	44
十、完善司法服务保障国家发展制度机制	49
十一、推进互联网司法和智慧法院建设	53
结束语	57
大事记	58

Contents

Preface.....	71
I. China’s Court System and Reform.....	72
II. Fully Implementing Judicial Accountability.....	79
III. Advancing the Reform of Organization and Management of Courts	90
IV. Advancing the Reform of the Litigation System	97
V. Strengthening the Judicial Protection of Human Rights.....	106
VI. Steadily Advancing the “Generally Resolving Enforcement Difficulties” Campaign.....	113
VII. Improving People’s Access to and Benefits from the Judiciary ..	119
VIII. Deepening Judicial Transparency and Judicial Democracy....	129
IX. Implementing Categorized Management of Judicial Personnel	135
X. Improving the Systems and Mechanisms for Judiciary to Serve and Guarantee National Developments.....	142
XI. Advancing the Construction of Internet Judiciary and Smart Courts	148
Conclusion	154
Chronology	156

前 言

法治是治国理政的基本方式，司法是法治体系的重要基石。全面深化司法改革，对于完善和发展中国特色社会主义司法制度、促进国家治理体系和治理能力现代化，具有重大而深远的意义。2013年以来，在以习近平同志为核心的党中央坚强领导下，中国法院坚持以习近平新时代中国特色社会主义思想为指导，深入贯彻习近平法治思想，牢牢坚持党对司法工作的绝对领导，始终立足中国国情，把握时代脉搏，紧紧围绕“努力让人民群众在每一个司法案件中感受到公平正义”目标，坚定不移全面深化司法改革。经过十年的不懈努力，人民法院审判执行工作全方位发展，司法质量、效率和公信力全面提升，为推动建设更高水平的平安中国、法治中国，服务党和国家事业发展作出积极贡献。中国共产党第二十次全国代表大会充分肯定了司法体制改革成效，对加快建设公正高效权威的社会主义司法制度作出重大部署，擘画了下一步改革的蓝图。

一、中国法院制度和改革历程

——中国法院改革的制度基础。根据《中华人民共和国宪法》和《中华人民共和国人民法院组织法》，人民法院作为国家的审判机关，依照法律规定独立行使审判权，不受行政机关、社会团体和个人的干涉。国家设立最高人民法院、地方各级人民法院和专门人民法院。人民法院依照法律规定审理刑事案件、民事案件、行政案件以及法律规定的其他案件，开展民事执行、行政执行等司法活动。独任庭、合议庭、审判委员会和赔偿委员会是法律规定的四类审判组织。

最高人民法院是中华人民共和国最高审判机关，负责审理全国范围内有重大影响，或者法律规定由其审理的各类案件，制定司法解释，监督和指导地方各级人民法院和专门人民法院的审判工作，并依照法律确定的职责范围管理全国法院的部分司法行政工作。地方各级人民法院包括基层人民法院、中级人民法院和高级人民法院。专门人民法院包括军事法院、海事法院、知识产权法院、金融法院等。

上级人民法院监督和指导下级人民法院的审判工作。在诉讼活动中，人民法院依法实行审判公开、合议、回避、人民陪审员、辩护、两审终审等制度。

——中国法院改革的基本历程。改革开放以来，随着经济社会全

面发展，民主法治不断进步，人民群众对司法的要求和期待日益增长，原有的司法体制已经不能适应形势发展的需要。早在 20 世纪 90 年代，中国法院就开始了以强化庭审功能、扩大审判公开、推进司法职业化建设为重点内容的改革历程。中国共产党第十五次全国代表大会以来，最高人民法院在法院组织体系、法官制度、诉讼程序、审判方式、执行制度、司法管理等方面，开展了一系列改革，并于 1999 年、2005 年、2009 年先后发布了三个“五年改革纲要”，作为 2013 年之前中国法院改革的基本依据。

中国共产党第十八届中央委员会第三次全体会议通过的《中共中央关于全面深化改革若干重大问题的决定》，确定了推进法治中国建设、深化司法体制改革的重要任务。第十八届中央委员会第四次全体会议通过的《中共中央关于全面推进依法治国若干重大问题的决定》，将建设中国特色社会主义法治体系、建设社会主义法治国家确立为全面推进依法治国的总目标，从科学立法、严格执法、公正司法、全民守法等方面提出了一系列重大改革举措。司法改革成为中国全面深化改革的重要组成部分，被纳入国家整体发展战略。

为进一步深化人民法院各项改革，最高人民法院制定了《关于全面深化人民法院改革的意见》，围绕建立具有中国特色的社会主义审判权力运行体系的关键目标，针对 7 个重点领域，提出 65 项改革举措，并作为《人民法院第四个五年改革纲要（2014—2018）》贯彻实施。经过五年的改革，到 2018 年，人民法院司法改革实现全面深入推进，重要领域和关键环节取得突破性进展，主要领域改革主体框架基本确立。

随着司法改革不断深入，越来越需要各项举措之间相互配合，形成有效运转的制度体系。2017 年召开的中国共产党第十九次全国代表大会作出“深化司法体制综合配套改革，全面落实司法责任制，努力

让人民群众在每一个司法案件中感受到公平正义”的重大战略部署，司法改革进入新阶段。

2019年，最高人民法院制定《关于深化人民法院司法体制综合配套改革的意见》，并将其作为《人民法院第五个五年改革纲要（2019—2023）》贯彻实施，推动构建坚持党的领导制度体系、服务和保障大局制度体系、以人民为中心的诉讼服务制度体系等十大体系。截至目前，“四五改革纲要”“五五改革纲要”确定的130项改革举措、220余项改革任务已基本完成。

——**中国法院改革的组织实施。**2013年12月30日，中国共产党成立以习近平总书记为组长的中央全面深化改革领导小组，负责改革的总体设计、统筹协调、整体推进、督促落实。2018年3月后，更名为中央全面深化改革委员会，习近平总书记任主任。2014年1月22日至2022年8月31日，中央全面深化改革领导小组、中央全面深化改革委员会共召开66次会议，审议通过涉及人民法院的重要改革文件70余份。

中央全面深化改革委员会下设6个专项小组，负责研究相关领域重要改革问题，协调推动有关专项改革政策措施的制定和实施。深化司法体制改革工作由社会体制改革专项小组（中央司法体制改革领导小组）负责。

司法体制改革是一项系统工程，涉及面广、政策性强，最高人民法院遵循先基础性改革、后综合配套改革，先地方试点、后全国推广的改革方法，成立由首席大法官周强担任组长的司法改革领导小组，组织领导、统筹协调法院司法改革工作，每年召开三到四次全体会议和专题会议，统筹规划改革要点、研究审议改革方案、讨论决定重大问题。各高级人民法院均成立司法改革领导小组，监督指导、统筹协

调辖区内法院的司法改革工作。各高级人民法院拟就司法改革项目开展试点的，试点方案须报最高人民法院审批同意，重大改革试点方案须经最高人民法院报中央审批同意方可实施。

考虑到司法责任制、司法人员分类管理、司法人员职业保障、省级以下地方法院人财物统一管理是司法体制改革的基础性措施，根据重大改革事项先行试点的原则，中国分三个批次，就上述四项措施在各省、自治区、直辖市先后推进试点，为全面推进改革积累经验。自2014年6月开始，上海、吉林、湖北、广东、海南、贵州、青海7个省、直辖市开展第一批司法体制改革试点；自2015年6月开始，山西、内蒙古、黑龙江、江苏、浙江、安徽、福建、山东、重庆、云南、宁夏11个省、自治区、直辖市开展第二批司法体制改革试点；自2016年3月开始，北京等其他13个省、自治区、直辖市及新疆维吾尔自治区生产建设兵团开展第三批司法体制改革试点。2016年7月以后，上述四项重大改革在全国范围内全面推开。

随着司法体制改革的全面深入推进，一些尚未落地的改革举措还需配套完善，一些已经取得突破的关键领域改革仍待持续优化。2017年8月29日，十八届中央全面深化改革领导小组审议通过了《关于上海市开展司法体制综合配套改革试点的框架意见》，自2017年9月开始，上海市率先启动了司法体制综合配套改革试点。2019年2月，最高人民法院发布实施“五五改革纲要”，司法体制综合配套改革在全国范围内全面推开。

为了实现预期改革目标，最高人民法院单独或者配合中央有关单位，通过改革督察、总结评估、专项调研，以及发布典型改革案例、组织评选改革创新措施、召开工作推进会等多种形式，及时推广成熟经验，研究解决改革中出现的问题，确保改革按计划推进。

中国法院的司法改革（2013—2022）

2022年7月8日，最高人民法院召开人民法院司法改革工作会议，全面总结了近十年改革的成效和经验。经过十年的不懈努力，人民群众在司法工作中的获得感和满意度明显增强，以司法责任制为重点的中国特色社会主义审判权力运行体系基本建成，公正高效权威的中国特色社会主义司法制度更加成熟、更加定型。

二、全面落实司法责任制

让审理者裁判、由裁判者负责，是司法规律的客观要求，也是深化司法改革的核心内容。2015年9月，最高人民法院印发《关于完善人民法院司法责任制的若干意见》，确定了新型审判权力运行机制，指导全国法院推进司法责任制改革。2018年12月，最高人民法院印发《关于进一步全面落实司法责任制的实施意见》，就完善审判监督管理机制、健全统一法律适用机制等问题加强指导，推动司法责任制全面落实。2020年7月，最高人民法院贯彻落实中央关于深化司法责任制综合配套改革部署，印发《关于深化司法责任制综合配套改革的实施意见》，围绕健全审判监督管理、强化廉政风险防控、加强履职保障体系等问题逐项细化。改革后，全国法院85%以上的审判力量配置到办案一线，法官办案自主性、责任心得到进一步增强，重大、疑难、新类型、涉群体等“四类案件”监督管理机制不断健全，有力提升了人民法院的办案质量和效率。

——实行独任庭、合议庭办案责任制。各级人民法院全面取消“逐层审批”案件审理模式，充分发挥法官在办案工作中的基础性作用，明确法定审判组织，特别是独任庭、合议庭的办案主体地位，形成“谁审理、谁裁判、谁负责”的办案模式。2019年11月，最高人民法院印

发《关于完善人民法院审判权力 and 责任清单的指导意见》，明确院长、庭长、审判长、承办法官及合议庭其他成员等审判人员行使职权的边界和责任。全国各级人民法院根据本院工作实际制定审判权责清单并向上一级人民法院备案，同时积极探索将权责清单嵌入办案系统，办案人员、监督管理人员均按照权限和程序履行各自的工作职责，有效防止了越权办案、违规监督等行为，进一步落实了办案责任制。

改革后，独任庭、合议庭的办案主体地位更加巩固，全国 98% 以上案件的裁判文书由独任庭、合议庭直接签发，除审判委员会讨论决定的案件以外，院长、庭长不再审核签发自己未直接参加审理案件的裁判文书，提交审判委员会讨论案件的范围和数量也大幅度限缩，例如，上海法院提交审判委员会讨论的案件数量仅占 0.1%。

——**改革案件分配机制。**各级人民法院建立“随机分案为主、指定分案为辅”的案件分配机制，根据审判领域类别和繁简分流机制，随机确定案件的承办法官。对于存在回避情形，或者因工作调动、身体健康、廉政风险等事由确需调整承办法官的，由院长、庭长按权限审批决定，调整结果及时通知当事人，并在办案平台公开。海南法院依托智慧办案系统，科学设置分案规则，以信息化手段解决了案件随机分配后法官之间分案不均衡的问题。

——**创新审判辅助工作模式。**各级人民法院建立专门实施文书送达、财产保全、执行查控、文书上网、网络公告等事务的工作团队，对审判辅助事务实行集约化管理。充分利用市场化、社会化资源，探索实施网拍辅助、文书上网、案款发放等审判辅助事务和部分行政综合事务外包，提升工作效能。最高人民法院建成人民法院送达平台，全国 31 省（自治区、直辖市）的 307 个地市建成 330 个邮政集约送达服务中心，邮政集约“绿色送达”新模式在全国主要城市实现了“次

日达”。2021年，全国72%的民事、行政案件通过送达平台送达诉讼文书或证据材料。广东省深圳市中级人民法院制定法院购买社会化服务指导文件，明确涉及诉讼服务、审判执行、法院管理、后勤保障、司法公开、信息化建设和文化建设等领域的七大类、41项服务可以向社会购买。福建省厦门市思明区人民法院和厦门鹭江公证处创建全国首个诉讼与公证协同创新中心，明确公证机构可以协助人民法院开展程序性、辅助性司法辅助业务。

——健全院庭长办案常态化机制。法官员额制改革后，各级人民法院院长、庭长（含副职）入额后普遍回归审判一线。2017年4月，最高人民法院发布《关于加强各级人民法院院庭长办理案件工作的意见（试行）》，建立院长、庭长办案刚性约束和考核监督机制，健全院领导主要审理重大疑难复杂案件机制，充分发挥院长、庭长办案示范引领作用。改革后，各地人民法院院长、庭长直接承办和担任审判长参与办理的案件数量、所占比例较改革前大幅提升，例如，广东法院2021年院庭长共办案99.2万件，占全省法院办案数量的35.2%。

——健全新型审判监督管理机制。2017年4月，最高人民法院印发《关于落实司法责任制完善审判监督管理机制的意见（试行）》，指导各地健全新型监督管理体系，加强对审判权力行使过程的内部监督。2021年11月，最高人民法院印发《关于进一步完善“四类案件”监督管理工作机制的指导意见》，强化对重大复杂、社会广泛关注、涉及统一法律适用问题、反映法官违法审判等情形的四类重点案件监督管理。各级人民法院积极运用信息化手段，构建全院、全员、全流程的监督管理机制，充分发挥审判组织自我监督功能，发挥专业法官会议和审判委员会监督平台作用，落实院长、庭长法定监督管理职责，推动院长、庭长从审批个案实体性裁决事项，转变为依法审核程序性事项、综合

指导审判工作、督促统一法律适用、全程监管审判质效、有效排除案外干扰。四川法院明确审判管理、监察等部门对“四类案件”的发现报告义务，细化监督管理的范围、程序和方式，将监督管理情况纳入全省法院考核，2018年以来，全省法院纳入“四类案件”监督管理的案件占受理案件的3.43%。上海、江苏、浙江、江西、山东、四川等地法院依托人工智能和大数据，探索形成“四类案件”智能化监督管理机制。

——**建立专业法官会议制度。**各级人民法院普遍建立专业法官会议制度，为法官办案提供专业咨询，讨论形成的意见供审判组织参考。2021年1月，最高人民法院印发《关于完善人民法院专业法官会议工作机制的指导意见》，进一步规范专业法官会议工作机制在辅助办案决策、统一法律适用、强化制约监督等方面的作用。湖南法院完善专业法官会议研究讨论案件与院长、庭长审判监督管理和审判委员会讨论决定的衔接机制，细化专业法官会议的讨论范围、召集程序、议事规则，确保专业法官会议充分发挥辅助审判的功能作用。北京市第三中级人民法院将专业法官会议讨论形成的成果提炼总结为类型化问题，定期发布类案裁判指引。

——**改革审判委员会制度。**最高人民法院改革审判委员会运行机制，制定《关于健全完善人民法院审判委员会工作机制的意见》，强化审判委员会总结审判经验、统一法律适用、讨论决定审判工作重大事项的职能。除法律规定不公开的外，审判委员会讨论案件的决定及其理由统一在裁判文书中公开。中级以上人民法院根据审判工作需要，按照审判委员会委员专业和工作分工，召开刑事审判、民事行政审判等专业委员会会议。除法律规定的情形和涉及国家外交、安全、社会稳定的重大复杂案件外，审判委员会主要讨论重大、疑难、复杂案件

的法律适用问题，各级人民法院审判委员会讨论案件数量较改革前普遍显著下降。海南法院推进审判委员会制度改革以来，审判委员会讨论案件数量同比减少了 41.75%。

——**建立统一法律适用机制。**最高人民法院成立统一法律适用工作领导小组，建立统一法律适用标准工作机制，制定印发法律适用分歧解决、加强类案检索等规范性文件，完善指导性案例制度，规范司法解释和案例指导工作，构建起“类案强制检索初步过滤、专业法官会议研究咨询、审判委员会最终决定”的统一法律适用保障机制，有效解决审判组织内部、不同审判组织，以及院长、庭长与审判组织之间的法律适用分歧。2021 年，最高人民法院印发《人民法院审判业务文件、参考性案例备案工作办法》，全年共审查、备案各高级人民法院制定的 81 件审判业务文件，完成 167 件参考性案例备案工作，纠正了一些不符合法律、司法解释精神的规定。截至 2022 年底，最高人民法院共发布 36 批、201 件指导性案例，并针对社会民生、环境资源、知识产权等重点热点领域及时发布典型案例、优秀案例、公报案例。山西省高级人民法院细化统一法律适用操作规程，将检索报告作为类案、关联案件裁判的前置程序。

——**建立法官惩戒制度。**最高人民法院印发《法官惩戒工作程序规定（试行）》，建立由人民法院和法官惩戒委员会分工负责的法官惩戒制度，明确法官惩戒工作程序。全国 31 个省（自治区、直辖市）及新疆生产建设兵团全部设立法官惩戒委员会，负责审议法官是否有违反审判职责的行为、是否存在故意或者重大过失、是否应当承担违法审判责任，并提出惩戒意见，既依法及时惩戒，也强化职业保障，促进审判人员依法行使职权、落实办案责任制。同时，最高人民法院积极配合国家监察体制改革，完善法官惩戒与纪检监察工作衔接机制，

印发《关于做好法官惩戒与纪检监察工作衔接的规定》，明确人民法院与纪检监察机关在法官惩戒中的职责范围和任务分工，建立相互之间的沟通协作及情况通报机制，促使法官惩戒工作与纪检监察工作有机衔接，促使人民法院和纪检监察机关分工负责、相互支持配合。截至2022年5月底，北京、山西、辽宁、吉林、黑龙江、江苏、江西、四川、云南、甘肃等地按照惩戒程序对57名法官实施了惩戒。

——完善法官业绩考核制度。最高人民法院印发《关于加强和完善法官考核工作的指导意见》，各级人民法院设立法官考评委员会，负责本院法官的考核工作，区分四级法院职能和岗位特点，科学考核评价法官业绩，激励法官依法公正高效履行审判职责。各级人民法院完善绩效考核奖金分配机制，明确法官绩效考核奖金的发放应当依据责任轻重、办案质量、办案数量和办案难度等因素，并重点向一线办案人员倾斜。江苏省高级人民法院分类建立包括近100项权重指标的绩效管理体系，2021年一季度审执结案件数量较2019年同期增加44.54%，让考核激励机制充分发挥引导作用。

——建立领导干部、司法机关内部人员干预司法活动、过问具体案件的记录、通报和责任追究制度。中共中央办公厅、国务院办公厅印发《领导干部干预司法活动、插手具体案件处理的记录、通报和责任追究规定》后，最高人民法院及时制定印发实施办法及相关意见，明确外部过问行为的记录对象、录入流程、例外情形、报送程序和特别事项，细化内部人员过问案件的界定标准、追责机制。2020年，最高人民法院建成贯通全国四级法院的“三个规定”记录报告平台，建立每月报告、定期通报制度，注重对“零报告”的分析研判，人民法院工作人员不记录或者不如实记录，以及相关领导授意不记录或者不如实记录的，将视情给予相应纪律处分。最高人民法院会同最高人民

检察院、司法部联合印发《关于建立健全禁止法官、检察官与律师不正当接触交往制度机制的意见》《关于进一步规范法院、检察院离任人员从事律师职业的意见》，强化了对法院工作人员与律师不正当交往、亲属违规代理案件、离任人员违规从事律师职业的监管力度。

——完善司法人员依法履职保障机制。2017年2月，最高人民法院印发《人民法院落实〈保护司法人员依法履行法定职责规定〉的实施办法》，明确法官依法办理案件不受行政机关、社会团体和个人的干涉；任何单位或者个人不得要求法官从事超出法定职责范围的事务；非因法定事由、非经法定程序，不得将法官调离、免职、辞退或者作出降级、撤职等处分；对于干扰阻碍司法活动，恐吓威胁、报复陷害、侮辱诽谤、暴力侵害法官及其近亲属的违法犯罪行为，依法迅速从严惩处；对采取不实举报、诬告陷害、利用信息网络等方式侮辱诽谤法官的，依法追究法律责任，为法官依法履职创造良好制度环境。全国31个省（自治区、直辖市）及新疆生产建设兵团法院全部成立法官权益保障委员会。各地人民法院积极健全与公安机关等相关单位的工作联动机制，共同采取教育训诫、动态追踪和安防稳控等综合措施，有效解决法院单方面惩戒措施局限、难以有力震慑违法行为人等问题。青海省高级人民法院会同省纪委等7个部门联合印发了《青海省保护地方各级人民法院法官依法履行法定职责实施办法》。辽宁、浙江、湖南、广东、四川等地人民法院会同纪委监委专门召开新闻通报会，为受到不实投诉举报的法官公开澄清正名。

三、推进法院组织体系和管理体制改革

健全完善优化、协同、高效的法院组织体系和机构职能体系，是司法改革的重要内容，也是审判体系和审判能力现代化的重要支撑。2013年以来，中国法院积极推进法院组织体系改革，优化司法管辖和职权配置，促进专业化审判和扁平化管理相结合，为服务大局、司法为民、公正司法奠定坚实基础。

——设立最高人民法院巡回法庭。2015年1月，最高人民法院在深圳、沈阳分别设立第一、第二巡回法庭；2016年12月，在南京、郑州、重庆、西安分别设立第三、第四、第五、第六巡回法庭。最高人民法院巡回法庭是最高人民法院派驻地方的常设审判机构，审理最高人民法院依法确定的案件，巡回法庭的判决和裁定即最高人民法院的判决和裁定。各巡回法庭大力开展巡回审判，积极创新工作机制，成立以来，每年办结案件数超过最高人民法院结案总数的50%，有效实现审判重心下移。各巡回法庭发挥贴近基层、贴近一线的优势，开展“律师值班志愿服务岗”“让信息多跑路、让群众少跑腿”等机制创新，开展巡回审判、跨域立案、视频接访、律师志愿咨询等工作，不断拓展便民服务范围，方便群众诉讼。围绕巡回区特点和需求，通过审判、调研、提出司法建议、开展巡回法庭开放日、巡回开庭进高校等活动，

加强法治宣传和对外交流，积极服务巡回区法治建设，被人民群众亲切称为“家门口的最高人民法院”。

——加强知识产权审判体系专门化建设。根据全国人民代表大会常务委员会决定，最高人民法院于2019年1月1日设立知识产权法庭，集中审理全国范围内技术类知识产权和垄断上诉案件，建立起国家层面知识产权案件上诉审理机制，经过三年多的试点运行，效果集中显现，法庭受理案件超过1.1万件。2014年以来，先后在北京、广州、上海、海南自由贸易港设立4家知识产权法院，截至目前，受理案件超过10万件，在南京、武汉、深圳等27个中级人民法院设立知识产权法庭，主要管辖专业技术性较强的知识产权案件，知识产权专业审判机构在全国范围内的布局得到优化。这些专门法院和专业法庭审理了一大批具有典型意义的知识产权案件，在提升审判质效、统一裁判尺度、促进创新驱动发展等方面发挥了积极作用。此外，最高人民法院通过制定司法解释和出台司法文件，进一步优化知识产权法院案件管辖范围，推进知识产权民事、行政和刑事案件“三审合一”，并就知识产权法院法官选任、知识产权法院技术调查官参与诉讼活动等事项制定发布规范性文件，加强对全国法院知识产权审判的业务指导。目前，围绕最高人民法院知识产权审判部门、知识产权法庭和4个知识产权法院、各地方人民法院知识产权审判庭，在管辖制度、案件审理、程序规则等方面，基本形成了中国特色知识产权专门化审判体系。

——设立杭州、北京、广州互联网法院。互联网法院是中国法院主动适应互联网时代司法需求，贯彻落实网络强国战略的重大制度创新。2017年以来，国家先后设立杭州互联网法院、北京互联网法院、广州互联网法院，率先探索“网上案件网上审理”机制，并逐步在全国法院推广在线审理模式，实现从起诉立案到审判、送达、执行的全

流程在线完成。互联网法院公正高效审理了一批新类型、疑难复杂互联网案件，总结提炼涉网案件裁判规则，有力推动了网络空间治理法治化。杭州互联网法院审理的全国首例大数据权属案和首例公共数据不正当竞争案，合理划定数据资源利用和个人信息保护边界；审理“小猪佩奇著作权案”等涉外案件，依法平等保护中外当事人合法权益，深度参与全球网络空间治理。北京互联网法院审理的全国首例“暗刷流量案”，有力打击网络黑灰产业，维护社会公共利益。广州互联网法院审理的全国首例“借名直播案”，明确实际使用人劳动创造的网络虚拟财产受法律保护。

——**设立上海、北京、成渝金融法院。**2018年以来，国家先后设立了上海、北京、成渝金融法院，分别管辖上海市、北京市、成渝双城经济圈范围内应当由中级人民法院管辖的金融民商事案件、涉金融行政案件，主要类型涵盖证券虚假陈述责任纠纷、金融借款合同纠纷、公司债券交易纠纷、质押式证券回购纠纷、融资租赁合同纠纷、营业信托纠纷等。金融法院成立以来，审理了一批重大、复杂、新类型和在法律适用方面具有普遍指导意义的案件，通过司法裁判厘清市场规则，规范、引导金融交易行为。2021年，北京、上海金融法院依法处理涉供应链金融、不良资产处置、私募投资基金等纠纷，防范化解金融风险。上海金融法院制定发布全国首个关于证券纠纷示范判决机制的规定，创建“示范判决+专业调解+司法确认”全链条纠纷多元解决机制，审理了全国首例证券群体性纠纷示范判决案件、全国首例涉新三板企业证券虚假陈述赔偿纠纷案等重大案件。北京金融法院与金融监管机构共建金融司法大数据研究中心，提出保障北京证券交易所25条举措，服务国家金融管理中心建设。

——**改革军事法院组织体系。**军事法院是国家设立在军队的审判

机关。根据中央统一部署，军事法院由过去按照军兵种和系统设置的模式改革为主要按照战区设置。改革后，新的军事法院组织体系包括：中国人民解放军军事法院（高级法院层级）；中国人民解放军东部战区军事法院、南部战区军事法院、西部战区第一军事法院、西部战区第二军事法院、北部战区军事法院、中部战区军事法院、总直属军事法院（中级法院层级）；中国人民解放军上海军事法院、南京军事法院、杭州军事法院等 26 个军事法院（基层法院层级）。

——推动省级以下地方法院人财物统一管理。省级以下地方法院机构编制实行由省级机构编制部门管理为主、高级人民法院协同管理的体制，市、县两级机构编制部门不再承担法院机构编制管理工作。各地建立法官统一由省级管理，并按法定程序任免的机制。法官助理由省级公务员主管部门会同高级人民法院统一招录。初任法官人选统一由省级法官遴选委员会专业把关，并按法定程序任免。各地因地制宜探索省级以下地方法院经费统一管理体制改革，北京、天津、山西等 18 个省（自治区、直辖市），以及大连、深圳 2 个计划单列市的省、市、县三级法院，均为省级政府财政部门一级预算单位，向省级政府财政部门编报预算，预算资金通过国库集中支付系统拨付。

四、推进诉讼制度改革

诉讼制度改革是司法改革的重要组成部分。2013年以来，特别是中国共产党第十九次全国代表大会以来，中国法院深入开展了刑事、民事、行政诉讼制度改革试点工作，完善诉讼程序规则，优化司法资源配置，推动成熟试点成果及时上升为法律制度，实现了司法公正与诉讼效率的平衡。

——推进以审判为中心的刑事诉讼制度改革。2016年和2017年，最高人民法院会同最高人民检察院、公安部、国家安全部、司法部，先后印发一系列改革文件，大力推进庭审实质化，完善审判对侦查、起诉活动的监督制约机制，从源头上防范刑讯逼供、非法取证等违法行为，推动形成诉讼以审判为中心、审判以庭审为中心、庭审以证据为中心的刑事诉讼格局，确保侦查、审查起诉的案件事实经得起法律检验。

2017年6月，最高人民法院在全国18个中级人民法院开展办理刑事案件庭前会议、排除非法证据、第一审普通程序法庭调查规程试点，并自2018年1月1日起在全国法院试行。各地人民法院全面落实证据裁判原则，完善关键证人、鉴定人、侦查人员出庭作证制度，有效解决控辩双方争议。最高人民法院充分发挥庭前会议功能，充分听取控

辩双方意见，成功再审顾维军案、张文中案等系列案件，取得良好的法律效果和社会效果。

——完善认罪认罚从宽制度。根据全国人民代表大会常务委员会授权，自2014年8月22日开始，最高人民法院在北京等18个城市的217个基层人民法院开展为期两年的刑事案件速裁程序改革试点。2016年9月，第十二届全国人民代表大会常务委员会第二十二次会议审议了试点情况报告，决定将刑事速裁试点改革统一纳入认罪认罚从宽制度改革继续试点。2016年9月至2018年9月，试点法院共适用认罪认罚从宽制度审结刑事案件205510件，占同期审结刑事案件的53.5%。2018年10月26日，第十三届全国人民代表大会常务委员会第六次会议通过《关于修改〈中华人民共和国刑事诉讼法〉的决定》，认罪认罚从宽制度在全国推行。2019年10月，最高人民法院联合最高人民检察院、公安部、国家安全部、司法部制定印发《关于适用认罪认罚从宽制度的指导意见》，明确法律适用、细化程序规程。

认罪认罚从宽制度实施以来，认罪认罚案件的数量、比例逐年增长。2021年，全国法院适用认罪认罚从宽制度审结刑事案件98万件，占同期审结刑事案件的80.09%。各地人民法院将认罪认罚作为程序分流的起点和基础，探索建立普通程序、简易程序、速裁程序有序衔接的多层次诉讼程序体系，不仅优化了司法资源配置，也为促进庭审实质化提供了程序保障。

——推进民事、行政案件繁简分流机制改革。最高人民法院根据全国人民代表大会常务委员会授权，于2020年1月至2021年12月，在全国15个省（自治区、直辖市）的20个城市开展为期两年的民事诉讼程序繁简分流改革试点工作。各试点人民法院依法拓宽司法确认程序适用范围，完善小额诉讼程序规则，扩大简易程序适用范围，探

索一审普通程序独任制和二审独任制审理模式，推进在线诉讼。试点期间，试点法院全部建立特邀调解名册，纠纷诉前化解率达 35.66%，有效减少诉讼增量；小额诉讼案件平均审理期限 27 天，简易程序案件平均审理期限 48 天，仅为法定审限的一半；在线庭审平均时长 46 分钟，较线下缩短 55%；小额诉讼和简易程序案件质量相关指标均优于全国平均水平。2021 年 12 月 24 日，第十三届全国人民代表大会常务委员会第三十二次会议审议通过了《关于修改〈中华人民共和国民事诉讼法〉的决定》，将试点成果上升为法律。

2021 年 5 月，为深化行政诉讼制度改革，最高人民法院制定印发《关于推进行政诉讼程序繁简分流改革的意见》，强化行政争议诉前分流，健全简易程序适用规则，依法快速审理简单案件，优化行政审判资源配置，行政诉讼繁简分流的程序运行机制初步形成。

——开展四级法院审级职能定位改革。2021 年 9 月，最高人民法院根据全国人民代表大会常务委员会授权，印发《关于完善四级法院审级职能定位改革试点的实施办法》，在本院和北京、天津、辽宁、上海、江苏、浙江、山东、河南、广东、重庆、四川、陕西 12 个省、直辖市的人民法院开展试点工作，完善行政案件级别管辖制度，改革案件提级管辖机制，优化再审程序，改革最高人民法院审判权力运行机制。经过一年多探索，四级法院审级职能逐步优化，高级、中级人民法院审理重大典型一审案件职能作用更加凸显。最高人民法院强化对全国法院审判工作的监督指导，完善再审程序运行机制，案件结构和分布日趋合理，司法职权配置更加科学，矛盾纠纷化解质效有效提升，人民群众对公平正义的获得感不断增强。

试点一年以来，各高级、中级人民法院共提级管辖案件 435 件，同比增长 19.5%，其中，23.7% 的案件涉及重大国家利益、社会公共利益，

33.96% 的案件属于在辖区内类型较新、疑难复杂的案件，34.91% 的案件具有普遍法律适用指导意义。提级管辖的案件涵盖民事、刑事、行政、知识产权等领域，涉及数据权利确权、网络不正当竞争、新业态用工主体资格、“双减”政策下教育培训合同效力等法律问题。

——**开展行政案件跨行政区划集中管辖改革试点。**2014 年 12 月，北京、上海分别设立北京市第四中级人民法院、上海市第三中级人民法院，作为跨行政区划人民法院试点，为探索建立普通案件在行政区划法院审理、特殊案件在跨行政区划法院审理的新型诉讼格局积累了经验。两个跨行政区划人民法院审理跨地区的重大民商事案件、重大行政案件、重大环境资源保护案件、重大食品药品安全案件和部分重大刑事案件，确保涉及地方利益的案件得到公正处理。经最高人民法院指定，自 2017 年 10 月 26 日起，北京市第四中级人民法院开始受理天津相关法院审理的环境保护行政案件上诉案件，迈出了跨省级行政区划管辖案件的重要一步。

2015 年 6 月，最高人民法院印发《关于人民法院跨行政区域集中管辖行政案件的指导意见》，各高级人民法院结合本地实际制定改革方案，推进行政案件跨行政区划集中管辖改革。目前，行政案件跨行政区域集中管辖改革试点已经在全国法院全面铺开，为全面实施跨区域管辖积累了丰富的实践经验。

——**健全行政机关负责人依法出庭应诉制度。**2016 年 7 月，最高人民法院印发通知，要求各级人民法院根据《中华人民共和国行政诉讼法》相关规定，进一步规范和促进行政应诉工作。2020 年 6 月，最高人民法院印发《关于行政机关负责人出庭应诉若干问题的规定》，明确人民法院通知行政机关负责人出庭应诉的案件范围，细化相关程序，规范负责人不能出庭的情形，进一步推进行政争议的实质性化解。江

苏省行政机关负责人行政诉讼出庭应诉率连续两年稳定在 90% 以上，南通等 9 个地级市超过 90%，昆山等 59 个县（市、区）达 100%，海安县人民政府连续三任县长出庭应诉，连续六年行政机关负责人出庭应诉率达 100%。

——完善环境资源案件集中管辖和审理机制。结合生态环境保护 and 流域区域治理需要，最高人民法院和高级人民法院设立环境资源审判庭，中级、基层人民法院因地制宜设立 2426 个环境资源审判庭、专业合议庭、专业审判团队和专业人民法庭，推动设立长江上游生态环境保护法院。最高人民法院和 29 个高级人民法院实行环境资源刑事、民事、行政案件“三合一”审理模式。各地法院结合本地区环境资源保护特点，探索环境资源案件跨行政区划集中管辖模式。河南、湖北、海南等地区探索以流域、海域等生态系统或生态功能区为单位集中管辖环境资源案件，推动案件管辖和审理模式更加符合生态环境自身特点和规律。江苏省高级人民法院提出以生态功能区为单位设立环境资源法庭，以江苏省高级人民法院环境资源审判庭、南京环境资源法庭、9 个生态功能区法庭为基础，形成了环境资源案件集中管辖审判体系，有效加强了生态环境保护力度。

——完善维护司法权威和诉讼诚信的制度。2015 年 8 月 29 日，第十二届全国人民代表大会常务委员会第十六次会议审议通过《中华人民共和国刑法修正案（九）》，完善了拒不执行判决、裁定罪，增加一档法定刑，并增加单位犯罪的规定；修改了扰乱法庭秩序罪，将殴打诉讼参与人以及侮辱、诽谤、威胁司法工作人员或者诉讼参与人，不听法庭制止等严重扰乱法庭秩序的行为增列为犯罪；增设了虚假诉讼罪，将以捏造的事实提起民事诉讼，妨害司法秩序或者严重侵害他人合法权益的行为增列为犯罪。最高人民法院先后印发关于防范和制裁

虚假诉讼、在民事诉讼中防范与惩治虚假诉讼工作指引、深入开展虚假诉讼整治工作等规范性文件，指导各地人民法院准确识别虚假诉讼要素，加大审查力度，坚决予以制裁。2018年9月，最高人民法院、最高人民检察院联合发布《关于办理虚假诉讼刑事案件适用法律若干问题的解释》，综合运用民事、刑事等多种手段，依法惩治发生在民商事案件审判、执行程序中的虚假诉讼违法犯罪行为。2021年3月，最高人民法院会同最高人民检察院、公安部、司法部印发《关于进一步加强虚假诉讼犯罪惩治工作的意见》，畅通司法机关依法惩治虚假诉讼犯罪的配合协作和程序衔接机制，保护公民、法人和其他组织的合法权益，促进社会诚信建设，维护司法公正和司法权威。

五、强化人权司法保障制度机制

尊重和保障人权，是《中华人民共和国宪法》确立的重要原则，也是中国特色社会主义司法制度的重要内容。中国法院坚持惩罚犯罪与保障人权并重的司法理念，加强被告人权利保护，依法保障律师执业权利，完善刑罚执行制度，在人权司法保障机制建设上取得积极成果。

——**预防和纠正冤假错案。**2013年，最高人民法院印发《关于建立健全防范刑事冤假错案工作机制的意见》，要求对于定罪证据不足的案件，应当依法宣告被告人无罪，不得降格或者变通作出“留有余地”的判决。2014年以来，各级人民法院共依法宣告8508名被告人无罪，依法保障无罪者不受追究。

人民法院建立健全刑事冤错案件主动发现、及时复查和依法纠正机制，对于已发现的冤错案件，坚持实事求是、有错必纠原则，对错案发现一起、查实一起、纠正一起，切实回应社会关切，维护司法公正和法律权威。2013年以来，人民法院通过审判监督程序依法纠正65起重大刑事冤错案件，改判129名原审被告人无罪，其中包括浙江张氏叔侄强奸案，内蒙古呼格吉勒图故意杀人案，海南陈满故意杀人、放火案等重大案件，提振了全社会对司法公正的信心。2016年12月2日，最高人民法院第二巡回法庭对原审被告人聂树斌故意杀人、强奸

妇女再审案公开宣判，宣告撤销原审判决，改判聂树斌无罪。这起历时二十二年的案件得以纠正，彰显了中国法院对人权司法保障的高度重视和对证据裁判、疑罪从无等法律原则的坚定实践。

——**严格规范减刑、假释和暂予监外执行。**2014年4月，最高人民法院印发《关于减刑、假释案件审理程序的规定》，建立减刑假释案件公开审理制度和典型案例定期公布制度。2015年开通全国法院减刑、假释、暂予监外执行信息网，向社会公众公开减刑、假释案件全流程信息，让减刑、假释司法活动全程在阳光下运行。2016年11月，最高人民法院发布《关于办理减刑、假释案件具体应用法律的规定》，进一步明确减刑、假释的性质、适用要求，统一全国减刑、假释案件裁判标准，促进减刑、假释案件办理的公平公正。2017年11月，最高人民法院开通全国减刑、假释信息化办案平台，实现人民法院与检察机关、刑罚执行机关以及上下级人民法院之间案件信息互通、网上协同办案，确保减刑、假释案件审理全程留痕、全程监督。

针对群众反映突出的违规违法办理减刑、假释、暂予监外执行案件问题，最高人民法院于2021年部署全国法院全面排查1990年以来减刑、假释、暂予监外执行案件1334.5万件，对有问题或瑕疵的5.9万件督促逐一整改。2021年12月，最高人民法院联合最高人民检察院、公安部、司法部发布《关于加强减刑、假释案件实质化审理的意见》，准确把握案件审理的基本要求，严格审查案件实体条件，强化案件办理程序机制，加强监督指导及工作保障，进一步规范减刑、假释工作。同时，加强对人民法院暂予监外执行工作的监督，决不允许“纸面服刑”“提钱出狱”，破坏公平正义。

——**修改完善人民法院法庭规则。**2015年2月，最高人民法院、公安部规定，刑事被告人或上诉人开庭时不再穿着看守所的识别服出

庭受审，正在服刑的罪犯不再穿着监狱的囚服出庭受审。人民法院提解在押刑事被告人或上诉人的，看守所应当将穿着正装或便装的在押刑事被告人或上诉人移交人民法院，彰显了现代司法文明。2016年4月13日，最高人民法院印发修订后的《中华人民共和国人民法院法庭规则》，进一步明确法庭行为规范、维护法庭秩序，强化人权司法保障，促进法庭更加开放、便民、文明、安全，让法庭成为人民群众感知公平正义的场所。2020年6月，最高人民法院印发进一步规范庭审秩序的通知，要求各地人民法院统一庭审活动规范，切实保障当事人各项诉讼权利。

——完善保障律师依法履职制度。2015年12月，最高人民法院印发《关于依法切实保障律师诉讼权利的规定》，依法保障律师知情权、阅卷权、出庭权、辩论辩护权、申请调取证据权、申请排除非法证据权、代理申诉权等执业权利，为律师依法履职提供保障和便利。建立死刑复核案件听取律师意见制度，保障律师查询立案信息、查阅案卷材料等权利，律师可直接向最高人民法院法官当面陈述辩护意见，确保死刑复核案件质量。2020年12月16日，最高人民法院联合司法部出台《关于为律师提供一站式诉讼服务的意见》，开通人民法院律师服务平台，提供网上立案、网上阅卷、联系法官等35项在线诉讼服务，实现“一次核验、全网通办、全国通办”。截至2022年7月底，律师服务平台累计为37.4万名律师提供在线立案服务387.49万件，发出案件排期避让提醒77.47万次。

2017年10月，最高人民法院、司法部印发《关于开展刑事案件律师辩护全覆盖试点工作的办法》，全国各地看守所和全国法院均设置了法律援助值班律师工作站。2021年12月，最高人民法院会同司法部印发《关于为死刑复核案件被告人依法提供法律援助的规定（试

行)》，完善死刑复核案件法律援助制度，依法保障死刑案件被告人获得辩护的权利。各级人民法院充分保障被告人依法获得律师辩护和法律帮助的权利，刑事案件辩护率逐年提升。山西省刑事一审案件辩护率从2019年的70.02%，上升到2021年的87.18%，较2017年以前提升了两倍以上。

——**完善国家赔偿制度**。最高人民法院先后制定发布《关于办理刑事赔偿案件适用法律若干问题的解释》《关于审理国家赔偿案件确定精神损害赔偿适用若干问题的解释》，进一步明确刑事赔偿疑难问题的法律适用，规范精神损害赔偿裁量标准，就进一步加强刑事冤错案件国家赔偿工作提出意见，充分发挥国家赔偿的权利救济功能。呼格吉勒图案、张氏叔侄案、聂树斌案、刘忠林案、张玉环案等刑事冤错案件的受害人或其近亲属依法及时获得赔偿。

——**完善司法救助制度**。最高人民法院印发《关于加强和规范人民法院国家司法救助工作的意见》《人民法院国家司法救助案件办理程序规定（试行）》，统一案件受理、救助范围、救助程序、救助标准、经费保障、资金发放。2016年9月18日，最高人民法院设立司法救助委员会，地方各级人民法院也相继成立司法救助委员会。2021年，全国各级人民法院共计司法救助4万人，发放救助金9.2亿元。天津法院加强与其他司法机关、社会救助和外省市救助的联动，实现司法救助与社会救助的无缝对接。四川法院简化司法救助办理流程，运行司法救助网络平台，提高了救助案件办理的规范性和效率。

——**规范处理涉案财物的司法程序**。2014年10月，最高人民法院印发《关于刑事裁判涉财产部分执行的若干规定》，规范没收财产、追缴、变价措施、执行异议等刑事涉案财物执行程序。2015年以来，最高人民法院会同中央有关部门，推动建立跨部门的地方涉案财物集中

管理信息平台，完善涉案财物先行处置程序、审前返还程序，明确利害关系人诉讼权利，完善权利救济和责任追究机制。2021年3月1日施行的《最高人民法院关于适用〈中华人民共和国民事诉讼法〉的解释》设置专章规范涉案财物的处理。浙江省诸暨市成立全国首家跨部门的刑事诉讼涉案财物管理中心，建立涉案财物管理统一信息平台，政法各部门各自管理的涉案财物信息统一进入平台，实现涉案财物电子化移送，方便了办案进程，规范了涉案财物处理程序。北京法院制定刑事诉讼涉案财物管理办法，推动涉案财物处理程序规范高效，实现“实物静止、手续流转”。

六、扎实推进“基本解决执行难”

生效法律文书的执行，是实现司法公正的“最后一公里”，事关司法权威和司法公信力。2016年3月，最高人民法院在第十二届全国人民代表大会第四次会议上提出“用两到三年时间基本解决执行难问题”。从2016年至2018年底，全国法院共受理执行案件2043.5万件，执结1936.1万件，执行到位金额4.4万亿元，同比分别增长98.5%、105.1%和71.2%。2019年3月12日，最高人民法院向第十三届全国人民代表大会第二次会议报告“基本解决执行难”目标如期实现，兑现了庄严承诺。

世界银行发布的《2019年营商环境报告》中，中国“执行合同”指标排名全球第6位。在2019年世界执行大会上，29个国家和2个国际组织代表一致认为，中国法院在执行领域进行的改革和创新，形成了中国模式，丰富了国际实践，推动了法治进步与发展。2022年6月，第十三届全国人民代表大会常务委员会第三十五次会议审议了《中华人民共和国民事诉讼法强制执行法（草案）》，攻坚“执行难”形成的制度经验即将成为正式法律制度。

——推动形成综合治理“执行难”工作格局。2019年7月，中央全面依法治国委员会印发《关于加强综合治理从源头切实解决执行难

问题的意见》。全国 31 个省级政府全部印发支持人民法院解决执行难、加强失信被执行人信用惩戒的文件，12 个省一级人民代表大会常务委员会专门通过支持人民法院解决执行难的决定。目前，“党委领导、政法委协调、人大监督、政府支持、法院主办、部门配合、社会参与”的综合治理“执行难”工作格局已初步形成。

——**深入推进执行工作信息化**。最高人民法院建成以执行指挥中心综合管理平台为核心，以四级法院统一的办案系统和执行公开系统为支撑，以网络查控、评估拍卖、信用惩戒、执行委托等多个执行办案辅助系统为补充的“1+2+N”执行信息化系统。建立“统一管理、统一协调、统一指挥”的执行管理新模式，实现执行协作、款物管理、申诉信访、流程监督等 20 多项功能。通过“一站式”执行公开、“一键式”案件督办，基本实现对执行案件、事项、人员的扁平化、集约化、可视化管理。

——**完善执行管理制度建设**。2013 年以来，最高人民法院积极推进执行规范体系建设，共印发 55 项重要司法解释和规范性文件，全面规范执行工作。特别是 2016 年以来，印发财产保全、财产调查、执行和解、执行担保、先予仲裁等 37 个司法解释和规范性文件，有效约束和规范执行权。自 2014 年开始，全国法院全面清查核录近二十年来未实际执结的执行案件，将 1600 余万案件录入执行案件管理系统。全国法院在一个平台办案，规范执行办案标准和流程，强化关键节点管控，畅通执行信息公开渠道，实现执行办案和执行公开模式的重大变革。

——**深化执行体制机制改革**。积极稳妥推进人民法院内部审判权和执行权相分离改革试点。最高人民法院印发《关于人民法院立案、审判与执行工作协调运行的意见》，加强立案、审判、执行、保全程序中的机制衔接。建立以法官为主导，法官助理、书记员、司法警察等

司法辅助人员组成的团队化执行工作模式。全面推广由保险公司为申请人提供财产保全责任保险的做法，解决财产保全申请人难以提供保全担保的突出问题，提升财产保全适用率。

——**推进网络查控系统建设。**针对传统执行查控模式存在的执行效率低、覆盖财产范围窄、查控人力成本高等难题，最高人民法院建立网络查控系统，与公安部、民政部、自然资源部、交通运输部、中国人民银行、中国银保监会等 16 家单位和 3900 多家银行业金融机构联网，可以查询被执行人在全国范围内的不动产、存款、金融理财产品、船舶、车辆、证券、网络资金等 16 类、25 项信息，基本涵盖了被执行人的主要财产形式和相关信息。截至 2021 年 12 月底，全国法院通过网络执行查控系统累计查询案件 10971.80 万件，累计冻结资金 18941.46 亿元，查询房屋、土地等不动产信息 34967.56 万条，车辆 14733.1 万辆，证券 23535.34 亿股，渔船和船舶 371.79 万艘，网络资金 760.22 亿元。

——**完善失信被执行人联合惩戒制度机制。**2013 年，最高人民法院建立失信被执行人名单制度，推动对失信被执行人进行联合惩戒，努力破解规避执行难题。2016 年以来，最高人民法院与国家发展和改革委员会等 60 家单位签署文件，推进失信被执行人信用监督、警示和惩戒机制建设，采取 11 类、37 大项、150 项惩戒措施，限制失信被执行人担任公职、党代表、人大代表、政协委员，以及出行、购房、投资、招投标等活动。截至 2022 年 8 月，正在发布中的失信被执行人共 756 万人，有 1013 万人次迫于惩戒压力自动履行了法律义务。

——**全面推行网络司法拍卖。**为克服传统拍卖方式存在的诸多弊端，最高人民法院印发网络司法拍卖司法解释，实行“以网络拍卖为原则、传统拍卖为例外”。从 2017 年 1 月 1 日开始，在全国法院全面

推行网络司法拍卖。截至目前，全国所有法院均实行网络拍卖。针对司法拍卖评估环节效率低问题，创设当事人议价、定向询价、网络询价和委托评估等评估方式，提高财产处置效率，减轻当事人负担。截至2021年底，全国法院通过询价评估系统累计对41.4万件案件中的72.9万件标的物确定财产处置参考价。从2017年3月网络拍卖系统上线至2022年8月，全国法院网络拍卖476.3万余次，成交120.5万余件，成交额20404亿元，标的物成交率为63.6%，为当事人节约佣金629亿元，并且违纪违法投诉始终为“零”。

七、完善司法便民利民制度机制

司法为民、公正司法是人民法院的工作主线。人民法院通过改革案件受理制度，建设一站式多元纠纷解决和诉讼服务体系，加强人民法庭建设，健全案件繁简分流机制，不断提升司法为民水平，走出了一条中国特色司法为民之路，让人民群众在司法改革中有更多获得感。

——**全面推进立案制度改革**。自2015年5月1日起，人民法院改立案审查制为立案登记制，从制度上、源头上彻底解决了“立案难”问题。针对年底不立案、拖延立案问题，最高人民法院召开专门会议，出台指导意见，开通12368诉讼服务热线投诉举报功能，研发上线立案偏离度预警系统，彻底打通立案登记制改革“最后一公里”。目前，全国法院平均当场立案率达95.7%，天津、上海、浙江、福建、重庆、云南等地当场立案率超过98%。截至2022年6月30日，全国法院累计登记立案13837.17万件，其中，民事一审9306.25万件，行政一审187.89万件，刑事自诉13.3万件，国家赔偿10.85万件，首次申请执行4318.88万件，长期困扰群众的“立案难”问题已经成为历史。

——**构建多元化登记立案新模式**。2019年，最高人民法院在全国法院部署开展跨域立案服务，建立就近受理申请、管辖权属不变、数

据网上流动的跨域立案联动办理机制。截至 2022 年 7 月底，依托全国四级法院和 1 万多个人民法庭建立的“立案协作网”，已经累计为群众提供“异地受理、无差别办理”的跨域立案服务 15.5 万件。人民法院建立健全现场立案、自助立案、网上立案、巡回立案、邮寄立案、12368 热线立案和跨域立案服务的登记立案新模式。全国法院 100% 应用“人民法院在线服务”小程序，总访问量高达 27 亿多次，网上立案申请总量累计 1960.15 万件，平均每分钟就有 41 件案件通过网上立案，有 30% 以上立案申请当事人在非工作时段和非工作日提交。

——**建成一站式多元纠纷解决和诉讼服务体系。**多元化纠纷解决机制是国家治理体系现代化建设的重要组成部分。2016 年 6 月，最高人民法院印发《关于人民法院进一步深化多元化纠纷解决机制改革的意见》，提出“国家制定发展战略、司法发挥保障作用、推动国家立法进程”的“三步走战略”，确立“国家主导、司法推动、社会参与、多元并举、法治保障”的现代纠纷解决理念。最高人民法院分别与国家发展和改革委员会、公安部、民政部、司法部、人力资源和社会保障部、中国银保监会、中国证监会、全国妇联、中国侨联、全国工商联等部门就人民调解、家事纠纷、公证参与法院司法辅助事务、劳动人事争议、保险纠纷、证券期货纠纷等领域联合发布 20 多个诉调对接文件。

2019 年 7 月，最高人民法院印发《关于建设一站式多元解纷机制一站式诉讼服务中心的意见》，推动形成中国特色纠纷解决和诉讼服务模式。截至 2021 年底，全国各级人民法院设置专门的诉调对接中心 3866 个，专门工作人员 26416 名，充分发挥案件分流、先行调解、委派调解、委托调解、司法确认等制度的功能，快速化解纠纷，发挥纠纷处理集散地、调度站和分流点的作用。依托人民法院调解平台，大力发展在线调解。2021 年，全国法院诉前调解成功案件 610.68 万件，

同比增长 43.86%。2018 年至今,在线调解案件累计超过 2962 万件,7.8 万家调解组织和 32.8 万名调解员通过人民法院调解平台开展工作,平均每个工作日有 4.68 万件纠纷在人民法院调解平台调解,每分钟就有 57 件成功化解在诉前,平均调解时长 12 天,不到一审民事案件平均审理周期的三分之一。持续推进“总对总”在线诉调对接工作,陆续与中央台办、国家发展和改革委员会、人力资源和社会保障部、退役军人事务部、中国人民银行、中国银保监会、中国证监会、国家知识产权局、全国总工会、中国侨联、全国工商联、中小企业协会等单位建立纠纷解决合作机制,人民法院累计在线委派“总对总”单位诉前调解纠纷 76.7 万件,调解成功率达 67.3%。

经过几年努力,集约集成、在线融合、普惠均等的中国特色一站式多元纠纷解决和诉讼服务体系全面建成,为人民群众提供菜单式、集约式、一站式多元解纷服务,群众需要什么方式就提供什么方式,真正做到方便快捷、诉非对接、线上线下联动。

——**建立完善律师调解制度。**2017 年 9 月,最高人民法院、司法部联合印发《关于开展律师调解试点工作的意见》,在北京、黑龙江、上海等 11 个省、直辖市开展试点。通过建立律师调解员队伍,发挥法律专业人士化解纠纷的优势,拓展律师服务领域。2018 年 12 月 26 日,最高人民法院、司法部联合印发《关于扩大律师调解试点工作的通知》,将律师调解改革试点范围扩大到全国,进一步发挥律师在化解社会矛盾、促进依法治理中的专业优势,建立符合我国国情的律师调解制度。四川省高级人民法院推动辖区 180 家法院设立律师调解室,湖北省潜江市人民法院将全市知名律师纳入法院特邀调解名册,河北省任丘市人民法院 18 名律师组成的律师调解团队曾于半年内诉前调解成功案件 1500 余件。

——**深化涉诉信访制度改革。**人民法院积极推动信访工作法治化，完善诉访分离工作机制，切实解决群众合法合理诉求。最高人民法院建设网上申诉信访平台，当事人只需填写申诉信访信息，提交相应材料，即可随时随地查询申诉信访办理进程和反馈结果，畅通了申诉信访渠道，减少了来往奔波之苦。为当事人提供跨层级、跨区域的视频接谈服务，实现最高人民法院、地方相关人民法院和信访人之间多方远程面对面交流。最高人民法院建成全国法院涉诉信访管理平台，汇聚全国法院信访信息，实现信访信息发布、信息报送、信访监督等功能，确保上下级法院涉诉信访信息的快速、准确沟通，提高了信访工作效率，完善了统一协调机制。2022年，最高人民法院印发《关于加强新时代人民法院涉诉信访工作的意见》，对新时代涉诉信访工作提出总体要求、作出具体部署。

——**推进家事审判方式和工作机制改革。**2016年4月和2018年7月，最高人民法院就深化家事审判方式和工作机制改革印发两份文件，探索家事纠纷的专业化、社会化和人性化解决方式，积极推进家事审判方式和工作机制改革试点。试点法院建立家事审判庭或者家事审判团队，引入家事调查员、社工陪护及儿童心理专家等，为当事人提供心理疏导等相关专业服务，整合司法、行政和社会多方力量，建设家事纠纷综合协调解决机制。2017年7月，最高人民法院牵头建立15家单位共同参与的家事审判方式和工作机制改革联席会议制度。河北、浙江、福建、山东、西藏、陕西、甘肃、青海等地法院建立多部门参与的联席会议制度。内蒙古、辽宁、安徽、广西、宁夏等高级人民法院制定家事案件审理规程。重庆、青海等地法院加强家事案件心理测评干预，防止“民转刑”案件发生。上海市普陀区人民法院创设“儿童权益代表人”机制，由妇儿工委办公室人员作为代表人，通过独立

调查、取证、参与庭审，切实保护未成年人合法权益。

——**完善中国特色少年司法制度。**全国法院坚决贯彻落实最有利于未成年人原则和特殊、优先、双向、全面保护的新时代少年司法理念，切实保护未成年人健康成长。2020年12月，最高人民法院发布《关于加强新时代未成年人审判工作的意见》，巩固并强化新时代少年审判的专业化发展方向。2021年3月，最高人民法院成立少年法庭工作办公室，负责综合统筹全国未成年人审判指导工作，同时在6个巡回法庭设立“少年法庭巡回审判点”。截至2021年底，全国法院共有独立建制或通过加挂牌子方式设立的少年法庭2181个。2013年至2022年6月，全国法院依法审结猥亵儿童、拐卖儿童、拐骗儿童、组织未成年人乞讨等侵害未成年人合法权益刑事案件4.8万件，惩处罪犯4.97万人，体现了对未成年人的特殊、优先保护。全国法院共判处未成年罪犯37.9万人，占全部刑事罪犯的2.89%，其中，非监禁刑适用比例达30%以上。未成年罪犯从2013年的5.58万人减少到2021年的3.5万人，占全部刑事罪犯的比例由4.82%降低至2.02%，实现了少年审判矫治和预防犯罪的功能。

——**推进道路交通事故损害赔偿纠纷“网上数据一体化处理”改革试点。**针对我国道路交通纠纷日渐增多、人民群众化解此类纠纷耗时费力的突出矛盾，最高人民法院在全国推行道交纠纷“网上数据一体化处理”工作，将公安交通管理部门责任认定、相关主体理赔计算、调解组织调解、鉴定机构鉴定、法院诉讼、保险行业理赔等纠纷处理流程全部实现在线处置，让纠纷解决更方便、更快捷。截至2022年8月，道交一体化平台在全国31家高级人民法院和新疆维吾尔自治区高级人民法院生产建设兵团分院上线，覆盖3006家基层法院，共调解174.95万余件，其中调解成功115.95万件，涉及金额568.29亿元。

——**改革完善民事送达制度。**最高人民法院全面推进当事人送达地址确认制度，统一送达地址确认书格式，规范送达地址确认书内容，积极探索电子送达及送达凭证保全的有效方式方法，提升民事送达质量效率，着力解决制约民事审判工作的瓶颈。最高人民法院设立人民法院送达平台，解决在送达工作中“找人难、送达难、回执难、成本高”等送达难题，整合电子送达、邮寄送达、公告送达，实现真正的“智慧诉讼服务”。浙江省温岭市人民法院设立送达管理中心，配备9名专职送达人员，开发送达管理软件，开通送达管理中心官方微信，加强与邮政送达协调，提高了送达效率。四川省德阳市旌阳区人民法院综合运用电子送达、公证送达、约定送达、司法建议等多种方式，送达成本降低50%。实施电子送达后，涉保险合同类案件仅送达签收环节就可节约5天以上，整个案件审理周期节约10天以上。

——**加强新时代人民法庭建设。**2021年，最高人民法院印发《关于推动新时代人民法庭工作高质量发展的意见》，确立新时代人民法庭工作“便于当事人诉讼，便于人民法院依法独立公正高效行使审判权，便于人民群众及时感受到公平正义”的原则。推进“枫桥式人民法庭”建设，启动服务新型城镇化试点工作，不断优化人民法庭区域布局，方便群众就地就近参加诉讼、统筹配置司法资源、提高司法效率。截至2021年底，全国实际运行的人民法庭共9654个，其中乡村法庭6028个、城区法庭1288个、城乡结合法庭2338个，为全国乡村以及绝大部分城市地区提供司法服务。人民法庭依托“车载法庭”“马背法庭”“背包法庭”等广泛开展巡回审判，依托诉源治理系统，实现矛盾预防、纠纷化解、在线调解、视频连线法官、司法确认等全流程在线办理。城区法庭、城乡结合法庭基本实现科技审判法庭全配备，包括庭审录音录像、证据展示、语音识别、卷宗扫描等设备，能够实现网

上调解、网上庭审、网上直播、电子卷宗随案生成、无纸化办公、电子签章、智能合议等功能。2016年至2021年，全国人民法庭审结案件2537.7万件，约占基层人民法院结案总数的25%。

八、深化司法公开和司法民主

阳光是最好的“防腐剂”。中国共产党第十八届中央委员会第三次全体会议明确提出推进审判公开，第十八届中央委员会第四次全体会议对“构建开放、动态、透明、便民的阳光司法机制”作出重大部署。2013年以来，最高人民法院贯彻落实党中央部署要求，坚持以公开促公正、以透明保廉洁，同步推进审判流程、庭审活动、裁判文书、执行信息四大公开平台建设，促进司法公开透明。在依法维护公民个人隐私、保障数据信息安全基础上，将司法公开覆盖人民法院审判执行工作各领域、各环节。2018年11月，最高人民法院印发《关于进一步深化司法公开的意见》。2020年3月，最高人民法院提出进一步深度运用司法公开“四大平台”。经过努力，开放、动态、透明、便民的阳光司法机制已经形成。

——**推进审判流程公开**。2014年11月，中国审判流程信息公开网正式开通，现已成为全国审判流程信息的集中汇聚和统一发布平台。案件当事人及其诉讼代理人自案件受理之日起，可以凭有效证件号码随时登录查询、下载相关案件的流程信息、材料等，程序性诉讼文书可以通过网络电子送达。2018年3月，最高人民法院印发《关于人民法院通过互联网公开审判流程信息的规定》，明确除涉及国家秘密以及

法律规定应当保密或者限制获取的审判流程信息以外，人民法院审判刑事、民事、行政、国家赔偿案件过程中产生的程序性信息、处理诉讼事项的流程信息、诉讼文书、笔录等四大类审判流程信息，均应当通过互联网向参加诉讼的当事人及其法定代理人、诉讼代理人、辩护人公开。截至 2022 年 7 月 31 日，中国审判流程信息公开网公开案件 7173.7 万件，公开率为 99.76%，公开信息项数量 45.44 亿个，网站访问量 7.4 亿次，共推送短信 4 亿余条，全国法院共发布公众栏目信息数量 538.5 万个。

——**推进庭审活动公开。**2013 年 12 月 11 日，中国法院庭审直播网开通。自 2016 年 7 月 1 日起，最高人民法院所有依法公开开庭的案件均可以通过互联网直播庭审。社会公众可以通过该网实时选择观看全国法院正在直播的案件、点播观看庭审录像、获取庭审直播统计信息，真正实现了庭审信息的全面覆盖、实时互联和深度公开。截至 2022 年 7 月 31 日，全国各级人民法院依托中国庭审公开网，累计直播庭审已突破 1990 万场，网站总访问量突破 50 亿人次。

——**推进裁判文书公开。**2013 年 7 月，最高人民法院开通中国裁判文书网，建立全国统一的裁判文书公开平台，并率先在该网公布本院作出的裁判文书。2014 年 1 月 1 日起，各级人民法院的生效裁判文书陆续在中国裁判文书网公布。2016 年 8 月 29 日，最高人民法院发布修订后的《关于人民法院在互联网公布裁判文书的规定》，详细列举了应当公开的裁判文书类型，将裁判文书公开工作模式由传统的专门机构集中公布，转变为办案法官在办案平台一键点击自动公布，建立了对公众反馈的投诉和意见处理机制、裁判文书公开督导机制，充分接受社会各界对裁判文书公开工作的监督。截至 2022 年 7 月 31 日，中国裁判文书网访问量 926.3 亿人次，用户覆盖 210 个国家和地区，超过 5.2

亿人次的访问量来自海外。

——**推进执行信息公开。**2014年11月，最高人民法院整合被执行人信息、全国法院失信被执行人名单、执行案件流程信息、执行裁判文书四项公开信息，统一纳入中国执行信息公开网，实现全国法院执行案件信息、失信被执行人信息、终结本次执行案件信息、网络司法拍卖信息等内容统一、及时、自动公开。2016年9月14日，“中国执行”微信公众号正式上线，适时发布涉执行法律、法规信息和各地法院执行工作动态。2020年12月，“智慧执行”App当事人公众端正式上线，当事人可以更加便捷地获取相关执行节点信息、联系执行法官、获得更多诉讼服务。截至2022年8月，中国执行信息公开网累计公布失信被执行人2448.26万人次。

——**推进企业破产信息公开。**2016年8月，最高人民法院发布《关于企业破产案件信息公开的规定（试行）》，正式开通全国企业破产重整案件信息网，成为对破产案件各类信息分级发布的互联网资讯平台，法律文书、管理人招募公告、投资人招募公告、资产拍卖公告等公告信息同步在该网公布，为债权人、债务人企业、市场投资者、其他利害关系人提供在线司法服务。截至2022年8月，通过全国企业破产重整案件信息网公开的破产案件达19.8万件。

——**拓展司法公开的广度和深度。**最高人民法院定期出版《最高人民法院公报》，发布知识产权司法保护、海事审判、环境资源审判、行政审判、司法改革、司法公开等白皮书，面向国内外公开司法文件、重大案件和法院工作情况。各级人民法院通过建设法院政务网站、法院微博微信、移动新闻客户端、院长信箱、代表委员联络平台、主题开放日活动等，进一步深化司法公开。2014年12月31日，最高人民法院开通诉讼服务网，方便当事人咨询查询、预约立案、网上阅卷、

联系法官。2015年12月15日，最高人民法院开通英文网站。自2013年起，最高人民法院开通官方微博，上线全国法院微博发布厅，截至2022年8月，新浪微博订阅用户总数达1837.6万余人，发布微博11万条。2013年11月，最高人民法院官方微信公众号正式上线，截至2021年底，订阅用户315万人。2015年1月起，全国法院推行新闻发布例会制度。2013年至2022年8月，最高人民法院召开新闻发布会250场，发布典型案例2000余个。

——**推进人民陪审员制度改革。**2015年5月，根据全国人民代表大会常务委员会授权，最高人民法院会同司法部印发人民陪审员制度改革试点方案和试点工作实施办法，在10个省（自治区、直辖市）的50个法院开展试点。2018年4月27日，《中华人民共和国人民陪审员法》正式颁布实施，放宽选任入口，合理界定案件参审范围，确定三人合议庭和七人合议庭两种审判组织模式，优化人民陪审员与法官事实认定和法律适用职权分工，人民陪审员制度发展迈入新阶段。最高人民法院单独或者会同相关部门出台一系列司法解释及配套规范性文件，形成人民陪审员制度体系。各级人民法院和司法行政机关规范选任机制、优化参审机制、健全履职保障、强化队伍管理、加强宣传推广。目前，全国人民陪审员共计33.2万余人，比2013年增加2.8倍。人民陪审员广泛性、代表性进一步增强，队伍素质、参审质效逐步提升，人民陪审员制度的影响力和公信力不断提高。

九、推行司法人员分类管理

最高人民法院按照党中央统一部署，配合中央有关部门，深入推进法院人员分类管理，完善法官选任制度，全面推行法官额制，建立法官单独职务序列和配套保障制度，推进审判辅助人员管理制度改革，分类科学、结构合理、分工明确、管理规范的人事制度基本建立。

——**建立司法人员分类管理制度。**根据人民法院工作人员职位的性质、特点和审判工作实际需要，最高人民法院积极推进司法人员分类管理制度改革，将法院人员分为法官、审判辅助人员和司法行政人员三类，并分别实行不同的管理制度，确保三类人员各司其职、各尽其责、互相配合。随着司法体制改革的深入推进，各类司法人员职责权限更加明确，职业发展渠道更加畅通，人员结构更加优化，人民法院队伍正规化、专业化、职业化水平进一步提高。2021年11月，最高人民法院制定印发《关于建立健全人民法院人员内部交流机制的若干意见》，解决了人员分类管理改革后不同类别人员间交流不畅的问题，拓宽了人员交流渠道。浙江省高级人民法院制定审判业务部门与综合部门人员交流办法，探索建立“双向平衡发展”的跨类别人员交流机制，有效促进一批优秀干部在交流中历练、成长。

——**全面实施法官额制。**全面推进法官额制改革，坚持优中

选优，经过严格的考试、考核程序，从原来的 21 万余名法官中遴选产生 12.8 万余名员额法官，资源配置更加合理，队伍结构更加优化。最高人民法院先后制定出台《人民法院法官员额退出办法（试行）》《人民法院法官违纪违法退额管理规定（试行）》，全面规定了法官员额退出的情形、程序及后果，完善法官违纪违法与员额退出的衔接适用政策，建立了“能进能出”的常态化员额管理机制。最高人民法院按照以案定额、按岗定员、总量控制的原则，制定《省级以下人民法院法官员额动态调整指导意见（试行）》，综合考虑审级、案件类型数量、人员配置以及辖区内经济社会发展状况等因素，在严格落实中央控制的员额比例范围内，实行法官员额省内统一调配、动态调整，并向基层人民法院和人案矛盾突出的地区倾斜。广东法院将占全省 60% 以上案件量、人案矛盾突出的珠三角地区法院法官员额比例确定在 50% 以上，而案件较少的粤西北地区 8 市法院的核定员额比例则在 30% 左右，总体仍在 39% 比例以内。

——**改革法官选任制度。**最高人民法院和各省（自治区、直辖市）均设立由法官代表和社会有关人员组成的法官遴选委员会，负责初任法官人选专业能力的审核，实现法官“逢任必选”，严格遴选标准和程序，确保品行端正、经验丰富、专业水平较高的优秀法律人才成为法官人选。2016 年 5 月，中央组织部、最高人民法院、最高人民检察院印发《关于建立法官检察官逐级遴选制度的意见》，全面规定了法官逐级遴选的方式、条件、程序。2019 年 10 月，修订后的《中华人民共和国法官法》正式实施，进一步严格了法官任职条件，健全法官选任机制。2020 年 2 月，最高人民法院发布指导意见，推动建立员额法官常态化增补机制。截至 2021 年 12 月，全国共有 100 余个高级、中级人民法院组织开展了逐级遴选。

——**推进法官单独职务序列管理。**2015年10月，中央组织部、中央政法委、最高人民法院、最高人民检察院联合印发《法官、检察官单独职务序列改革试点方案》，法官等级与行政职级脱钩，实行单独管理，不同审级法院的法官根据一定比例实行按期晋升和择优选升相结合的晋升制度，打破法官职务晋升的“天花板”，拓宽法官职业发展空间，基层一线法官职级低、待遇差、晋升通道狭窄、职业尊荣感不强等问题得到有效解决。2022年3月，最高人民法院配合中央组织部制定出台《法官单独职务序列规定》，详细规定了法官等级升降条件，健全法官职务序列转任定级制度，明确法官等级可以作为选任人民法院领导干部的资格条件，标志着中国特色法官职务管理制度基本定型。

——**加强法官职业保障。**根据权、责、利相统一的原则，最高人民法院建立了与法官单独职务序列改革相配套的工资福利制度，推动实行与法官等级相适应的职务等级工资，积极联合有关部门推动明确法官的退休年龄、医疗、差旅、住房、公务交通补贴及退休待遇政策，并督促各级人民法院推动落实。2019年修订的《中华人民共和国法官法》专门对完善法官职业保障作了系统规定。全国法院现已全部落实新的工资制度和绩效考核奖金，各高级人民法院会同当地相关部门，通过印发相关文件或协调出台“一揽子”文件等方式，明确了法官配套待遇各项政策，法官职业尊荣感愈发突出。

——**改革审判辅助人员管理制度。**最高人民法院会同中央有关部门先后出台一系列规范性文件，为建立健全审判辅助人员选任、培养、使用、监督、保障机制，全面提高审判辅助人员队伍建设水平提供了制度保障。各高级人民法院协调当地财政、人力资源和社会保障等部门，将聘用制书记员和聘用制警务辅助人员所需经费列入法院年度预算予以统筹保障，推动提高薪酬待遇水平。北京法院审判辅助人员人数较

改革前增加 68%。上海法院法官与审判辅助人员配比从改革前的 1:0.8 变为 1:1.8。

——**改革司法警察管理制度。**最高人民法院积极推进司法警察警员职务序列改革，对全国中级、基层人民法院司法警察参照公安机关试行执法勤务警员职务序列，明确司法警察执法勤务警员职级是与警官职务并行的晋升通道，在不同层级法院按照比例晋升职级，落实司法警察编队管理制度，有效拓宽中级、基层人民法院司法警察职业发展空间，提升职业保障水平。

——**建立法律研修学者和法律实习生制度。**最高人民法院建立挂职法学专家学者、法律研修学者制度和法律实习生制度，加强了与法律院校和法律科研机构司法合作交流，推动完善了法治人才培养机制。各地普遍加强同法律院校的合作，建立接收法律院校实习生担任法官助理制度，实习法官助理在法官指导下参与审判辅助工作，有效补充了审判辅助人员的来源渠道。吉林省高级人民法院与吉林大学就法学大学生到人民法院实习联合签署合作协议。河南省高级人民法院与郑州大学共建“法律研究生工作站”。四川成都 14 家法院和 11 所在川高校共建司法实践基地，并同步面向全国高校招录，已与全国 29 所高校联合培养 8 期共 629 名实习法官助理，人均辅助办理案件 46.2 件，64 名实习法官助理按程序成为法院正式工作人员，有效助力审判执行工作。

——**加强司法职业伦理建设。**健全法官统一职业培训和入职晋级宣誓制度，完善职业道德准则、职业行为规范和职业道德评价机制。最高人民法院会同中央有关部门先后制定印发《关于进一步规范司法人员与当事人、律师、特殊关系人、中介组织接触交往行为的若干规定》《关于建立健全禁止法官检察官与律师不正当接触交往制度机制的

意见》《关于进一步规范法院、检察院离任人员从事律师职业的意见》，规范法院人员与当事人、律师、特殊关系人、中介组织的6种接触交往行为，严禁法官与律师之间的不正当接触交往，进一步加强对法院离任人员从事律师职业的管理监督，有效维护司法廉洁和司法公正。

十、完善司法服务保障国家发展制度机制

人民法院承担着维护国家政治安全、确保社会大局稳定、维护社会公平正义、保障人民安居乐业的重要使命。各级人民法院立足司法职能，通过加强审判执行工作，深化司法改革，助力构建新发展格局，营造更加稳定、公正、透明、可预期的法治化营商环境，推动高质量发展、保障国家重大发展战略实施。

——完善国家重大发展战略司法服务和保障机制。最高人民法院主动围绕服务河北雄安新区建设、京津冀协同发展、粤港澳大湾区建设、自由贸易试验区建设、海南自由贸易港建设、成渝地区双城经济圈建设等区域发展战略出台司法服务政策，制定印发关于为合作共建“一带一路”、长江经济带发展、全面推进乡村振兴等战略提供司法服务和保障的意见，创新司法协同工作机制，有计划、按步骤综合运用改革规划、指导意见、司法解释、指导性案例等各类司法政策工具，确保人民法院工作始终与经济社会发展精准对接。

2018年6月，最高人民法院在深圳、西安分别设立第一、第二国际商事法庭，并制定印发程序规则等配套文件。2018年9月，最高人民法院成立国际商事专家委员会，聘请来自25个国家和地区的52位专家，发挥智库在国际商事争端解决中的作用。2021年7月，最高人

民法院建成“一站式”国际商事纠纷多元化解平台，吸纳中国国际经济贸易仲裁委员会等国际商事仲裁、调解机构，促进国际商事纠纷诉讼与调解、仲裁有机衔接，进一步完善了“一带一路”争端解决机制。

——**服务构建市场化、法治化、国际化营商环境。**人民法院注重通过深化改革为优化营商环境提供保障，确保在审判执行工作中正确实施法律，依法维护市场基础规则和市场交易秩序统一，依法平等保护中外当事人合法权益，强化市场主体法治意识和契约精神，服务扩大高水平对外开放。最高人民法院制定发布一系列关于为加快建设全国统一大市场、改善营商环境提供司法服务保障的规范性文件，公布配套典型案例，为人民法院更好维护信用经济、法治经济提供指引。加强产权司法保护，依法惩处侵害企业家人身和财产安全的犯罪，依法规制反垄断和不正当竞争行为，平等保护各类市场主体合法权益。最高人民法院发布三批保护产权和企业家合法权益典型案例。健全市场主体救治和退出机制，推进破产审判专业化建设，2016年以来，全国超过100家法院设立破产审判庭，确保破产类案件集中规范、公正高效审理，支持和指导深圳市率先试点个人破产制度。在世界银行发布的《2020年营商环境报告》中，中国被记录的8项改革措施中，最高人民法院实施了3项，其中“执行合同”指标中的“司法程序质量指数”方面获得16.5分（满分18分），排名全球首位，促进中国营商环境指标排名大幅提升。

——**为统筹疫情防控和经济社会发展提供司法助力。**为有效防控新冠肺炎疫情，人民法院依托在线诉讼平台、在线调解平台、人民法院在线服务（即手机端诉讼服务）等信息化平台，积极探索“云办案”，在疫情期间提供“不间断”服务，及时依法审理了一批涉疫刑事案件，公布了一批涉医犯罪典型案例，严惩扰乱医疗秩序、破坏防疫秩序等

违法犯罪行为。2020年，最高人民法院先后印发《关于依法妥善审理涉新冠肺炎疫情民事案件若干问题的指导意见》等一系列涉疫情民事司法政策，在常态化疫情防控中加强司法应对，对涉疫情民商事纠纷案件中亟待解决的重大问题作出规范，指导各级人民法院妥善处理因疫情引发的合同违约、企业债务、企业破产等案件，有效服务企业复工复产，巩固经济社会发展成果。

——**服务创新驱动发展**。2017年11月，十九届中央全面深化改革领导小组第一次会议审议通过《关于加强知识产权审判领域改革创新若干问题的意见》，提出完善符合知识产权审判特点的权利效力审查机制和证据规则，建立体现知识产权价值的侵权损害赔偿制度。最高人民法院研究制定指导意见，出台审理专利授权确权行政案件和侵犯专利权纠纷案件司法解释，依法严格保护发明创造，加强科技创新成果保护。落实药品专利链接制度，维护人民群众生命健康。妥善审理涉及5G通信、生物医药、高端装备制造、新材料新能源等一批高新技术案件，加大对创新成果知识产权保护力度，激励科技创新，促进技术产业升级。落实《中华人民共和国科学技术进步法》和《中华人民共和国促进科技成果转化法》，妥善处理因科技成果权属认定、权利转让、价值确定和利益分配产生的纠纷，保障职务发明人合法权益。加大对重大农业科技成果保护力度。制定植物新品种权案件司法解释，依法严格保护国家种质资源，加大种业知识产权保护力度。最高人民法院知识产权法庭和北京、上海、广州等知识产权法院审理了一批具有规则确立意义和国际影响力的重大知识产权案件，有效保护了我国关键核心技术自主知识产权，维护新兴行业竞争秩序，促进创新驱动发展。

——**完善生态环境资源司法保护制度机制**。最高人民法院努力构建具有中国特色和国际影响力的生态环境司法保护体系，指导各级人

民法院依法公正审理各类环境资源案件，维护生态环境国家利益、社会公共利益和人民群众环境权益，加强环境司法国际交流合作，为协同推进人民富裕、国家强盛、中国美丽提供有力司法服务。2021年，全国法院审结一审环境资源案件26.5万件。最高人民法院制定发布生态环境侵权禁止令、惩罚性赔偿等司法解释，落实“谁污染谁治理、谁破坏谁赔偿”原则，探索公益诉讼损害赔偿专项基金制度。按照生态环境损害赔偿制度改革试点方案要求，积极探索省级政府提起生态环境损害赔偿诉讼案件的审理规则。江苏、江西等地区法院委托第三方监管，保障了生态修复资金专款专用。福建法院推行“碳汇”认购等替代性修复方式，有效助力碳达峰碳中和。青海法院设立三江源生态法庭、祁连山生态法庭、青海湖生态法庭，共同守护“中华水塔”。

十一、推进互联网司法和智慧法院建设

2013年以来，人民法院坚决贯彻党中央决策部署，坚持司法体制改革和智慧法院建设双轮驱动，大力推进互联网司法和智慧法院建设，推动数字时代司法工作实现质量变革、效率变革、动力变革，初步实现了审判体系和审判能力现代化。

——**建立完善在线诉讼模式。**为适应互联网时代发展要求，各级人民法院大力推进在线诉讼，推动诉讼模式和机制创新。杭州、北京、广州互联网法院率先探索“网上案件网上审理”机制，并逐步在全国法院推广在线审理模式，实现从起诉立案到审判、送达、执行的全流程在线完成。特别是新冠肺炎疫情发生以来，在线诉讼加速推进、广泛适用，确保各类案件得到公正高效审理。2021年，全国法院网上立案1143.9万件，网上立案率为30.9%，在线开庭127.5万场，在线诉讼规模和质量、效率不断提升，线上线下并行的诉讼模式基本形成。同时，各地人民法院积极探索适用异步审理模式，允许各方当事人在一定期限内，以非同步方式在线开展调解、证据交换、调查询问等诉讼活动，有效解决“时间差”“异地难”带来的诉讼不便问题。

——**形成互联网司法程序规则体系。**最高人民法院先后出台了《人民法院在线诉讼规则》《人民法院在线调解规则》《人民法院在线运行

规则》，分别针对在线诉讼活动、在线调解活动以及在线司法平台建设和技术保障，明确程序要求和实践标准。“三大规则”覆盖司法活动全领域，贯穿审判执行全过程，使各类在线司法活动有规可依、合法规范，互联网司法实现从技术领先迈向规则引领。2022年1月，修正后的《中华人民共和国民事诉讼法》正式施行，吸收了人民法院在线司法的实践经验，明确了在线诉讼的法律效力，将其确立为与线下诉讼并行的基本诉讼方式，有力推动了互联网时代下诉讼法律制度的与时俱进。

——智慧法院驱动司法服务转型升级。最高人民法院印发信息化建设五年发展规划，明确智慧法院建设的重点任务和具体要求。各级人民法院按照“全面覆盖、移动互联、跨界融合、深度应用、透明便民、安全可控”原则，实现信息化建设由被动向主动、由局部向全局、由基础建设向全面应用、由网络为中心向数据为中心的转变，建成了全业务网上办理、全流程依法公开、全方位智能服务的智慧法院，在服务人民群众、服务审判执行、服务司法管理、服务廉洁司法等方面应用成效显著。

——新兴科技与司法各领域深度融合。5G、大数据、云计算、区块链、人工智能等现代科技被广泛应用于诉讼服务、诉前调解、案件审理、审判管理、裁判执行等各领域。最高人民法院建成“人民法院司法区块链统一平台”，已完成超过27.7亿条数据上链存证固证，有效解决诉讼中存证难、取证难、认证难等问题。2022年5月，最高人民法院发布全球首个区块链司法应用意见，填补了数字司法领域区块链应用的制度空白。各级人民法院研发各类智能化办案辅助平台，逐步实现案件繁简自动甄别分流、电子卷宗文字识别、语音识别转录、案件智能画像、证据自动核验、法条及类案精准推送等智能辅助功能，有效减轻司法人员工作负担，促进审判质效大幅提升。

——**确立完善数字治理领域规则制度。**最高人民法院制定人脸识别、网络消费、反不正当竞争、涉网络知识产权侵权等司法解释，明确裁判标准，为数字经济发展营造了良好的法治环境。以互联网法院为代表的各级人民法院通过审理一批涉及网络基础设施安全、算法规制、数据权属交易、个人信息保护、网络平台治理等新类型、疑难复杂和互联网特性突出的案件，不断丰富和完善互联网裁判规则，探索确立了数据、虚拟财产、数字货币、智能作品等为新客体的保护标准，依法规范直播带货、算法推荐、付费点播等新兴业态，严厉打击暗刷流量、网络刷单、空包洗钱等网络黑灰产业，坚决打击开设网络赌场、实施网络诈骗、非法盗取数字财产等各类网络刑事犯罪，有效维护网络空间秩序，有力推动了数字经济、数字产业创新发展。

——**建成云网一体的信息化基础设施和信息安全保障体系。**最高人民法院统筹网络、计算、存储等基础设施建设需求，构建形成覆盖五大网系和三大云平台的一体化信息基础设施，支持全国法院在“一张网”办公办案，支持实现跨网系数据安全共享交换。建立覆盖物理安全、网络安全、主机安全、应用安全、数据安全等五个层次的人民法院信息安全保障体系。落实信息系统安全保护建设要求，通过安全保障系统防范计算机病毒和网络攻击、网络入侵等危害网络安全的行为。建立用户统一身份认证体系，制定数据分类分级保护、数据安全应急处理和数据安全审查制度，健全数据安全保护机制。运用信息化手段支持司法公开个人敏感信息自动屏蔽，保证在线诉讼、在线调解等司法活动中的个人隐私、个人信息等数据依法保密，确保智慧法院在运行过程中的网络安全、数据安全和个人信息保护。

——**以大数据技术服务司法管理和社会治理。**最高人民法院建成人民法院大数据管理和服务平台，实现对全国法院司法信息资源的汇

集、管理、分析和服 务。人民法院大数据管理和服务平台实时收集全国法院收结案数据，每 5 分钟自动更新一次，累计汇集 2.7 亿件案件信息，每年自动生成司法统计报表 750 万张。2016 年，全国法院全面实现司法统计与大数据管理和服务平台并轨，标志着人民法院彻底告别人工司法统计时代。针对定量化人事绩效评估需求，大数据管理和服务平台关联融合人事和案件数据，司法人事管理实现从定性到定量的跨越。人民法院充分发挥司法大数据对经济社会运行情况的映射功能，积极运用司法大数据助力社会治理，形成高空抛物、电信诈骗、金融诈骗、网购纠纷等大数据专题分析报告 1000 余份，深入分析经济社会运行中的矛盾纠纷发展趋势，为推动数字经济发展、促进社会治理、建设平安中国提供决策参考。

结束语

中国法院的司法改革牢牢坚持中国共产党对司法工作的绝对领导，坚定不移走中国特色社会主义法治道路，确保正确政治方向；始终坚持遵循司法规律与立足中国国情相结合，着力建设和完善中国特色社会主义司法制度；始终坚持问题导向和目标导向，从影响司法公正、制约司法能力的深层次问题改起，从解决人民最关心最直接最现实的利益问题入手；始终坚持循序渐进、依法有序推进改革，走顶层设计与试点探索相结合之路，确保改革依法积极稳妥开展。

人民的理解支持是司法改革的动力源泉，人民的获得感是司法改革的评价标准。面对时代的新机遇、人民的新期待、科技的新进步，中国法院的司法改革只有进行时，没有完成时。下一步，人民法院将按照中国共产党第二十次全国代表大会部署，坚持以习近平新时代中国特色社会主义思想为指导，深入贯彻习近平法治思想，深刻领悟“两个确立”的决定性意义，增强“四个意识”、坚定“四个自信”、做到“两个维护”，深化司法体制综合配套改革，全面准确落实司法责任制，加快建设公正高效权威的社会主义司法制度，创造更高水平的社会主义司法文明，推进严格公正司法，努力让人民群众在每一个司法案件中感受到公平正义。

大事记

2013 年

1月7日至8日，全国政法工作电视电话会议召开。

7月1日，中国裁判文书网正式上线，最高人民法院裁判文书首次集中上网公布。

10月26日，最高人民法院在上海、江苏、浙江、广东、陕西等省市部分法院开展司法公开、审判权运行机制改革试点工作。

11月9日至12日，中国共产党第十八届中央委员会第三次全体会议在北京召开。会议审议通过《中共中央关于全面深化改革若干重大问题的决定》，提出建设法治中国，必须深化司法体制改革，加快建设公正高效权威的社会主义司法制度，维护人民权益。

11月27日至28日，全国法院司法公开工作推进会在深圳召开。

12月11日，中国法院庭审直播网正式开通。

12月19日，最高人民法院印发《人民法院司法警察警员职务套改方案》。

2014 年

1月7日至8日,中央政法工作会议在北京召开。中共中央总书记、国家主席、中央军委主席习近平出席会议并讲话。

6月6日,十八届中央全面深化改革领导小组第三次会议审议通过《关于司法体制改革试点若干问题的框架意见》《上海市司法改革试点工作方案》《关于设立知识产权法院的方案》。

6月27日,第十二届全国人民代表大会常务委员会第九次会议通过《关于授权最高人民法院、最高人民检察院在部分地区开展刑事案件速裁程序试点工作的决定》。

10月20日至23日,中国共产党第十八届中央委员会第四次全体会议在北京召开。会议审议通过《中共中央关于全面推进依法治国若干重大问题的决定》,提出完善司法管理体制和司法权力运行机制,规范司法行为,加强对司法活动的监督,努力让人民群众在每一个司法案件中感受到公平正义。

11月1日,中国执行信息公开网正式开通。

11月6日,北京知识产权法院挂牌成立。

12月16日,广州知识产权法院挂牌成立。

12月28日,上海知识产权法院挂牌成立。

2015 年

1月20日,中央政法工作会议在北京召开。

1月28日,最高人民法院在深圳设立第一巡回法庭,并印发《最高人民法院关于巡回法庭审理案件若干问题的规定》。

1月31日，最高人民法院在沈阳设立第二巡回法庭。

2月4日，最高人民法院印发《关于全面深化人民法院改革的意见——人民法院第四个五年改革纲要（2014—2018）》。

3月30日，中共中央办公厅、国务院办公厅印发《领导干部干预司法活动、插手具体案件处理的记录、通报和责任追究规定》。同日，中央政法委印发《司法机关内部人员过问案件的记录和责任追究规定》。

4月15日，最高人民法院印发《关于人民法院推行立案登记制改革的意见》《关于人民法院登记立案若干问题的规定》，自2015年5月1日起施行。

4月24日，第十二届全国人民代表大会常务委员第十四次会议通过《关于授权在部分地区开展人民陪审员制度改革试点工作的决定》。

5月12日，全国政协召开“推进人民法院司法体制改革”专题协商会，最高人民法院院长周强出席。

9月21日，最高人民法院印发《关于完善人民法院司法责任制的若干意见》。

10月15日，中央组织部、中央政法委、最高人民法院、最高人民检察院印发《法官、检察官单独职务序列改革试点方案》。

12月6日，中共中央办公厅、国务院办公厅印发《关于完善矛盾纠纷多元化解机制的意见》。

12月15日，最高人民法院英文网站暨新版中国裁判文书网开通。

2016年

1月22日至23日，中央政法工作会议在北京召开。

4月13日，最高人民法院印发修正后的《中华人民共和国民事诉讼法

院法庭规则》。

6月27日，十八届中央全面深化改革领导小组第二十五次会议审议通过《关于推进以审判为中心的刑事诉讼制度改革的意见》《关于加快推进失信被执行人信用监督、警示和惩戒机制建设的意见》。

6月27日，中央组织部、中央政法委、最高人民法院、最高人民检察院印发《法官助理、检察官助理和书记员职务序列改革试点方案》。

6月28日，最高人民法院印发《关于人民法院进一步深化多元化纠纷解决机制改革的意见》和《关于人民法院特邀调解的规定》。

7月18日至19日，全国司法体制改革推进会在长春召开。

7月22日，十八届中央全面深化改革领导小组第二十六次会议审议通过《关于认罪认罚从宽制度改革试点方案》《关于建立法官、检察官惩戒制度的意见（试行）》等文件。

9月3日，第十二届全国人民代表大会常务委员会第二十二次会议通过《关于授权最高人民法院、最高人民检察院在部分地区开展刑事案件认罪认罚从宽制度试点工作的决定》。

9月12日，最高人民法院印发《关于进一步推进案件繁简分流优化司法资源配置的若干意见》。

9月25日，中共中央办公厅、国务院办公厅印发《关于加快推进失信被执行人信用监督、警示和惩戒机制建设的意见》。

9月27日，中国庭审公开网正式开通。

11月1日，十八届中央全面深化改革领导小组第二十九次会议审议通过《关于最高人民法院增设巡回法庭的请示》，同意最高人民法院在深圳市、沈阳市设立第一、第二巡回法庭的基础上，在南京市、郑州市、重庆市、西安市增设巡回法庭。

11月17日，第三届世界互联网大会智慧法院暨网络法治论坛在浙

江乌镇举行。与会各方通过《乌镇共识》。

12月27日至28日，全国法院司法责任制改革督察推进会在云南省昆明市召开。

12月28日至29日，最高人民法院先后在南京市、郑州市、重庆市、西安市设立第三、第四、第五、第六巡回法庭。

2017年

2月7日，最高人民法院印发《人民法院落实〈保护司法人员依法履行法定职责规定〉的实施办法》，发布司法人员依法履职保障十大典型案例。

2月16日，全国法院深入推进多元化纠纷解决机制改革暨示范法院经验交流会在安徽省马鞍山市召开。

4月1日，最高人民法院、最高人民检察院、司法部印发《关于逐步实行律师代理申诉制度的意见》。

4月7日，全国法院司法责任制督察整改情况通报暨推进案件繁简分流机制改革视频会议在北京召开。

4月18日，十八届中央全面深化改革领导小组第三十四次会议审议通过《关于办理刑事案件严格排除非法证据若干问题的规定》。

4月28日，最高人民法院、最高人民检察院、财政部、人力资源和社会保障部印发《人民法院、人民检察院聘用制书记员管理制度改革方案（试行）》。

6月26日，十八届中央全面深化改革领导小组第三十六次会议审议通过《关于设立杭州互联网法院的方案》。

7月3日，最高人民法院举行首批员额法官宪法宣誓活动，中华人

民共和国首席大法官、最高人民法院院长周强领誓。

7月9日，中共中央总书记、国家主席、中央军委主席习近平对全国司法体制改革推进会作出重要指示。他指出，党的十八大以来，政法战线坚持正确改革方向，敢于啃硬骨头、涉险滩、闯难关，做成了想了很多年、讲了很多年但没有做成的改革，司法公信力不断提升，对维护社会公平正义发挥了重要作用。

8月18日，杭州互联网法院在浙江杭州挂牌运行。

8月29日，十八届中央全面深化改革领导小组第三十八次会议审议通过《关于加强法官检察官正规化专业化职业化建设全面落实司法责任制的意见》《关于上海市开展司法体制综合配套改革试点的框架意见》。

11月1日，第十二届全国人民代表大会常务委员会第三十次会议听取了最高人民法院院长周强所作人民法院全面深化司法改革专项报告。

2018年

1月16日，最高人民法院下发《关于进一步加快推进电子卷宗同步生成和深度应用工作的通知》。

1月22日，中央政法工作会议在北京召开。

1月23日，十九届中央全面深化改革领导小组第二次会议审议通过《关于建立“一带一路”国际商事争端解决机制和机构的意见》。

4月27日，第十三届全国人民代表大会常务委员会第二次会议表决通过《关于设立上海金融法院的决定》。

6月29日，最高人民法院第一、第二国际商事法庭分别在深圳和西安挂牌成立。

7月5日，“羊城杯”新时代人民法院深化司法体制综合配套改革研讨会在最高人民法院司法改革与创新研究实践（广州）基地召开。

7月6日，中央全面深化改革委员会第三次会议审议通过《关于增设北京互联网法院、广州互联网法院的方案》。

7月24日，全面深化司法体制改革推进会在深圳召开。

8月20日，上海金融法院挂牌成立。

8月26日，最高人民法院国际商事专家委员会正式成立并召开首届研讨会。

9月6日，最高人民法院印发《关于互联网法院审理案件若干问题的规定》。

9月9日，北京互联网法院挂牌成立。

9月28日，广州互联网法院挂牌成立。

10月24日，最高人民法院院长周强在第十三届全国人民代表大会常务委员会第六次会议上作《最高人民法院关于人民法院解决“执行难”工作情况的报告》。

10月26日，第十三届全国人民代表大会常务委员会第六次会议通过《关于专利等知识产权案件诉讼程序若干问题的决定》。

10月26日，第十三届全国人民代表大会常务委员会第六次会议表决通过新修订的《中华人民共和国人民法院组织法》，表决通过《关于修改〈中华人民共和国刑事诉讼法〉的决定》。

11月16日，新时代深化人民法院司法体制综合配套改革法学专家座谈会在北京召开。会议就《最高人民法院关于深化人民法院司法体制综合配套改革的意见》听取专家学者意见建议，最高人民法院院长周强出席会议并讲话。

12月10日至11日，最高人民法院在上海召开全国法院司法体制

综合配套改革推进会。

2019 年

1 月 1 日，最高人民法院知识产权法庭挂牌运行。

1 月 15 日至 16 日，中央政法工作会议在北京召开。中共中央总书记、国家主席、中央军委主席习近平出席会议并发表重要讲话。

1 月 22 日，世界执行大会在上海举行。最高人民法院院长周强出席开幕式并致辞。

2 月 27 日，最高人民法院印发《关于深化人民法院司法体制综合配套改革的意见——人民法院第五个五年改革纲要（2019—2023）》。

3 月 19 日，最高人民法院在总结“浙江移动微法院”实践经验基础上，在北京等 12 个省（自治区、直辖市）辖区内法院全面试点。

4 月 23 日，第十三届全国人民代表大会常务委员会第十次会议审议通过《中华人民共和国法官法》修订案。

5 月 29 日，中央组织部、最高人民法院、最高人民检察院印发《关于法官助理、检察官助理和书记员职级设置管理的通知》。

6 月 3 日，最高人民法院印发《关于深化执行改革健全解决执行难长效机制的意见》，作为《人民法院执行工作纲要（2019—2023）》推进实施。

7 月 19 日，政法领域全面深化改革推进会在成都召开。

10 月 11 日，最高人民法院、最高人民检察院、公安部、国家安全部、司法部印发《关于适用认罪认罚从宽制度的指导意见》，推动构建中国特色轻罪诉讼制度体系。

12 月 5 日，由中国最高人民法院举办的世界互联网法治论坛在浙

江乌镇开幕。与会各方一致通过《世界互联网法治论坛乌镇宣言》。

12月6日，南京海事法院挂牌运行。

12月17日，全国法院司法体制综合配套改革推进会在广州召开。

12月28日，第十三届全国人民代表大会常务委员会第十五次会议通过《关于授权最高人民法院在部分地区开展民事诉讼程序繁简分流改革试点工作的决定》。

2020年

2月14日，最高人民法院印发《关于新冠肺炎疫情防控期间加强和规范在线诉讼工作的通知》。

5月6日，最高人民法院、公安部、司法部、中国银行保险监督管理委员会联合印发《关于在全国推广道路交通事故损害赔偿纠纷“网上数据一体化处理”改革工作的通知》。

7月15日，杭州互联网法院跨境贸易法庭正式成立，这是全国首个依法集中审理跨境数字贸易纠纷案件的人民法庭。

7月31日，最高人民法院印发《关于深化司法责任制综合配套改革的实施意见》。

8月27日，政法领域全面深化改革推进视频会召开。

9月23日，最高人民法院举行互联网法院工作座谈会，最高人民法院院长周强出席会议并讲话。

12月3日，全国法院司法体制综合配套改革推进会在广州召开。

12月31日，海南自由贸易港知识产权法院挂牌成立。

2021 年

2月19日,中央全面深化改革委员会第十八次会议审议通过了《关于加强诉源治理推动矛盾纠纷源头化解的意见》。

2月27日,第十三届全国人民代表大会常务委员会第二十六次会议听取最高人民法院关于民事诉讼程序繁简分流改革试点情况的中期报告。

3月18日,北京金融法院挂牌成立。

5月14日,最高人民法院印发《关于推进行政诉讼程序繁简分流改革的意见》。

6月16日,最高人民法院印发《人民法院在线诉讼规则》。

7月21日,最高人民法院“一站式”国际商事纠纷多元化解决平台正式运行。

7月24日,政法领域全面深化改革推进会在北京召开。

8月20日,第十三届全国人民代表大会常务委员会第三十次会议通过《关于授权最高人民法院组织开展四级法院审级职能定位改革试点工作的决定》。

9月30日,最高人民法院、最高人民检察院、司法部印发《关于建立健全禁止法官、检察官与律师不正当接触交往制度机制的意见》《关于进一步规范法院、检察院离任人员从事律师职业的意见》。

10月12日,最高人民法院印发《关于加强和完善法官考核工作的指导意见》。

11月18日,最高人民法院印发《关于建立健全人民法院人员内部交流机制的若干意见》。

12月8日,最高人民法院印发《法官惩戒工作程序规定(试行)》。

12月15日，最高人民法院以视频方式召开全国法院司法体制综合配套改革推进会。

12月24日，第十三届全国人民代表大会常务委员第三十二次会议审议通过《关于修改〈中华人民共和国民事诉讼法〉的决定》。

12月30日，最高人民法院印发《人民法院在线调解规则》。

2022年

1月19日，清华大学互联网司法研究院成立。最高人民法院院长周强为基地揭牌。

1月26日，最高人民法院印发《人民法院在线运行规则》。

2月27日，第十三届全国人民代表大会常务委员第三十三次会议听取最高人民法院院长周强关于《全国人民代表大会常务委员关于专利等知识产权案件诉讼程序若干问题的决定》实施情况的报告。

2月28日，第十三届全国人民代表大会常务委员第三十三次会议审议通过《关于设立成渝金融法院的决定》。

3月3日，最高人民法院与中国政法大学共建的人民法院司法改革研究基地成立。最高人民法院院长周强为基地揭牌。

3月23日，清华大学互联网司法研究院以“网络智能服务算法：公平性、责任性与透明性”为主题，举办首次清华互联网司法论坛。

4月22日，中央宣传部举行“中国这十年”系列主题新闻发布会，介绍党的十八大以来政法领域改革举措与成效。

5月18日，国际司法争端解决网络（JDRN）成立大会召开。

5月21日，中华人民共和国首席大法官、最高人民法院院长周强视频出席古巴第十届国际司法与法律大会闭幕式并致辞。

5月23日,最高人民法院印发《关于加强区块链司法应用的意见》。

5月26日,最高人民法院召开数字经济法治论坛,最高人民法院院长周强发表开幕式、闭幕式致辞并作主旨发言。

6月23日,第十三届全国人民代表大会常务委员会第三十五次会议审议《中华人民共和国民事诉讼法强制执行法(草案)》。

7月8日,人民法院司法改革工作会议在北京召开,最高人民法院院长周强出席会议并讲话。

8月30日,第十三届全国人民代表大会常务委员会第三十六次会议听取最高人民法院院长周强所作的四级法院审级职能定位改革试点情况中期报告。

10月26日,最高人民法院印发《关于规范合议庭运行机制的意见》。

Preface

The rule of law is the fundamental principle for the governance of a country, while the judiciary functions as one cornerstone. Comprehensively deepening judicial reform has significant and profound implications for improving and developing the judicial system under Socialism with Chinese Characteristics while promoting the modernization of China's governance system and capacity. Since 2013, the people's courts, deep-rooted in the Chinese context and keeping pace with the times, have been striving to ensure people experience fairness and justice in each individual case, and comprehensively deepening judicial reform with unswerving determination. After a decade of persistent efforts, the people's courts have developed adjudication and enforcement capacity in all aspects, holistically elevated judicial efficiency, competency, credibility, and vigorously contributed to the promotion of the Peaceful China initiative, Rule of Law in China, and the developments of the Party and the country. The 20th National Congress of the Communist Party of China ("CPC") fully recognized the achievements of judicial reform, while drew up a blueprint for the incoming reform.

I. China's Court System and Reform

Institutional Basis of Court Reform in China. According to the *Constitution of the People's Republic of China* and the *Organic Law of the People's Courts of the People's Republic of China*, the people's courts, as the judicial branch of the People's Republic of China, shall independently exercise the judicial power in accordance with laws, and shall not be subject to interference by any government agency, social organization or individual. China sets up the Supreme People's Court ("SPC"), local people's courts in accordance with administrative division and special people's courts. These people's courts are entitled to adjudicate civil, criminal and administrative cases and other cases prescribed by laws, and carry out judicial activities including enforcement of civil and administrative judgments. Single-judge benches, collegiate benches, adjudication committees, and state compensation committees are the 4 categories of adjudicative authorities prescribed by laws.

The SPC, as the highest judicatory of the country, is responsible for adjudicating cases that have significant effects nationwide or are subject to its jurisdiction according to law, formulating judicial interpretations, supervising and guiding the judicial work of local people's courts at all levels and special people's courts, and managing judiciary administration works of courts nationwide within the scope of its functions and powers

ascertained by law. Local people's courts include primary people's courts, intermediate people's courts and high people's courts, and special people's courts include military courts, maritime courts, intellectual property courts, and financial courts.

A people's court at a higher level supervises the judicatory work of the people's courts at the next lower level. The people's courts apply the legal principles of open trial, the decision of the second instance court as final, adopt the sitting of collegiate benches and people's assessors subject to recusation, and protect the right to defense in litigations.

Brief History of Court Reform in China. Since the introduction of the reform and opening-up policy, the public demands of and expectations for justice have been ever-growing along with all-round economic and social developments, continuous advancement of democracy and rule of law in China, leaving the judicial system inadequate to accommodate the emerging demands under new circumstances. Early in the 1990s, China's courts had started the reforms focusing on enhancing court trial proceedings, expanding trial openness and advancing the professionalization of court personnel. Since the 15th National Congress of the CPC, the SPC has initiated a series of reforms including but not limited to organization of courts, role of judges, litigation procedures, court processes, enforcement mechanism, and court management. Three corresponding “*Frameworks of Five-year Judicial Reform for People's Courts*” were enacted respectively in 1999, 2005 and 2009, periodically serving as the basis of China's court reforms before 2013.

The *Decision of the Central Committee of the CPC (“CCCPC”) on Some Major Issues concerning Comprehensively Deepening the Reform* adopted at the 3rd Plenary Session of the 18th CCCPC set an important task of advancing the rule of law in China and deepening the reform of the judicial system. The *Decision of the CCCPC on Some Major Issues concerning Management of State Affairs under the Rule of Law in an All-round Way* adopted at the 4th Plenary Session of the 18th CCCPC set the establishment of a socialist system of the rule of law with Chinese characteristics and the building of a socialist country under the rule of law as the general objective of advancing the overall law-based governance, and put forward major reform proposals for scientific legislation, strict law enforcement, judicial impartiality, obedience to the laws and other areas. The judicial reform has become an important part of overall deepening reforms in China and has been included in the overall development strategy of China.

In order to steadily implement the reform of people’s courts, the SPC promulgated the *Guidelines on Comprehensively Deepening the Reform of People’s Courts*. The Guidelines, which served as the *Framework of the Fourth Five-year Judicial Reform for People’s Courts, 2014–2018*, circulated the overarching target of establishing the operating system of judicial power under Socialism with Chinese characteristics and focused on 7 major areas, putting forward 65 reform measures. By 2018, the judicial reform had advanced on all fronts, making breakthroughs in major areas with crucial steps. The main foundations of the reform had been laid.

As judicial reform advances, it increasingly requires synergy among different measures, without which an effective operating mechanism could not be attainable. In 2017, the 19th National Congress of the CPC strategically planned to “deepen the comprehensive integrated reforms of the judicial system, fully implementing judicial accountability to ensure people experience fairness and justice in each judicial case”. While implementing this major strategy, China’s judicial reform entered a new stage.

In 2019, the SPC formulated the *Guidelines on Deepening the Comprehensive Integrated Reform for the Judicial System of the People’s Courts*, which served as the *Framework of the Fifth Five-year Judicial Reform for People’s Courts, 2019–2023*. The Framework proposed to establish 10 major system transformations including upholding the leadership of the Party, serving the overall interests and building people-centered litigation service, etc. Up to present, 130 reform measures and more than 220 reform targets prescribed in the *Fourth* and *Fifth Five-year Reform Framework* have been substantially accomplished.

Organization and Implementation of Court Reform in China.

On December 30, 2013, CPC set up the Central Leading Group for Comprehensively Deepening Reform headed by President Xi Jinping, responsible for the overall design, arrangement, coordination, promotion, and implementation of reforms. In March 2018, the leading group was updated to the Central Commission for Comprehensively Deepening Reforms with President Xi as its director. Between January 22, 2014, and August 31, 2022, the two crucial organs, in aggregate, held 66 meetings and

approved more than 70 critical documents relating to people's court reform.

Six specific units operate under the Central Commission for Comprehensively Deepening Reforms, which are responsible for considering key issues relating to reforms in the relevant areas, coordinating and advancing the formulation and implementation of specific reform policies and measures. The Leading Group instructs reform of the judicial branch for Reform of the Social System (also called the Central Leading Group for Reform of the Judicial System).

Judicial reform is a systematic project which covers a wide range of issues and has high policy sensitivity. The SPC followed the methodology of completing fundamental reform before comprehensive integrated reforms and piloting locally before implementing nationwide. Headed by Chief Justice Zhou Qiang, a leading group for judicial reform was established within the SPC. It is responsible for organizing, leading, arranging and coordinating the reform; holding plenary and special meetings 3 or 4 times yearly; overseeing the planning of reform key points; developing and reviewing reform proposals; discussing and deciding on critical issues. All high people's courts have set up similar leading groups and taken responsibility for the judicial reform of courts within their jurisdiction. Each high people's court's proposal of the pilot program for judicial reform shall be reviewed and approved by the SPC or referred to central authorities for approval if significant.

Weighing the importance of some measures are prerequisites of the judicial reform, such as judicial accountability, categorized management

of judicial personnel, compensations & benefits of judicial personnel and the centralization of personnel, funds and property management of courts under the provincial level, China launched 3 rounds of pilot programs for the four measures above in selected provinces and equivalent administrative units according to the principle that influential reforms shall be piloted before full implementation to accumulate experience for future expansion and promotion. In June 2014, Shanghai, Jilin, Hubei, Guangdong, Hainan, Guizhou, and Qinghai launched the first-round pilot programs. In June 2015, Shanxi, Inner Mongolia, Heilongjiang, Jiangsu, Zhejiang, Anhui, Fujian, Shandong, Chongqing, Yunnan, and Ningxia joined the second-round pilot programs. In March 2016, the other 13 provinces and equivalent administrative units including Beijing, and the Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous Region Production and Construction Corps joined with the third. Since July 2016, these four key reform measures have been fully adopted nationwide.

While the judicial reform further advances on all fronts, some of the unfurnished reform measures need supplements and improvements, and some reforms that have made breakthroughs in key areas still need constant optimization. On August 29, 2017, the 18th Central Leading Group for Comprehensively Deepening Reform reviewed and approved the *Framework of the Pilot Plan on the Comprehensive Integrated Reform of the Judicial System in Shanghai*, which guided the initiation of the trail-blazing comprehensive integrated reform of the judicial system in Shanghai in September 2017. In February 2019, the SPC published and implemented the *Framework of the Fifth Five-year Judicial Reform*, expanding the

comprehensive integrated reforms of the judicial system to a national scale.

To achieve the expected objectives, the SPC, independently or jointly with relevant central authorities, supervised the reform to ensure the whole progress was under control. It conducted inspections, reviews and evaluations, specific investigations and research, published model examples of reform, organized assessments and reward on innovative reform measures, convened conference, promptly promoted matured experience and solved issues emerging from the reform process.

On July 8, 2022, the SPC convened the Judicial Reform Conference and comprehensively reviewed the accomplishments and experiences of the reform in the past decade. After a decade of persistent efforts, people's sense of gain and satisfaction from the judiciary has significantly improved, and the operating system of judicial power under Socialism with Chinese characteristics gravitating toward judicial accountability has been established substantially. A just, efficient, authoritative socialist judicial system with Chinese characteristics has matured and stabilized.

II. Fully Implementing Judicial Accountability

Independent adjudication and judicial accountability, phrased as “those who try shall decide, those who decide shall be held accountable”, are nature requirements of justice and the core of judicial reform. In September 2015, the SPC issued the *Opinions on Improving Judicial Accountability of the People’s Courts*, which renovated the operation of adjudicative power and courts nationwide to advance judicial accountability reform. In December 2018, the SPC issued the *Opinions on Comprehensively Furthering the Implementation of Judicial Accountability*, providing instructions on issues including strengthening the judicatory supervision and unifying courts’ interpretation and application of the law, via which judicial accountability has been implemented and consolidated. In order to implement the plan for deepening the comprehensive reform of judicial accountability, the SPC issued the *Guiding Opinions on Deepening the Integrated Reform of Judicial Accountability* in July 2020. The Opinions detailed issues such as improving judicatory supervision and management, reinforcing corruption prevention, and safeguarding judges’ performance of official duties. After the reform, more than 85% of the adjudicative personnel have been reassigned to permanent adjudicative posts, enhancing judges’ autonomy and sense of responsibility nationwide. Regarding “the four types of cases”, also known as significant, complex, novel and group-involved cases, the SPC has continuously improved the supervision and management mechanism.

These improvements have effectively elevated the adjudication quality and efficiency.

Enhancing Judicial Accountability of Single-judge Benches and Collegiate Benches. People's courts at all levels have abolished the old adjudicating process requiring level-by-level approval, underlining the judge's fundamental role of judges. The reform unequivocally established the dominant role of statutory adjudicative authorities, especially single-judge benches and collegiate benches, ensuring independent adjudication and judicial accountability. In November 2019, the SPC issued the *Guiding Opinions on Improving the List of Judicial Powers and Responsibilities of the People's Courts*, which clarified the boundaries and responsibilities of the adjudicative powers exercised by court presidents, presiding judges, judges and other members of the collegiate bench. Based on respective practicalities, all high people's courts have drawn up lists of adjudicative powers and duties, and filed them with the SPC while integrating the list with case-handling databases. With both adjudicative personnel and management personnel performing duties according to the proper procedure, this reform effectively prevents misconduct such as undue interference and illegal supervision.

The reform consolidated the dominant role of single-judge benches and collegiate benches in case handling. More than 98% of court decisions nationwide were issued directly by single-judge benches or collegiate benches. Court presidents and chief judges no longer review and issue decisions on cases they do not hear, except for cases referred to and decided

by the Adjudication Committee. The range and number of cases referred to the Adjudication Committee have decreased significantly since then. In the courts of Shanghai, for instance, the ratio of the Adjudication Committee discussed cases to all cases dropped to 0.1%.

Reforming Case Allocation. People's courts at all levels have established the random case allocation mechanism with a special assignment as an exception. After the simple and complex cases diversion, cases are randomly allocated to judges with relevant expertise. Approval from court presidents or chief judges is required to reallocate any case when the assigned judge is challenged by recusation, relocation, health problems or corruption risks. The reallocation shall be timely notified to relevant parties and published in the case-handling platform. By deploying an automated case allocation system, courts in Hainan have taken a scientific and digital approach to allocate cases and balance the caseloads among judges.

Innovating Patterns of Judicial Support Work. People's courts at all levels have formed working units specialized in service, property preservation, investigation and seizure, online publication of judicial documents, online announcement and other affairs to centralized management of judicial support work. People's courts have achieved higher efficiency by utilizing market and social resources. Of the measures that have been explored stands out the outsourcing of the administrative work and judicial support work ranging over online auction support, online publication of judicial documents, and distribution of proceeds from enforcement. The SPC has built a service platform for people's courts, and

330 postal service centers have been set up in 307 cities from 31 provinces and equivalent administrative units. Via this collective mode, judicial mail in major cities has realized “next-day delivery”. In the year of 2021, documents in over 72% of civil and administrative cases nationwide were serviced through service platforms. Shenzhen Intermediate People’s Court has formulated guidelines on purchasing social services, allowing the court to outsource 41 categories of service, including litigation service, adjudication and enforcement, court management, logistics, publication, digitalization and cultural services. Siming District People’s Court and Lujiang Notary Office in Xiamen, Fujian have created the first litigation-notary collaborative innovation center in China, empowering the notary to assist people’s courts with procedural and judicial support work.

Normalizing Case Handling by Court Presidents and Divisional Chief Judges. After reforming the judge quota system, presidents and vice presidents, chief judges, and deputy chief judges of people’s courts at all levels have generally engaged in case handling. In April 2017, the SPC issued the *Pilot Guidelines on Promoting Case Handling by Court Presidents, the Divisional Chief Judges of Courts at All Levels*. The Guidelines established case handling by court presidents and chief judges as mandatory and subject to evaluation and supervision and advocated that leading court officials hear significant and complex cases. Since the reform, the number of cases heard by court presidents and chief judges of people’s courts nationwide has increased significantly. Of all the cases handled by Guangdong courts in 2011, 992,000 were handled by divisional chief judges

and above, accounting for 35.2% of the total.

Improving Judicial Supervision and Management with New Approaches. In April 2017, the SPC issued the *Pilot Opinions on the Implementation of Judicial Accountability and Enhancement of the Judicial Supervision and Management Mechanism*, instructing courts at all levels to renovate the supervision and management with new approaches, and reinforcing internal supervision of adjudicative powers. In November 2021, the SPC issued the *Guiding Opinions on Further Improving the Supervision and Management Mechanism of the Four Types of Cases*, to strengthen supervision and management of significant and complex or high-profile cases and cases requiring unified application of law or risks of miscarriage of justice. With information technologies, people’s courts at all levels have realized overall whole-process supervision and management. Adjudicative authorities themselves, judges advisory conference, adjudication committee, court presidents and chief judges all play a role in supervising the adjudication processes. The role of court presidents and divisional chief judges has shifted from approving substantive rulings in individual cases to reviewing procedural matters, providing general guidance, promoting the unification of law application, supervising the judicatory quality and efficiency, and effectively eliminating interference. Sichuan courts have clarified the obligation of identification and report for judicatory management, supervision and other departments on “the four types of cases”, and have refined relevant scope, procedure and method. Performances in this sector are incorporated into the provincial assessment of courts. Since

2018, cases identified as the “the four types of cases” accounted for 3.43% of all the cases across the province. Courts in Shanghai, Jiangsu, Zhejiang, Jiangxi, Shandong, Sichuan assisted by AI and Big Data, have achieved intelligent supervision and management of “the four types of cases”.

Institutionalizing the Judges Advisory Conference. People’s courts at all levels have regularly convened judges to provide expertise on challenging legal issues arising from cases, and opinions formed by the meeting are for the reference of the judges who hear those cases. In January 2021, the SPC issued the *Guiding Opinions on Improving Judges Advisory Conference in People’s Courts* to specify further the role of judges advisory conference in assisting adjudication, unifying law application and strengthening supervision. Courts in Hunan have improved judges’ conference to assist adjudication better. Courts in Hunan have refined the discussion scope, convening procedures, quorums, and voting rules for the judges’ conference. Meanwhile, the mechanism regarding coordination between judges advisory conference, judicatory supervision and management by court presidents and chief judges, and decision-making of adjudication committee has also been established. The Third Intermediate People’s Court of Beijing Municipality has regularly summarized key legal issues discussed by advisory conferences and published guidelines for similar cases.

Reforming the Adjudication Committee System. The SPC has reformed the operation of the adjudication committee and formulated *Opinions on Improving the Functions of Adjudication Committees* to reaffirm the functions of the adjudication committee in summarizing adjudication

experiences, unifying law application and deciding significant legal issues. Except as otherwise prescribed by laws, decisions and reasoning made by the adjudication committee on cases shall be recorded in judgments. People's courts above municipal levels shall convene separate meetings with respect to criminal, civil and administrative cases according to the practical needs and the expertise of committee members. The adjudication committee shall focus on applying the law in significant and complex cases. Since the reform, the number of cases referred to the adjudication committee in people's courts at all levels has decreased significantly. For instance, such cases in Hainan Province have decreased by 41.75%.

Establishing a Uniform Application of Law Mechanism. The SPC has established a leading group and corresponding mechanism for unifying law application. It has formulated and issued directives, providing guidelines on resolving differences in law application and searching for similar cases. Together with the publication of guiding cases and the enactment of judicial interpretations, the SPC has gradually formed its mature methods to unify the application of law in courts across the country. Such methods include compulsory searching and screening for similar cases, consultation by judges advisory conferences, and the ultimate decision by adjudication committees so as to effectively resolve differences in law application within or between adjudicative authorities. In 2021, to standardize lower courts' autonomous measures in this field, the SPC issued the *Approaches on Reports and Records of Judicatory Directives and Reference Cases of the People's Courts*. Since the Approaches were introduced, a total of 81 judicatory

directives and 167 reference cases have been reported to the SPC for the record. Some provisions not in line with the laws and judicial interpretations had been refined. By the end of 2022, the SPC had issued 36 sets of 201 guiding cases, and timely published typical, leading and gazette cases on popular topics, including social and livelihood issues, environmental protection and intellectual property rights. The High People's Court of Shanxi Province detailed the procedures for unifying law application and set reports of similar case research as a prerequisite.

Establishing the Disciplinary Mechanism for Misconducted Judges. The SPC has issued the *Provisions on Disciplinary Procedures on Misconducted Judges*, which specifies disciplinary procedures for misconducted judges. This disciplinary mechanism functions under the collaboration between people's courts and the disciplinary committee for judges. All 31 provinces and equivalent administrative units and the Xinjiang Production and Construction Corps have established disciplinary committees for misconducted judges. The committees are responsible for reviewing whether the accused judges are of breaches of duties, intentional misconduct or gross negligence, finding whether the accused judge is liable and proposing disciplinary measures, thus with such timely and legitimate discipline, courts successfully promote the exercise of judicial powers in accordance with the law and the implementation of judicial accountability. Meanwhile, to coordinate with national supervision system reform, the SPC has improved the coordination between the discipline of judges and the discipline inspection and supervision, and issued the *Provisions on the Coordination*

between the Discipline of Judges and Discipline Inspection and Supervision. The Provisions specified the scope of duties and division of tasks between the people's courts and the discipline inspection and supervision agencies regarding misconducted judges. The Provisions established a mechanism for communication, collaboration and notification, which promoted inter-departmental connections and synergies. By May 2022, 57 judges from Beijing, Shanxi, Liaoning, Jilin, Heilongjiang, Jiangsu, Jiangxi, Sichuan, Yunnan, and Gansu had been disciplined via the disciplinary procedures.

Improving Judicial Performance Evaluation. The SPC issued the *Guiding Opinions on Strengthening and Improving Judge Performance Evaluation*, according to which people's courts at all levels set up committees for judge performance evaluation. The opinions also differentiate the indicators based on the functions of the four-tier people's courts so that judges receive scientific assessments and stimulation for self-improvement. The people's courts have clarified that bonus distribution shall be based on factors including responsibilities fulfilled, work quality, case quantity and difficulty, and shall prefer judges who assume case-handling duties. The High People's Court of Jiangsu Province established the performance assessment system with nearly 100 weighting indicators. With it coming into force, the number of cases concluded in the first quarter of 2021 increased by 44.54% compared to the same period in 2019.

Establishing the Mechanism of Recording, Reporting and Pursuing Accountability of Leading Cadres and Judicial Personnel Interfering with Judicial Activities and the Handling of Specific Cases. Shortly

after the release of the *Regulations on Recording, Reporting and Pursuing Accountability of Leading Cadre Interfering with Judicial Activities and the Handling of Specific Cases* by the general offices of the CCCPC and the State Council, the SPC formulated implementation measures and related guidances, specifying the definition of external interference, contents and procedures of record and report, exceptions and other particular matters. The Regulation also elaborated on the criteria and accountability of interference by judicial personnel. In 2020, the SPC established a corresponding report platform accessible to all courts nationwide, requiring monthly reports and regularly notifying documented records. While zero-report is subject to further analysis, failure to report and false reports, whether instructed by relevant superiors or not, result in disciplinary punishments. The SPC, together with the Supreme People's Procuratorate and the Ministry of Justice, jointly issued the *Opinions on Establishing the Institutional Mechanism to Prohibit Improper Contacts and Interactions between Judges, Procurators and Lawyers* and the *Opinions on Further Regulating the Practice of Law by Former Court and Procuratorate Personnel*, strengthening the supervision of improper interactions between judicial personnel and lawyers, illegal representation by relatives, and irregular practice of law by former judicial personnel.

Improving the Safeguard Mechanism for Judicial Personnel to Perform Duties in Accordance with the Law. In February 2017, the SPC issued the *Implementation Measures for the People's Courts to Implement the Provisions on the Protection of Judges in the Performance of Statutory Duties in accordance with the Law*, underlining independent adjudication

and prohibiting interference from administrative agencies, social organizations and individuals. The Measures specified that no agencies or individuals may require judges to engage in matters beyond the scope of their statutory duties; judges shall not be relocated, removed, dismissed or demoted except for legitimate reasons and procedures; any unlawful behaviours to judges and their family members shall be sanctioned timely and strictly, including interference with judicial activities, intimidation, threat, retaliation, frame, insult, violent injuries; those who insult and defame judges through false reports, false accusations and information networks shall be held liable, thus solidly safeguarding judges to perform duties by the law. All courts in 31 provinces (including autonomous regions and centrally administered municipalities) and the Xinjiang Production and Construction Corps have set up special committees to protect the rights and interests of judges. The people's courts, coordinating with police and other authorities, jointly adopted comprehensive measures such as education, admonishment, diligent inquiries and risk prevention, effectively strengthening court disciplinary measures and deterring illegal behaviours. The High People's Court of Qinghai Province, the Provincial Commission for Discipline Inspection, and seven other departments jointly issued the *Implementation Measures for Protecting Judges of Local People's Courts at All Levels to Perform Statutory Duties in Accordance with the Law in Qinghai Province*. People's Courts in Liaoning, Zhejiang, Hunan, Guangdong and Sichuan collaborated with the Discipline Inspection and Supervision Commission, together held press conferences to publicly clarify false complaints and reports to restore impacted judges' reputations.

III. Advancing the Reform of Organization and Management of Courts

Improving an optimized, coordinated and efficient organizational system and functional system of courts is a crucial part of judicial reform and an essential support for modernizing the judiciary and judicial capability. Since 2013, the people's courts have actively promoted the organizational system reform, scientifically re-arranged the jurisdiction and the allocation of duties and powers, and coordinated the judicial specialization with flat management. The above measures laid a solid foundation for serving the overall interests of the country, justice for the people, and judicial impartiality.

Establishing the Circuit Courts of the SPC. In January 2015, the SPC established the First and the Second Circuit Courts in Shenzhen and Shenyang, and in December 2016, the Third to the Sixth in Nanjing, Zhengzhou, Chongqing and Xi'an respectively. The Circuit Courts, as standing organs dispatched by the SPC, exercise adjudicative powers over cases specified by the SPC. Decisions and judgments issued by the Circuit Courts are of the same effect as the ones made by the SPC. The Circuit Courts actively exercised adjudicative powers and innovated the working mechanism. Since the establishment, cases concluded by the Circuit Courts per year accounted for over 50% of the total of the SPC,

ensuring that the adjudicative power responds to local demands. The Circuit Courts encouraged voluntary lawyer service and offered easier access and more information for the people in local communities. By introducing innovative measures, including cross-regional case filing services and virtual acceptance of public complaints and proposals, the Circuit Courts made enormous efforts to continuously offer more access to convenient litigation services for the people. As the SPC was one step away, the Circuit Courts presented research reports and judicial proposals, organized public open days and hearings in universities to raise public awareness of the law and establish the rule of law in respective regions.

Strengthening the Specialization of Intellectual Property Courts and Tribunals. On January 1, 2019, the SPC established the Intellectual Property (“IP”) Tribunal following the decision of the Standing Committee of the National People’s Congress (“NPC”). The IP Tribunal has centralized jurisdiction over appeals on technology-related IP cases and monopoly cases, forming a national adjudicating mechanism for IP appeals. It has accepted over 11,000 cases, proving the three-year pilot has achieved great effect. Since 2014, four IP Courts have been successively established in Beijing, Guangzhou, Shanghai and Hainan Free Trade Port, with more than 100,000 cases accepted. Also, IP tribunals were established in 27 Intermediate People’s Courts to optimize the layout of IP judicial specialization nationwide. These tribunals primarily exercise jurisdiction over technology-intensive IP cases. These specialized courts and tribunals have concluded a large number of influential IP cases, elevated judicial

quality and efficiency, promoted uniform law application, and facilitated the “innovation-driven development” strategy. In addition, the SPC issued judicial interpretations and documents, which refined the jurisdiction of IP courts and combined the trial of civil, criminal, and administrative IP cases in the same division, referred to as the “3-in-1” mechanism. Also, the SPC issued normative documents on the appointment of judges, participation of technical investigation officers in litigious activities and other issues, to provide better guidance for nationwide IP adjudication. A specialized IP adjudication system with Chinese characteristics, including jurisdiction, case trial, and procedure rules, has been formed based on the current IP judicial establishments: the IP division and the IP Tribunal of the SPC, the four specialized IP Courts, and the above IP tribunals.

Establishing Internet Courts in Hangzhou, Beijing and Guangzhou.

The establishment of Internet Courts is a significant judicial institutional innovation responding to the needs of the Internet era and the National Cyber Development Strategy. Since 2017, China has successively established Hangzhou Internet Court, Beijing Internet Court, and Guangzhou Internet Court. These courts pioneered the mechanism of “Online Disputes Tried Online”, and gradually promoted online trials. As a result, the entire litigation procedures including case filing and acceptance, trial hearing, service, and enforcement could be conducted online. The Internet Courts have fairly and efficiently concluded a number of Internet-related cases which were novel, difficult, and complex. These courts formulated adjudicative criteria for these cases and promoted the rule of law governance

in cyberspace. Hangzhou Internet Court concluded the first Big Data ownership case and the first unfair competition case involving public data, which stroke a balance between utilizing of data resources and protecting of personal information. The court also equally protected the legitimate rights of domestic and foreign parties through a series of foreign-related cases, including the “*Peppa Pig* copyright” case, participating in global cyberspace governance. In the first case concerning click farms, Beijing Internet Court stroke grey-area internet businesses to protect public interest. In the first dispute over the ownership of a livestreaming account, Guangzhou Internet Court held that online virtual assets gained by the actual user should be protected.

Establishing Financial Courts in Shanghai, Beijing, Chengdu-Chongqing. Since 2018, China successively established Shanghai Financial Court, Beijing Financial Court, and Chengdu-Chongqing Financial Court. These courts undertake jurisdiction over finance-related civil and administrative cases from the Intermediate People’s Courts in Shanghai, Beijing, and Chengdu-Chongqing Economic Circle. The jurisdiction of these financial courts covers disputes involving securities misrepresentation, financial lending, corporate bond transactions, repurchase of pledged securities, financial leasing, and business trust activities. Since its inauguration, the Financial Courts concluded a number of financial cases which were novel, difficult, complex and typical in terms of law application. By adjudicating these cases, the Financial Courts clarified market rules to regulate and guide financial transactions. In 2021, the cases concluded

by the Beijing Financial Court and Shanghai Financial Court were mainly in the areas of supply chain finance, non-performing assets, and private equity investment funds, mitigated financial risks. Shanghai Financial Court issued the first provisions on the model judgment mechanism for securities disputes, created a holistic dispute resolution mechanism combining model judgement, professional mediation, and judicial confirmation. Shanghai Financial Court issued the first provisions on the model judgment mechanism for group securities disputes, aiming to create a holistic dispute resolution mechanism combining model judgement, professional mediation, and judicial confirmation. Thus followed the unprecedented model judgment of group disputes concerning securities misrepresentation liability, which played a leading role among similar disputes. Beijing Financial Court built the Finance Justice Big Data Research Center jointly with financial supervision institutions and carried out 25 measures supporting the establishment of the Beijing Stock Exchange to facilitate the construction of the national financial management center.

Reforming the Military Courts Organizational System. Military Courts are adjudicative organs set up in the army by the state. The organization structure of military courts transitioned from a vertical division based on different arms of the PLA to a regional division based on designated theaters. The post-reformed military courts' system consists of The Military Court of the Chinese People's Liberation Army (high court level); The Military Court of the Eastern Theater Command of the Chinese People's Liberation Army, The Military Court of the Southern Theater Command of the Chinese

People's Liberation Army, The First and The Second Military Court of the Western Theater Command of the Chinese People's Liberation Army, The Military Court of the Northern Theater Command of the Chinese People's Liberation Army, The Military Court of the Central Theater Command of the Chinese People's Liberation Army, The Military Court Directly Under the Chinese People's Liberation Army (intermediate court level); The Military Court of Shanghai of the Chinese People's Liberation Army, The Military Court of Nanjing of the Chinese People's Liberation Army, The Military Court of Hangzhou of the Chinese People's Liberation Army and other 23 primary military courts.

Promoting Centralized Management of Personnel, Funds and Property of Courts at Provincial Level. With assistance from the local high court, the office of Public Sectors Reform at the provincial level is in charge of the staffing management of all local courts below the provincial levels. The offices of Public Sectors Reform at municipal levels and county levels are no longer responsible for staffing management of courts. Judge's management, appointment and removal are conducted at the provincial level by legal procedures. Selection of new judges is subject to approval by the provincial judge selection committee prior to appointment under legal procedures. Judge assistants are recruited jointly by provincial personnel and organization departments of civil servants and high courts. Centralized funds management in courts below provincial level is carried out in line with local conditions. Courts at provincial, municipal, and county levels from 18 provinces and equivalent administrative units including Beijing, Tianjin,

and Shanxi, and two municipalities separately listed on the state plan, namely Dalian and Shenzhen, are first-level budget entities of the provincial financial departments. The budget of the above courts shall be submitted to the provincial financial departments and funded through centralized treasury payments.

IV. Advancing the Reform of the Litigation System

The reform of the litigation system has always been an important component of judicial reform. Ever since 2013, especially since the 19th National Congress of the CPC, the people's courts have carried out the pilot reform on the litigation system of criminal, civil and administrative cases. By improving the rules of the litigation procedure, optimizing the allocation of judicial resources, and adopting pilot fruits as parts of the law, China's courts successfully stroke a balance between judicial justice and litigation efficiency.

Advancing the Reform of the Criminal Procedure System Centering on Trials. During 2016 and 2017, the SPC, jointly with the Supreme People's Procuratorate, the Ministry of Public Security, the Ministry of State Security and the Ministry of Justice, issued a series of documents to build on the strengths of the court trial, the improvement in adjudicative supervision on investigation and prosecution activities, the prevention of illegal acts including extortion of confessions by torture and illegal collection of evidence. A trial-centered, evidence-based criminal litigation layout was formed to ensure the legitimacy of facts found during investigations and prosecutions.

In June 2017, the SPC implemented a pilot program in 18 selected intermediate people's courts, regarding pre-trial meetings, illegal evidence

exclusion, and court investigations in ordinary procedures of first-instance criminal cases. On January 1, 2018, the pilot program was promoted nationwide. The people's courts implemented the principle of evidence-based adjudication and trial attendance of key witnesses, appraisers, and investigators to effectively settle the arguments (disputes) between prosecution and defense. The SPC exploited the use of pre-trial meetings, fully heard opinions from the prosecutor and the defense attorney, and successfully concluded a series of retrials including Gu Chujun case and Zhang Wenzhong case, achieving ideal legal and social effects.

Improving the Leniency System for Admitting Guilt and Accepting Punishment. With the authorization of the NPC Standing Committee, since August 22, 2014, the SPC has launched a two-year pilot reform on fast-track sentencing procedure for criminal cases in 217 primary courts in Beijing and 17 other cities. In September 2016, the 22nd Session of the Standing Committee of the 12th NPC reviewed a report on the fast-track sentencing pilot reform and decided to incorporate it into the reform of imposing lenient penalties for admitting guilt and accepting punishment. From September 2016 to September 2018, 205,510 criminal cases applying lenient penalties for admitting guilt and accepting punishment were concluded in selected courts, accounting for 53.5% of the total. On October 26, 2018, the 6th Session of the Standing Committee of the 13th NPC passed the decision to amend the *Criminal Procedure Law*, after which the leniency system for admitting guilt and accepting punishment was applied nationwide. In

October 2019, the SPC, jointly with the Supreme People's Procuratorate, the Ministry of Public Security, the Ministry of State Security and the Ministry of Justice, issued the *Guiding Opinions on the Application of the Leniency System for Admitting Guilt and Accepting Punishment*, specifying the application of laws and the details of procedural rules.

Since the implementation of the leniency system for admitting guilt and accepting punishment, the number and proportion of cases applying this system have increased year by year. In 2021, courts nationwide concluded 980,000 criminal cases applying the leniency system, accounting for 80.09 % of the total. Taking the leniency system as a starting point, the people's courts streamlined the criminal procedure and explored the multi-level mechanism for coordinating ordinary, summary, and fast-track procedures, thus optimizing judicial resources allocation and building on the strengths of trials.

Advancing the Reform of the Mechanism of Simple and Complex Cases Diversion in Civil and Administrative Proceedings. From January 2020 to December 2021, the SPC conducted a two-year pilot program reforming the simple and complex cases diversion in civil procedures in 20 cities of 15 provincial regions under the authorization of NPC Standing Committee. Under the program, piloting courts expanded the application of judicial confirmation and summary procedure, improved the rules of the small-claim procedure, tested the application of sole-judge trial system to non-summary first-instance cases and second-instance cases, and promoted online litigation in accordance with the law. During the testing period, all piloting

courts set up rosters of specially appointed mediators and resolved 35.66% of disputes through mediation before litigation, which effectively curbed the spike of filed cases. The key performance indicators of small claim cases and summary procedure cases surpassed the average of all civil cases nationwide. A small-claim procedure case would cost 27 days on average, while 48 days for a case were adopting summary procedure, both halved the maximum limitation of trial period prescribed by law respectively. An online hearing session would cost 46 minutes on average, 55% shorter than the average of an on-site session. Performance indicators of small-claim procedure and summary procedure cases have both surpassed the average of all civil cases nationwide. On December 24, 2021, the NPC Standing Committee consolidated the achievement of the pilot reform into legislation, with the approval of the *Decision to Amend the Civil Procedure Law of the People's Republic of China*.

In May 2021, the SPC issued the *Guiding Opinions on Advancing Reform the Simple and Complex Cases Diversion in Administrative Proceedings* to deepen the administrative procedure reform. By emphasizing the diversion of disputes before litigation, improving the application rules of summary procedure, providing fast-track adjudication for simple cases, and optimizing the allocation of judicial resources, the Opinions have primarily established the simple and complex cases diversion in administrative procedures.

Reforming the Hierarchy and Functional Orientations of the Four-tier Courts. In September 2021, with the authorization of the NPC Standing Committee, the SPC issued the *Implementation Measures for the Pilot*

Reform of the Four-tier Hierarchy and Functional Orientations of Courts, and launched the pilot program in the SPC itself and courts in 12 provinces and municipalities directly under the Central Government, including Beijing, Tianjin, Liaoning, Shanghai, Jiangsu, Zhejiang, Shandong, Henan, Guangdong, Sichuan, Chongqing, Shaanxi. These measures aim at optimizing the jurisdiction over administrative cases between different hierarchies, systematizing the mechanism to escalate cases to the higher level of jurisdiction, improving the retrial procedure and reforming the operation of adjudicative power of the SPC. After one year of practice, the four-tier hierarchy and functional orientations of courts have been improved step by step, and the function of letting the high and intermediate people's courts try significant and typical first-instance cases is performed better. The SPC has also strengthened the supervision and guidance for the trial of people's courts, optimizing the practical mechanism of retrial procedure. It turns out that the distribution of cases becomes more reasonable, the allocation of judicial power more scientific and the resolving of disputes more effective, enabling the public have a more solid sense of fulfillment to fairness and justice.

Since the pilot program, the high and intermediate people's courts have escalated 435 cases to the higher level of jurisdiction, with a year-on-year increase of 19.5% in number, and among which, 23.7% were related to critical national and public interests, 33.96% were new-type cases or complex cases within the respective jurisdiction, and 34.91% were of guiding value in relation to uniform law application. These cases involved

multiple legal fields, including civil law, criminal law, administrative law, and intellectual property law, and also concerned many legal issues, including the confirmation of data rights, unfair competition on internet, the qualification of employment in the newly emerging business, and the validity of education service contracts under the “double reduction” policy.

Initiating Pilot Reform of the Centralization of Cross-regional Administrative Cases. In December 2014, Beijing Fourth Intermediate People’s Court and Shanghai Third Intermediate People’s Court were established as pilot courts to exercise jurisdiction over cross-regional administrative cases. This move built a foundation for a new jurisdictional layout under which regular cases are tried at local courts while the specific ones are tried at courts with centralized jurisdiction. The above two courts hear significant cross-regional civil, administrative, and criminal cases, especially those concerning environment and resources protection, and food and drug safety, to ensure fairness in handling disputes involving local interests. On October 26, 2017, Beijing Fourth Intermediate People’s Court, authorized by the SPC, started to hear the appeals of environment-protection administrative cases from Tianjin courts, marking an important step in cross-provincial jurisdiction over certain cases. In June 2015, the SPC issued the *Guidelines on Cross-regional Centralized Jurisdiction over Administrative Cases*. All high people’s courts made reform plans aligned with local realities to advance the pilot reform of cross-regional centralization of administrative cases. By now, the pilot reform had been promoted nationwide, gaining fruitful experience for the centralization of cases.

Strengthening the Mechanism of Requiring Principals of Administrative Agencies to Appear and Respond in Court. In July 2016, the SPC issued a notice requiring the people's courts to further regulate and promote administrative agencies to respond in accordance with the *Administrative Procedure Law of the People's Republic of China*. In June 2020, the SPC issued the *Provisions on Several Issues concerning the Appearance of the Principals of Administrative Agencies to Appear and Respond in Court*, which specified the cases in which the courts shall notify the principal of administrative agencies to appear and respond in court, the procedure, and the exceptions, promoting substantive resolution of administrative disputes. In Jiangsu, the rate of principals appearing in court remained above 90% for two consecutive years, among which the rates in Nantong and other 8 cities were above 90%, while the ones in Kunshan and other 58 counties reached 100%. Especially in Hai'an County, chief executives in three consecutive terms appeared in court, with the appearance rate remaining at 100% for six consecutive years.

Improving the Specialization and Centralization of Environmental and Natural Resource Cases. To meet the needs of environmental protection and regional governance of river-basins, environmental and natural resource divisions were established in the SPC and high people's courts, and 2426 environmental and resource divisions, with specialized collegiate benches, specialized judge teams and specialized dispatched people's tribunals, were established in certain intermediate and primary people's courts. Additionally, China pushed ahead with setting up the special court for

ecological protection of the upper reaches of the Yangtze River. The SPC and 29 high people's courts combined the "3-in-1" trial of civil, criminal, and administrative cases on environmental and natural resources disputes. Based on the realities of each region, other courts have been exploring the centralization of cross-regional environmental and natural resources cases. In Henan, Hubei, Hainan and other regions, the courts centralized the cases based on ecosystem or ecological functional zones including river-basins and sea areas, enabling better compliance with realities and laws of nature. Jiangsu High People's Court proposed to establish environmental and natural resource tribunals according to ecological functional zones. The centralized jurisdiction over environmental and resources cases in Jiangsu consists of the environmental and natural resources division of Jiangsu High People's Court, Nanjing Environmental and Natural Resources Tribunal, and tribunals in 9 ecological functional zones, which effectively reinforced the environmental protection.

Improving the System of Preserving the Integrity of Litigation and Judicial Authority. On August 29, 2015, the 16th Session of the Standing Committee of the 12th NPC approved the *Amendment (IX) to the Criminal Law of the People's Republic of China*, which further defined the crime of refusal to satisfy judgments or decisions by adding a level of statutory penalty and provisions regarding crime by entities; modified the crime of disturbance of court order by incorporating certain acts which seriously disrupt the order of the courtroom, including assaulting litigation participants, insulting, defaming or threatening judicial personnel

or litigation participants despite of court prohibition; added the crime of feigned actions targeting the act of filing a civil lawsuit based on fabricated fact, which disrupts the judicial order or seriously infringes other person's lawful rights and interests. The SPC has issued several normative documents on preventing and punishing feigned actions to instruct all people's courts to identify the elements of feigned actions and enhance the examination of and punishment against feigned actions. In September 2018, the SPC and the Supreme People's Procuratorate jointly issued the *Interpretation on Several Issues concerning the Application of Law in the Handling of Criminal Cases regarding Feigned Actions*, suggesting that feigned actions in civil and enforcement proceedings shall attract civil and criminal penalties. In March 2021, the SPC, the Supreme People's Procuratorate, the Ministry of Public Security and the Ministry of Justice issued the *Opinions on Further Enhancing the Work on Punishment of the Crimes of Feigned Actions* to promote coordination in feigned actions punishments, protect the legitimate rights of citizens, legal entities or other organizations, so as to pursue social integrity, judicial justice and authority.

V. Strengthening the Judicial Protection of Human Rights

To respect and protect human rights is an important principle outlined in the *Constitution of the People's Republic of China*, and is essential for the judicial system under Socialism with Chinese characteristics. The people's courts uphold the judicial ideal of equal emphasis on criminal justice and human rights protection. By reinforcing the protection of defendants' rights, safeguarding lawyers' rights to practice by law, and improving the enforcement of criminal penalties, the people's courts have advanced positively in judicial protection of human rights.

Preventing and Redressing Miscarriages of Justice. In 2013, the SPC issued the *Guiding Opinions on Establishing the Mechanism for the Prevention of Wrongful Convictions in Criminal Cases*, which mandates that any defendant against whom the evidence is insufficient for conviction according to law shall be acquitted. None of arbitrarily imposing lighter or adjustable penalties is allowed in such cases. Since 2014, the people's courts have acquitted 8,508 defendants, ensuring that the innocent will not be convicted wrongly according to the law.

The people's courts have established and been improving the mechanism of readdressing miscarried criminal cases, to proactively discover, promptly review and legally correct all miscarriages of justice based on facts. These efforts earnestly responded to social concerns to maintain judicial justice

and authority. Since 2013, the people's courts have overturned 65 high-profile criminal cases of miscarried justice through judicatory supervision procedures, in which 129 defendants are acquitted. Among them were Zhang Hui and Zhang Gaoping(the accused of rape in Zhejiang), Hujilt(the accused of murder in Inner Mongolia), and Chen Man(the accused of murder and arson in Hainan). These corrections elevated the public confidence in the judiciary. On December 2, 2016, the Second Circuit Court of the SPC re-tried and acquitted Nie Shubin, accused of murder and rape, and overturned the original judgment made 22 years ago. The correction of this case reflected the people's courts' devotion to judicial protection of human rights, and the courts' persistence in upholding legal principles such as judgments shall be made upon sufficient evidence, and the defendants should be presumed innocent until proven guilty.

Strictly Regulating Commutation, Parole and Temporary Execution of Sentences outside Prisons. In April 2014, the SPC issued *the Provisions on the Hearing Procedures for Commutation and Parole Cases*, requiring that commutation and parole cases shall be heard publicly and typical cases shall be published periodically. In 2015, the information website on cases of commutation, parole and temporary execution of sentences outside prison was launched, publishing holistic information of the process of pursuing open justice for commutation and parole. In November 2016, the SPC issued *the Provisions on the Specific Application of Law in Handling Commutation and Parole Cases*, which further clarified the nature of commutation and parole, unified the adjudicative criteria, and ensured fairness and justice

well served therein. In November 2017, the SPC launched a national online platform for commutation and parole cases. This new platform enabled information sharing and coordinated working among the people's courts, the people's procuratorates, and the penalty execution authorities, allowing the whole process of commutation and parole cases to be supervised and traceable.

In response to the public concerns about improper case-handling on commutation, parole, and temporary execution of sentences outside prison, the SPC comprehensively reviewed 13.345 million commutations, parole, and temporary execution of sentence outside prison cases handled since 1990, resulting in the rectification of 59,000 flawed cases in 2021. In December 2021, the SPC, the Supreme People's Procuratorate, the Ministry of Public Security and the Ministry of Justice jointly issued the *Opinions on Strengthening the Substantive Hearing of Commutation and Parole Cases*, which further regulates the handling of such cases. The Opinions require a precise understanding of the basic requirements, strict examination of the merits of cases, an enhanced procedural mechanism, and solid supervision, guidance and supporting mechanisms for such cases. Additionally, the supervision of temporary execution of sentences outside prison is reinforced, and circumstances like “serving sentence solely on the paper” or “bribe the shortcut out of jail” would not be allowed to avoid undermining fairness and justice.

Amending and Improving Court Rules and Protocols. In February 2015, the SPC and the Ministry of Public Security jointly issued a notice

cancelling the requirement that criminal defendants, appellants and prisoners shall wear detention house or prison uniforms while appearing in court. Meanwhile, it stipulated that criminal defendants and appellants under escort shall wear formal or casual clothing, demonstrating modern judicial civilization. On April 13, 2016, the SPC issued the revised version of the *Courtroom Protocols of People's Courts of the People's Republic of China*, which further specified codes of conduct in courtrooms to maintain court orders well, strengthen judicial protection for human rights, and ultimately make the courtroom a more accessible, convenient, civilized, and safe place where fairness and justice experienced. In June 2020, the SPC issued a notice requiring further standardization of courtroom protocols in all people's courts to protect the litigation rights of the parties better.

Improving the Mechanism to Safeguard Lawyers Performing Their Duties in Accordance with the Law. In December 2015, the SPC issued the *Provisions on Safeguarding Lawyers' Litigation Rights in Accordance with the Law*, protecting lawyers' rights to know, access case files, attend in court, debate, defend, apply for gathering evidence and excluding illegal evidence, and petition on behalf of the parties, which at the same time provides further judicial safeguards and conveniences to lawyers. Regarding the death penalty review procedure, the Provisions consolidate lawyers' access to information and files as well as their right to defend in front of the judges of the SPC to ensure every decision on the death penalty is legitimate and justified. The SPC and the Ministry of Justice jointly issued the *Opinions on Providing One-stop Litigation Services for Lawyers* on December 16,

2020. A judicial service platform for lawyers was introduced soon after, which provides 35 online services, including case filing, accessing files, and contacting judges, enabling the lawyers to use the service nationwide by one-time identity verification. Until July 2022, this service platform had provided service to 374,000 lawyers, accepted 3,874,900 cases online, and alerted lawyers of 774,700 schedule conflicts.

In October 2017, the SPC and the Ministry of Justice issued the *Pilot Measures for Full Coverage of Defense Lawyers in Criminal Cases*. Accordingly, all detention houses and people's courts have established workstations for legal-aid lawyers. In December 2021, the SPC and the Ministry of Justice issued the *Provisions on Providing Legal Aid to Defendants in Death Penalty Review Procedures*, which improves the legal aid system and protects the legal right to obtain defense. People's courts at all levels have made corresponding efforts, and the ratio of cases with lawyer defenses has increased yearly. The ratio of Shanxi Province, for instance, arrived at 70.02% in 2019 and reached 87.18% in 2021, which doubled the rate in 2017.

Improving the State Compensation System. The SPC has issued the *Interpretations on Several Issues concerning the Application of Law in Cases regarding Criminal Compensation* and the *Interpretations on Several Issues concerning the Application of Law in Determining Liability for Emotional Distress Damages in State Compensation Cases*. These two judicial interpretations further refine the law application concerning complex state compensation issues in criminal cases, unify the discretionary

criteria of emotional distress compensation, and provide instructions on strengthening state compensation for miscarriage of justice, which serves to fully exploit the remedial function of the state compensation. In criminal cases of miscarried justice, including the Hugjiltu case, the Zhang Hui and Zhang Gaoping case, the Nie Shubin case, the Liu Zhonglin case, and the Zhang Yuhuan case, the defendants or their relatives have received state compensation in due course and timely manner.

Improving the Judicial Aid and Relief System. the SPC issued two documents on strengthening the utilization and standardizing the procedures of state judicial aid and relief system. Such documents unify important elements of this system, including case acceptance, applicable conditions, process and standards, financing and payment making. On September 18, 2016, the SPC set up the Judicial Aid and Relief Committee and lower courts followed up subsequently. In 2021, 40 thousand people received aids and reliefs and 920 million yuan in total were allocated. Tianjin courts have worked jointly with other judicial authorities, social organizations and those out of Tianjin, ensuring the system functions coordinately and effectively. Sichuan courts have streamlined the handling procedures via an online platform to elevate standardization and efficiency.

Standardizing the Judicial Procedure for Handling Assets Involved in Cases. In October 2014, the SPC issued the *Provisions for Enforcement of Monetary Punishments against Criminal Defendants* and provided instructions on key elements with forfeiture, forced collection appraisal and sale, and petitions of enforcement included. Since 2015, the SPC, jointly

with the relevant authorities, has established inter-departmental platforms for case-related assets management and introduced pre-trial disposition and pre-trial restitution of case-related assets. With interested parties' litigation rights being specified, they are guaranteed better access to remedies and pursuits of accountability. A special chapter about Case-related assets in the *Interpretation regarding the Application of the Criminal Procedure Law of the People's Republic of China* was effective on March 1, 2021. Zhuji City of Zhejiang Province initiated an inter-departmental platform for case-related assets management, via which information is shared between local courts, procuratorates, public security bureaus and other authorities. Assets can also be processed between different authorities in a more convenient, better-regulated manner. Beijing courts also stipulated similar measures to transfer assets along procedures without physical relocation.

VI. Steadily Advancing the “Generally Resolving Enforcement Difficulties” Campaign

The enforcement of effective legal instruments is the “last mile” in achieving judicial justice, which is crucial to judicial authority and credibility. In March 2016, the SPC proclaimed the goal of “Generally Resolving Enforcement Difficulties” within two to three years at the 4th Session of the 12th NPC. From 2016 to the end of 2018, the people’s courts accepted a total of 20.435 million enforcement cases, and concluded 19.361 million cases with a total enforced value of 4.4 trillion yuan. During this period, the year-on-year growths of these numbers reached 98.45%, 105.1%, and 71.2% respectively. On March 12, 2019, the SPC reported to the 2nd Session of the 13th NPC, that the goal of “generally resolving enforcement difficulties” had been achieved as scheduled, fulfilling its solemn commitment.

In *Doing Business 2019* released by the World Bank, China ranked the 6th in the world on the indicator of “enforcing contracts”. At the 2019 World Enforcement Conference, delegates from 29 countries and 2 international organizations held the consensus that the reforms and innovations of the people’s courts in the field of enforcement have formed a Chinese model, which contributed to international practice, and pushed the progress and development of the rule of law. In June 2022, the 35th Session of the

Standing Committee of the 13th NPC reviewed the *Civil Enforcement Law of the People's Republic of China (Draft)*. Institutions established and experiences acquired from the campaign of resolving enforcement difficulties would soon be recognized in legislation.

Formulating a Comprehensive Governance Structure for Resolving Enforcement Difficulties. In July 2019, the Commission for Law-based Governance under the CPC Central Committee issued the *Guidelines on Strengthening Comprehensive Governance to Effectively Resolve Enforcement Difficulties at Source*. All 31 provincial governments across the country issued documents supporting the people's courts in resolving enforcement difficulties and intensifying credit punishment for discredited persons subject to enforcement. Standing committees of people's congresses in 12 provincial regions passed special decisions supporting the people's courts to resolve enforcement difficulties. The comprehensive governance over resolving enforcement difficulties has taken shape, which is “led by the Party Committee, coordinated by the CPC Political and Legal Affairs Commission, supervised by the people's congress, conducted by the people's courts, contributed by relevant authorities, and participated by the public”.

Further Advancing the Digitalization in Enforcement. The SPC has built a “1+2+N” information-based enforcement system. The “1” refers to the management platform of the enforcement command center; the “2” stands for the case handling system and enforcement disclosure platform uniformly applied in courts at all levels; the “N” consists of supportive enforcement case handling systems, including the system for online investigation and

seizure, appraisal and auction, credit punishment, and entrusted enforcement. A new management mode of centralized management, coordination, and command over enforcement was established with more than 20 functions, including enforcement cooperation, property management, procedure supervision, petition and public complaints. With “one-stop” disclosure and “one-click” supervision, the flat, intensive and visual management over enforcement cases, matters and personnel has been achieved.

Improving the Enforcement Management Institution. Since 2013, the SPC has actively advanced the construction of an enforcement regulation system and has issued 55 major judicial interpretations and normative documents, realizing overall regulations on enforcement. Especially since 2016, the SPC has issued 37 judicial interpretations and normative documents involving property preservation, property investigation, enforcement reconciliation, enforcement guarantee, and advance arbitration. Such efforts have effectively regulated the exercise of enforcement power. Since 2014, people’s courts nationwide have conducted a thorough inspection of enforcement cases without actual satisfaction of judgments over the last 20 years, and registered 16 million cases into the enforcement management system. By enabling the people’s courts to work on one unified enforcement platform, the enforcement standards and procedures were further regulated, the management of crucial stages was improved, the public access to enforcement information was optimized, and the significant transformation in enforcement case handling and information disclosure was well-observed.

Deepening the Reform of the Enforcement System and Mechanism.

The people's courts vigorously and steadily promote pilot reform on the separation of judicial power and enforcement power. The SPC issued the *Opinions on the Coordination and Operation of Case Filing, Trial and Enforcement* to strengthen the coordination of filing, trial, enforcement and preservation procedures. The people's courts have developed a team-based enforcement work model, which is led by judges, assisted by judge assistants, and supported by clerks, judicial police and other judicial personnel. The liability insurance provided by insurance companies for property preservation applicants was promoted to address the difficulty in providing adequate guarantees for property preservation, and it expanded the application of property preservation.

Developing an Online Property Investigation and Seizure System. The SPC established a national network for asset investigation and seizure to defeat low efficiency, limited coverage, and high human resource costs in the traditional enforcement mode. It assembles information shared by 16 authorities, including the Ministry of Public Security, the Ministry of Civil Affairs, the Ministry of Natural Resources, the Ministry of Transport, the People's Bank of China, the China Banking and Insurance Regulatory Commission, and more than 3,900 financial institutions. The network allows the courts to access the asset information nationwide of the persons subject to enforcement. There are 25 types of asset information accessible, including real estate, deposits, financial investments, ships, vehicles, securities, online assets and other 9 categories, realizing the full coverage of main asset

forms and information. By the end of December 2021, courts nationwide had, through the network, cumulatively conducted asset investigations in 109,718,000 cases, and frozen 1,894,146 million yuan. Through online investigation, 349,675,600 pieces of information related to real estate and land were found, plus 147,331,000 vehicles, 2,353,534 million shares of securities, 3,717,900 fishing boats and ships, and 76.022 billion yuan of online assets.

Improving the Joint Disciplinary System on Discredited Persons Subject to Enforcement. In 2013, the SPC started to publish the list of discredited persons subject to enforcement, aiming to join multiple efforts to punish such persons and resolve enforcement difficulties. Since 2016, the SPC has signed documents with 60 authorities, including the National Development and Reform Commission, to develop mechanisms for credit supervision, warning and punishment of discredited persons subject to enforcement and adopted 150 punitive measures falling into 37 items under 11 categories. The punitive measures include restrictions on holding the post of public office and serving as representatives of the CPC, deputies to the NPC, or members of the National People's Political Consultative Conference, as well as restrictions on travel mode, property purchasing, investment and bidding activities. Up till August 2022, there were 7.56 million discredited persons on the list, and 10.13 million had performed their judgement obligations due to the pressure.

Fully Implementing the Online Judicial Auction Scheme. To tackle the shortcomings of the traditional auction, the SPC issued judicial

interpretations on the online auction, implementing the principle to take online auction as the general resort and traditional as the last, and has since January 1, 2017, successfully promoted the online mode nationwide. To cure the inefficiency of appraisal in judicial auctions, the people's courts introduced online price negotiation, targeted inquiry, online inquiry and entrusted evaluation, accelerating asset disposal and alleviating participants' costs. By the end of 2021, courts nationwide have utilized the inquiry and evaluation system to appraise 729,000 asset items in 414,000 cases. Since the launch in March 2017, courts nationwide have conducted more than 4,763,000 online auctions and closed more than 1,205,000 deals, accounting for 63.6% of the total items auctioned. The total proceeds were 2.0404 trillion yuan, saving participants 62.9 billion yuan in commission fees while keeping a clean sheet of complaints concerning violations of disciplines and laws.

VII. Improving People's Access to and Benefits from the Judiciary

Serving the people and justice is the cardinal work of the people's courts. By reforming the case filing system, reinforcing the construction of litigation service centers and dispatched people's tribunals, and improving the mechanism of diversified disputes resolutions and the mechanism of simple and complex cases diversion, the people's courts have been improving the performance of judicial service to the people and providing a stronger sense of gain for the people from the reforms persistently.

Comprehensively Advancing the Reform of the Case Filing System.

Since May 1, 2015, to thoroughly solve the problem of low acceptance in case filing, the people's courts have abolished the requirement for approval before acceptance and introduced an overall case registration mechanism. In response to refusal or delay in case filing at the end of the year, the SPC held a special conference, issued guidelines, launched the 12368 litigation service hotline for complaints and proposals, and developed a monitoring system for case acceptance rate, to thoroughly surmount the last obstacle of the reform. The current average rate of instance acceptance nationwide is 95.7%, with over 98% in Tianjin, Shanghai, Zhejiang, Fujian, Chongqing and Yunnan. By June 30, 2022, the people's courts had registered over 138,371,700 cases. Among them were 93,062,500 first-instance civil cases, 1,878,900

first-instance administrative cases, 133,000 criminal private prosecutions, 108,500 cases of state compensation, and 43,188,800 cases of first-time application for enforcement. The long-lasting problem of low acceptance no longer exists.

Expanding and Diversifying Case Filing Channels. In 2019, the SPC deployed a cross-regional filing service in courts nationwide and established a cross-regional case filing mechanism allowing cross-regional acceptance online with unchanged jurisdiction. As of the end of July 2022, by utilizing the case-filing collaborative network, courts and more than 10,000 dispatched people’s tribunals nationwide had accepted 155,000 cases cross-regionally with equal treatment. The people’s courts have introduced diversified filing channels, including on-site, self-service, online, circuit, filing by post, the 12368 hotlines, and cross-regional. *The People’s Court Online Service* mini program was 100% applied in courts nationwide. Since the launch of the mini program, the total number of visits has surpassed 2.7 billion, and the number of online filing applications has reached 19,601,500, with an average of 41 cases filed online per minute. Over 30% of the applications were submitted during non-working periods.

Constructing the “One-stop” Service Platform of Diversified Disputes Resolutions and Litigation. The diversified dispute resolution mechanism is an important component of China’s efforts in modernizing its governance system. In June 2016, the SPC promulgated the *Opinions on Further Deepening the Reform of Diversified Dispute Resolution Mechanisms in People’s Courts*. The Opinions conceptualized a “state-helmed, judiciary-

propelled, society-participated” modern dispute resolution scheme with diversified measures under the rule of law. The Opinions proposed a “three-step strategy” where the state forms a development strategy, the judiciary facilitates and implements it, and eventually pushes for legislative progress. The SPC, in conjunction with multiple government authorities and social organizations, has issued over 20 documents in the areas of litigation-mediation coordination, covering issues related to people’s mediation, family disputes, securities and futures disputes, insurance disputes, and assignment of judicial support work to notary offices.

In July 2019, the SPC issued the *Opinions on Building “One-stop” Diversified Dispute Resolution Mechanisms Litigant Service Centers* to form a dispute resolution and litigation service model with Chinese characteristics. By the end of 2021, courts nationwide established 3,866 specialized litigation-mediation coordination centers with 26,416 designated staff members. These centers fully utilized the functions of case diversion, pre-litigation mediation, designated mediation, entrusted mediation and judicial confirmation, becoming the hubs for accelerating dispute resolution. The people’s courts promote online mediation based on the mediation platform. In 2021, 6,106,800 cases were successfully mediated before litigation, with a year-on-year increase of 43.86%. Since 2018, the total number of online mediation cases has exceeded 29.62 million. Nearly 78,000 mediation organizations and 328,000 mediators work on the Mediation Platform of the People’s Courts. On average, 46,800 disputes are mediated on the platform during a working day, and 57 cases are successfully resolved prior

to litigation every minute. A mediation would cost 12 days on average, less than one-third of the average period of a first-instance civil proceeding. The people's courts continued to promote the “*General to General*” (*Zong Dui Zong*) collaborations on online litigation-mediation coordination and established collaborating mechanisms for dispute resolution with multiple authorities, agencies and organizations. Through these mechanisms, the people's courts have online commissioned these entities to mediate a total of 767,000 disputes prior to litigation, achieving a success rate of 67.3%.

Establishing and Improving the Lawyer Mediation Scheme. In September 2017, the SPC and the Ministry of Justice jointly issued *the Opinions on the Pilot Program of Lawyer Mediation*, and launched the pilot program in 11 provinces and equivalent administrative units. The depth and breadth of lawyer services have been successfully expanded by establishing lawyer mediator teams and giving full play to the lawyers' advantage of resolving disputes. On December 26, 2018, the SPC and the Ministry of Justice jointly issued *the Notice on Expanding the Pilot Program of Lawyers' Mediation* to promote the pilot program on a national scale. It further exploited the lawyers' advantage in promoting dispute resolution, facilitating law-based governance and building up the lawyer mediation scheme with Chinese characteristics. Up to 180 Sichuan courts established lawyer mediation stations under Sichuan High People's Court's propelling. Qianjiang Primary People's Court of Hubei Province included all outstanding Qianjiang lawyers on the panel of specially invited mediators. The lawyer mediator team of Renqiu Primary People's Court of Hebei

Province, which consists of 18 lawyers, had once mediated over 1,500 disputes in less than 6 months.

Deepening the Reform of the Public Complaints and Proposals System Involving Litigation. The people's courts have actively promoted the handling of public complaints and proposals under the rule of law and improved the diversion mechanism of litigation and public complaints to effectively solve the people's lawful claims. The SPC established an online platform for public complaints and proposals, enabling litigants to check updates and results anytime, anywhere after submitting complaints or proposals with relevant materials, and effectively alleviated people's burden of shuttling. The platform also provides cross-level and cross-regional video meeting services for the litigants to realize remote communication between the SPC, local people's courts and litigants. The SPC also built a national platform for managing public complaints and proposals. By collecting, posting, submitting and supervising the information nationwide, the platform enabled fast and accurate communication between courts at all levels, which achieved high efficiency and coordination in addressing public complaints and proposals. In 2022, the SPC issued the *Opinions on Developing the Mechanism of Public Complaint and Proposals Involving Litigation in the New Era*, which proclaimed the general principles and specific requirements for handling public complaints and proposals.

Advancing the Reform of Trial and Working Mechanisms for Family Law Cases. In April 2016 and July 2018, the SPC issued two judicial documents on the reform of trial and working mechanism for family law

cases, exploring a professionalized, socialized and humanized approach to resolve family disputes and, in the meantime, actively advancing the pilot reform. In the pilot reform, by integrating judicial, administrative and social resources, the selected courts set up family trial divisions and family trial panels, introduced family-matter investigators, social workers and psychologists to provide professional services, including psychological counselling for the parties involved, and established a coordinated mechanism for resolving family disputes. In July 2017, the SPC organized and established a joint conference mechanism to advance this reform, which involved 15 relevant authorities. Subsequently, courts in Hebei, Zhejiang, Fujian, Shandong, Xizang, Shaanxi, Gansu and Qinghai established similar mechanisms involving relevant authorities. The high people's courts in Inner Mongolia, Liaoning, Anhui, Guangxi, Ningxia and other regions have issued rules for adjudicating family cases. The courts in Chongqing, Qinghai and other regions improved the psychological assessment and intervention in handling family cases to reduce the crime risks arising from family cases. Putuo Primary People's Court of Shanghai Municipality created a scheme of "representatives of children's interests", where the staff members at the Office of National Working Committee on Women and Children acted as representatives to effectively protect the legitimate rights and interests of children through independent investigations, evidence collection and participation in court trials.

Improving the Juvenile Justice System with Chinese Characteristics. To guard juveniles' healthy growth, courts nationwide have firmly implemented

the principles of being most beneficial to the juvenile, as well as the ideal of special, preferential, balanced and overall protection in juvenile justice in the New Era. In December 2020, the SPC issued the *Opinions on Optimizing the Trial of Cases Involving Juveniles in the New Era*, consolidating the developing direction towards specialization on juvenile trials. In March 2021, the SPC established the juvenile tribunal office responsible for coordinating and guiding juvenile trials nationwide and set up a “circuit juvenile tribunal” in 6 Circuit Courts of the SPC. By the end of 2021, courts nationwide established 2,181 juvenile tribunals, either by setting up a new division or adding the plate and duty to an existing one. From 2013 to June 2022, courts nationwide have concluded 48,000 criminal cases and convicted 49,700 criminals who infringed juvenile’s rights and interests, with crimes including child molestation, child abduction, child trafficking and organizing child begging, which embodied the preferential status of juvenile protection. In the same period, courts nationwide have convicted 379,000 juvenile criminals, accounting for 2.89% of all, and more than 30% were given non-custodial penalties. Statistically, the juvenile criminal number reduced from 55,800 in 2013 to 35,000 in 2021, and the ratio of juvenile criminals among all criminals reduced from 4.82% to 2.02%. The functions to correct and prevent juvenile crimes were well served.

Advancing the Pilot Reform of Resolving Traffic Accident Damages Disputes on Online Data Processing Platform. In response to the rapid increase and lengthy resolution procedures of disputes over traffic accidents, the SPC initiated a pilot reform of resolving traffic accident disputes through

the Online Data Processing Platform which enables online processing of disputes, such as liability determination, claim calculation, mediation, appraisal, litigation, and claim settlement, to achieve more efficient and convenient resolution of disputes. By August 2022, the platform has been launched in 32 high people's courts (including Xinjiang Production and Construction Corps Branch High People's Court), covering 3,006 primary courts. The platform has processed 1,749,500 mediations, of which 1,159,500 were successfully settled, involving a total amount of 56.829 billion yuan.

Reforming and Improving Service in Civil Proceedings. The SPC comprehensively promoted confirmation of service address by litigants, prescribed the format and content of written confirmation, and explored effective methods of electronic service and preservation of records, to improve the quality and efficiency and clear the stumbling blocks of service in civil procedures. The SPC introduced the People's Court Service Platform integrating diversified service and litigation notice channels, including service by electronic means, by post, and by publications, to address the difficulties in locating the defendants, achieving successful service, collecting service records and elevating cost-effectiveness, achieving a genuine "intelligent litigation service". Wenling Primary People's Court of Zhejiang Province set up a service management center equipped with 9 full-time service personnel, developed service management software, created an official WeChat account, and strengthened cooperation with the postal service, thus improving service efficiency. Jingyang Primary People's Court of Sichuan Province reduced the service budget by 50% by utilizing

electronic service, service by notary office, agreements-based service, and judicial advice. After the introduction of electronic service, the time of service in cases involving insurance contracts was reduced by over 5 days, saving over 10 days in the whole process.

Reinforcing the Development of Dispatched People’s Tribunals in the New Era. In 2021, the SPC issued the *Opinions on Promoting the High-quality Development of Dispatched People’s Tribunals in the New Era*, establishing that the dispatched people’s tribunals shall provide convenience to litigants, facilitate the people’s courts to exercise adjudicative power independently, impartially and efficiently in accordance with the law, and improve the people’s experience of fair and justice promptly. The Opinions urged constructing the Fengqiao-style people’s tribunals, launched the pilot on facilitating the new urbanization strategy, and constantly optimized the layout of dispatched people’s courts. The measures enable convenient and vicinal litigation service for the people, coordinated allocation of judicial resources, and elevation of judicial efficiency. By the end of 2021, there were 9,654 dispatched people’s tribunals nationwide, including 6,028 in rural areas, 1,288 in urban areas and 2,338 in urban-rural areas, to provide judicial service covering most rural and urban areas throughout the country. The dispatched people’s tribunals carried out circuit trials in different manners, including “vehicle tribunals”, “horseback tribunals”, and “backpack tribunals”. By employing the dispute resolution system at source, whole-process online judicial services have been realized, including dispute prevention and resolution, online mediation,

video calls with judges and judicial confirmation. Dispatched people's courts in urban and rural-urban areas have generally been equipped with smart court systems. These systems include voice and video recording, evidence presentation, speech recognition and file scanning, allowing online mediation, online hearing, court hearing livestream, simultaneous generation of the digital case file, paper-free office, digital signature and smart system for Collegial Bench. From 2016 to 2021, 25.377 million cases were concluded by dispatched people's tribunals nationwide, accounting for approximately 25% of the total cases concluded by primary people's courts.

VIII. Deepening Judicial Transparency and Judicial Democracy

Transparency is the best prevention against corruption. Since 2013, the SPC has implemented the central authorities' deployment to promote judicial transparency. Aiming to provide proactive, law-abiding, timely, and substantial transparency in judicial activities, the SPC has been simultaneously pushing the construction of four major information platforms for the disclosure and publication of judicial processes, court hearings, adjudicative instruments, and enforcement information. Judicial transparency shall cover all aspects and stages of the works of the people's courts on the condition that citizen privacy and data security are protected in accordance with the law. In November 2018, the SPC issued the *Opinions on Further Deepening Judicial Transparency*. In March 2020, the SPC proposed to utilize the four major information platforms further to build an open, dynamic, and user-friendly mechanism of judicial transparency.

Promoting the Transparency of the Judicial Process. In November 2014, the *China Judicial Process Information Online* was launched, which has become the national hub for the aggregation and publication of judicial process information. In March 2018, the SPC issued the *Provisions on the Online Disclosure of Judicial Process Information by the People's Courts*. The Provisions stipulate that procedural information, progress

status, litigation documents, and transcripts in criminal, civil, administrative, and state compensation proceedings, except for those pertains to national secret or is classified or restricted according to the law, shall be disclosed to participating parties and their legal representatives, litigation agents and defenders online. Until July 31, 2022, 71.737 million cases and 4.544 billion information entries were disclosed on *China Judicial Process Information Online*, with a disclosure rate of 99.76%. The website has received 740 million visits, pushed 400 million SMS messages, and released 5.385 million items of information from courts nationwide on public columns.

Promoting the Openness of Court Hearings. On 11 December 2013, the *China Court Trial Online* was launched. Since 1 July 2016, all public trials heard by the SPC have been live-streamed. On the *China Court Trial Online*, the general public can watch livestream of ongoing trials, videos of past hearings, and have access to livestream statistics. These functions have realized people's full range, real-time, and in-depth access to trial information. By the end of July 2022, the *China Court Trial Online* had livestreamed over 19.9 million trials heard by courts nationwide, with total visits exceeding 5 billion.

Promoting the Publication of Adjudicative Instruments. In July 2013, the SPC launched *China Judgments Online* as the unified national platform for publishing adjudicative instruments, and took the lead in publishing its own adjudicative instruments. Since 1 January 2014, valid adjudicative instruments from people's courts at all levels have been published on the platform successively. On 29 August 2016, the SPC issued the *Regulations*

on the Publication of Adjudicative Instruments by the People's Courts on the Internet, elaborating the types of adjudicative instruments that should be published. According to the Regulation, adjudicative instruments, which used to be published by specialized agencies, shall now be published by judges through one-click automatic publication on the case handling platform. The Regulation also established a mechanism for handling complaints and feedback from the public, and a mechanism to supervise the publication of adjudication instruments, so that public supervision can be well received. By the end of July 2022, *China Judgments Online* accumulated 92.63 billion visits from 210 countries and regions, among which 520 million visits were overseas.

Promoting the Disclosure of Enforcement Information. In November 2014, the SPC included four types of enforcement-related information in the *China Enforcement Information Online*: the information about persons subject to enforcement, the list of discredited persons subject to enforcement, the information on enforcement process and enforcement-related instruments. It reached a unified, timely and automatic disclosure on enforcement cases, discredited persons subject to enforcement, procedural termination of enforcement and online judicial auctions. On September 14, 2016, the WeChat account “China Enforcement” officially opened, providing timely information on enforcement-related laws and regulations as well as local courts’ enforcement-related work and events. In December 2020, the *Smart Enforcement App* was officially launched, providing more convenient public access to obtain enforcement process information, contact

the enforcement judges and acquire other litigation services. By the end of August 2022, a total of 24,482,600 discredited person-time subject to enforcement was published on *China Enforcement Information Online*.

Promoting the Disclosure of Corporate Bankruptcy Information. In August 2016, the SPC issued the *Provisions on the Information Disclosure of Corporate Bankruptcy Cases (for Trial Implementation)* and officially launched the *National Enterprise Bankruptcy and Restructuring Case Information Disclosure Platform*. As a website gathering information on corporate bankruptcy cases and disclosing hierarchically, the online platform discloses various legal instruments and announcements on bankruptcy administrator recruitment, investors invitation, assets auction and other issues, further providing online judicial services for creditors, corporate debtors, market investors and other stakeholders. By the end of August 2022, up to 198,000 corporate bankruptcy cases had been disclosed online through the *National Enterprise Bankruptcy and Restructuring Case Information Disclosure Platform*.

Expanding the Scope and Depth of Judicial Transparency. To release judicial documents, significant cases and judicial achievements to both domestic and overseas society, the SPC published *Gazettes of the Supreme People's Court* on a regular basis. Additionally, white papers on different areas, including judicial protection for IP, maritime trials, environmental and natural resource trials, administrative trials, judicial reform and transparency, were published. Courts nationwide have further improved judicial transparency through official websites, WeChat, Weibo, mobile news media,

court's president mailboxes, people's congress contact platforms and open days. On December 31, 2014, the SPC established the *Litigation Service Platform*, offering people easy access to information, case filing, case files and contact with judges. On December 15, 2015, the English website of the SPC was launched. Since 2013, the SPC has opened an official account and *National Courts Press Room* on Weibo. By August 2022, the official account had had more than 18.376 million subscribers and uploaded over 110,000 posts. The SPC official WeChat account was opened in November 2013 and had had 3.15 million subscribers by the end of 2021. Since January 2015, courts nationwide have introduced the mechanism of a regular press conference. From 2013 to August 2022, the SPC held over 250 news press conferences, which released more than 2,000 typical cases.

Advancing the Reform of People's Assessors System. In May 2015, authorized by the NPC Standing Committee, the SPC and the Ministry of Justice jointly issued the pilot plan and guiding measures on the reform of the people's assessors system to carry out the reform in 50 selected courts from 10 provinces and equivalent administrative units. On April 27, 2018, *the Law on People's Assessors of the People's Republic of China* was in effect. The new law expanded the scope of candidacy, defined the range of cases in which people's assessors can sit in, set up two modes of collegial benches consisting of 3 or 7 members respectively, optimized the diversion of duties under which the judge determines the law applications and the people's assessor finds the facts, which represented a new phase of the people's assessors system. The SPC, separately or jointly with other relevant

agencies, issued a series of judicial interpretations and normative documents, forming an institutional system of people's assessors. People's courts at all levels, jointly with judiciary administration departments, standardized the selection and appointment procedures of people's assessors, optimized the mechanism of people's assessors sitting in cases, improved the safeguard mechanism for duty performance, and enhanced management and publicity. So far, the total number of people's assessors has reached over 332,000, 2.8 times higher than in 2013. The diversity and representativeness of people's assessors have been further promoted, while their capability and efficiency in trials have been gradually improved, elevating the influence and credibility of the people's assessors system.

IX. Implementing Categorized Management of Judicial Personnel

According to the overall arrangement of central leadership, the SPC has been collaborating with relevant agencies to further reform the personnel system of the courts. The SPC has been promoting categorized management of judicial personnel, improving the judge selection and appointment system, fully implementing the judge quota system, advancing the management of the independent ranks of judges with relevant supports, and reforming the management of judicial support personnel. These efforts have generally established a judicial personnel system that is scientifically categorized and structured, with a clear division of human resources and standardized management.

Establishing the Categorized Management of Judicial Personnel. The SPC has been actively promoting the categorized management of judicial personnel. Based on the natures and specifications of different positions in the court and the practicality of judicial work, the SPC divided all judicial personnel into three categories: judges, judicial support personnel and judiciary administrative personnel. The SPC accordingly applies separate management institutions to these categories to ensure all personnel diligently perform their designated duties with cooperation and coordination. The further advancement of judicial reform has defined the

powers and responsibilities of different positions more clearly, expanded personnel's career paths, and further optimized the personnel structure, elevating the standardization, specialization and professionalism of judicial personnel. In November 2021, the SPC issued the *Opinions on Improving the Mechanism for Internal Repositioning of Judicial Personnel* to remove the barriers to the cross-category repositioning personnel after the reform of categorized management and broadened the channels for repositioning within the judiciary. Zhejiang High People's Court issued measures for the repositioning between judicatory and administrative personnel, exploring a cross-category reposition mechanism for "balanced development in both directions". The scheme has effectively trained and cultivated a fleet of outstanding cadres through their positional exchanges.

Fully Implementing the Judge Quota Mechanism. The people's courts fully promoted the reform of the judge quota mechanism, and insisted on the principle of selecting from the best. After strict examination and assessment, over 128,000 quota judges were selected from over 210,000 pre-existing judges, optimising resource allocation and personnel structure of people's courts. The SPC issued a series of documents, further regulating the grounds, procedures and consequences of such removal, improving the policy to connect the judge's misbehaviour with the removal, and establishing a flexible management mechanism of the appointment and removal of quota judge. The SPC also beared the principle of setting the quota by case numbers and available posts with a controlled ceiling of 39%. Within the controlled quota ceiling at the provincial level, the SPC authorised high

people's courts to dynamically allocate and adjust quotas of local courts based on their trial levels, case types, caseload, and staffing conditions, as well as the economic and social development within their jurisdiction, and to prioritise lower courts and understaffed courts with the huge caseload. Guangdong courts set the judge quota proportion in the Pearl River Delta Region at over 50%, where the courts are overburdened with more than 60% caseload of Guangdong. While the judge quota proportion in 8 cities in western and northern Guangdong was set at 30%, keeping the overall quota proportion in Guangdong below 39%.

Reforming the Judge Selection and Appointment System. The SPC and all provinces and equivalent administrative units have established judge selection committees consisting of judges and other social representatives. The duties of judge selection committees are to assess the professional ability of judge candidates, fulfil the prerequisite of “selection-before-appointment”, and apply strict standards and procedures to ensure that only outstanding legal professionals with integrity, experience and expertise can be selected to become judges. In May 2016, the Organization Department of the Central Committee of the CPC, the SPC and the Supreme People's Procuratorate jointly issued the *Opinions on Establishing the Judges and Procurators Level-by-Level Selection System*, which provided the measures, requirements, and procedures for selecting judges level by level. In October 2019, the revised version of the *Judges Law of the People's Republic of China* was in effect, further enhancing the strict requirements for appointing judges and improving the selection mechanism. In February 2020, the SPC

established a mechanism to appoint new judges on a regular basis. By the end of December 2021, over 100 high and intermediate people's courts nationwide had implemented the mechanism of selecting judges level by level.

Advancing the Management of the Independent Ranks of Judges. In October 2015, the Organization Department of the Central Committee of the CPC, the Central Political and Legal Affairs Commission, the SPC, and the Supreme People's Procuratorate jointly issued the *Pilot Plan on the Reforms of Independent Ranks of Judges and Procurators*, according to which judges' ranks are separated from administrative ranks, and managed independently. Judges in courts of different levels are regularly promoted based on lock-step and further promoted based on performance, breaking the upper limit of judge promotion and broadening the space for judges' career development, which effectively elevated the ranks, compensations, and sense of honour of common judges and expanded their career prospects. In March 2022, the SPC, cooperating with the Organization Department of the Central Committee of the CPC, issued the *Provisions on Independent Ranks of Judges*, stipulating the detailed requirements for rank promotion, improving the transition mechanism between judge ranks and administrative ranks, and clarifying that judges ranks should be taken into consideration when selecting leading cadres of the people's courts. The issuance of the Provisions marks the general formation of a judge management system with Chinese characteristics.

Improving Professional Compensation and Benefits for Judges.

According to the principle of balancing power, duty, and benefit, the SPC has established a scheme of compensation and benefits coordinating with the reform of independent ranks of judges to promote compensation in line with judge ranks. Meanwhile, the SPC actively cooperated with relevant departments to clarify judges' retirement age, pension, and allowance on medical care, business travel, housing and traffic, and urged implementation by local courts. In October 2019, the revised *Judges Law of the People's Republic of China* provided specific and systematic stipulations on improving professional compensation and benefits for judges. Courts nationwide have all applied the new scheme of compensation and performance-based bonus. Each high people's court, associated with relevant local departments, through issuing relevant documents and other measures, released various policies on compensation and benefits for judges, underlining judges' sense of honor.

Reforming the Management System of Judicial Support Personnel.

Jointly with relevant central authorities, the SPC promulgated a series of regulatory documents to improve the mechanisms of selection, appointment, training, deployment, supervision, and compensation of judicial support personnel. These documents provided institutional protection for elevating the level of establishment of judicial support personnel. Coordinating with local departments of finance, human resources and social security, each high people's court incorporates the necessary expenditure for contracted clerks and support personnel for judicial police into the annual budget, increasing

their compensation and benefits. Since the reform, the number of judicial support personnel in Beijing courts has increased by 68%, and the ratio of judges to judicial support personnel in Shanghai courts has changed from 1 : 0.8 to 1 : 1.8.

Reforming the Management of Judicial Police. The SPC advanced the reform of the ranks and posts of the judicial police. The judicial police in intermediate and primary people's courts set the rank and post for judicial police on par with public security organs. This pilot program purported a parallel promotion system for administrative ranks and official posts. The judicial police are promoted proportionally according to the assigned quotas to courts at different levels and managed under unified squads. The reform has effectively broadened the career prospect of the judicial police in intermediate and primary people's courts, providing them with better compensation and benefits.

Institutionalizing the Legal Research Scholar and Intern Programs. To enhance the cooperation and communication with law schools and legal research institutes and to improve the legal talent training mechanism, the SPC introduced a legal research scholar program, an intern program, a practical training program for young scholars and a special program, under which selected legal scholars could serve temporary positions in the SPC. Courts nationwide enhanced the cooperation with law schools and introduced intern programs where law school students could intern in the people's courts, engaging in judicial support work under the guidance of judges. These programs effectively expand the pool of judicial support

personnel. Jilin High People's Court and Jilin University jointly signed an intern program agreement. Henan High People's Court and Zhengzhou University jointly established the "Legal Graduates Training Station". Besides, 14 courts in Chengdu and 11 universities in Sichuan jointly set up training arrangements recruiting applicants from colleges across the country. So far, a total of 629 students from 29 universities nationwide have finished their internship in the above 14 courts. On average, each of them participated in the handling of 46.2 cases. Among them, 64 formally became judicial support personnel after the internship, effectively facilitating the judicial work.

Strengthening the Professional Ethics of the Judiciary. The judicial reform has been developing a unified training system and purporting the requirement for judges to take the oath of allegiance when appointed and promoted. Meanwhile, the code of conduct and the standards and evaluation mechanism of professional ethics for judges were gradually improved. Jointly with relevant central authorities, the SPC regulated 6 types of interaction between judicial personnel and the parties, lawyers, special interested parties and intermediaries. Meanwhile, The SPC also prohibited inappropriate interaction between judges and lawyers and further strengthened the supervision of former staff members who became lawyers, effectively preserving judicial integrity and justice.

X. Improving the Systems and Mechanisms for Judiciary to Serve and Guarantee National Developments

The people's courts aim to safeguard the state's political security, ensure overall social stability, uphold fairness and justice, and guarantee that the people live and work in peace and contentment. People's courts at all levels, via deepened judicial reform and strengthened adjudication and enforcement, make contributions to the overall developments of the country from diversified perspectives, including forming the new development paradigm, to create a more stable, fair, transparent and predictable legal business environment, to advance high-quality development, and to back the implementation of major national development strategies.

Improving the Mechanisms to Serve and Safeguard Major National Strategies. The SPC has proactively introduced a series of judicial policies to serve regional development strategies, including the Hebei Xiong'an New Area, the Beijing-Tianjin-Hebei Region, the Greater Bay Area, Pilot Free Trade Zones, the Hainan Free Trade Port, and the Chengdu-Chongqing Economic Circle. The SPC has also issued opinions on providing judicial safeguards for the Belt and Road Initiative, the Yangtze River Economic Belt, the Strategy of Pushing Forward the Rural Vitalization in an All-round Way and other development plans. The SPC has innovated its collaboration mechanism to ensure the people's courts respond to economic and social

development needs by planning and organizing the comprehensive utilization of judicial policy instruments, including reform planning, guiding opinions, judicial interpretations, and guiding cases.

In June 2018, the SPC set up the First and the Second International Commercial Courts in Shenzhen and Xi'an, with procedural rules and other supporting documents applied to them. In September 2018, the International Commercial Expert Committee of the SPC was established. The Committee has appointed 52 Chinese and foreign experts and functions as a think tank in international commercial dispute resolution. In July 2021, the SPC completed the construction of the “One-stop” Diversified International Commercial Dispute Resolution Platform. With the incorporation of China International Economic and Trade Arbitration Commission and other international commercial dispute arbitration and mediation institutions, the Platform enhanced the connection among international commercial litigation, arbitration and mediation, and thus provided updated resolution mechanisms for disputes emerging under the Belt and Road Initiative.

Serving the Establishment of a Market-based International Business Environment Governed by Law. To optimize the business environment is one significant end of people's courts' reform. With measures adopted to ensure proper application of the law in adjudication and enforcement, people's courts have safeguarded the consistency of market rules and the maintenance of transaction order, provided equal protection to both domestic and foreign entities, emphasized the public sense of rule-of-law, maintained the spirit of the contract, and have striven to support open-up at a

higher level. To build a unified national market and to improve the business environment, the SPC has issued a series of judicial policy documents, and published relevant typical cases which guided lower courts to play respective roles in establishing a credit-driven and law-governed-based economy. In this regard, the SPC also took measures to strengthen the judicial protection over property rights, to punish the crimes targeting entrepreneurs' personal safety and property rights according to the law, to restrict monopoly and unfair competition practices, and to enhance equal protection to all market participants further. The SPC published 3 sets of typical cases regarding the protection of entrepreneurs' rights and interests. Furthermore, the SPC also strove to optimize the mechanisms for business rescue and market exit of debtors and to promote the specialization of bankruptcy procedures. Since 2016, more than 100 people's courts have established specialized bankruptcy divisions, enabling centralized, efficient and just handling of bankruptcy cases. With the SPC's support and guidance, Shenzhen pioneered China's personal bankruptcy system and launched the pilot scheme. Three out of eight China reforms specified in the *Doing Business 2020* report of the World Bank were undertaken by the SPC. In particular, regarding the quality of the judicial procedure, one of the indicators concerning contract enforcement, China scored 16.5 out of 18 and ranked 1st with contributions made mainly by the people's courts.

Engaging in the Coordination between Pandemic Prevention and Socio-Economic Development. To combat the COVID-19 pandemic, the people's courts have utilized the *Online Litigation Platform*, the *Online Mediation*

Platform, the People's Court Mobile Service, and other digital platforms to actively explore remote court hearings and provide persistent litigation services. Meanwhile, the people's courts have tried a series of pandemic-related criminal cases, and published typical criminal cases involving medical issues to impose severe punishments for the disruption of medical care and pandemic prevention. In 2020, the SPC promulgated a series of judicial policies on civil cases involving the COVID-19 pandemic, including the *Guiding Opinions on Civil Cases Involving the COVID-19 Pandemic in Accordance with the Law*. These judicial policies helped to instruct lower courts to strengthen actions responding to the COVID-19 pandemic and provide guiding opinions concerning major issues in civil and commercial disputes arising out of the pandemic. The issues involved include but are not limited to the breach of contracts, debt defaults, corporate insolvency and such that effectively resolved businesses can be revitalized, and socio-economic developments can be sustained.

Serving the Innovation-Driven Development. In November 2017, the Central Leading Group for Comprehensively Deepening Reforms approved the *Opinions on Several Issues concerning Strengthening Reform and Innovation in the Field of Intellectual Property Adjudication*. The Opinions aimed to improve the mechanism for validity proceedings and evidence rules that are both tailored for the characteristics of intellectual property adjudication and to establish a mechanism for damages which reflects the reasonable value of the infringed intellectual property. To provide strict protection for inventions and scientific and technological innovations,

the SPC promulgated guiding opinions and issued judicial interpretations on properly handling administrative cases involving rejecting and revoking patents and patent infringement disputes. To safeguard people's lives and health, the SPC implemented the patent linkage system of medicine. By adequately handling a series of cases involving cutting-edge innovations, including 5G, bio-pharmaceuticals, high-end equipment manufacturing, new material, and new energy, the SPC provided strong protection for an incentive to innovations, thus benefiting the upgrade of technologies and industries. Meanwhile, the SPC correctly applied the *Scientific and Technological Progress Law of the People's Republic of China* and the *Promoting the Transformation of Scientific and Technological Achievements Law of the People's Republic of China*, and properly handled innovation-related disputes over-identification of inventors, transfer of rights, evaluation of IP and distribution of benefits, as well as employee-inventors' right and interests in accordance with the law. Regarding agricultural technology achievements, the SPC strengthened the protection by formulating judicial interpretations on cases involving the rights of new varieties of plants and placing more emphasis on germplasm protection. The Intellectual Property Tribunal of the SPC, along with 4 IP courts, concluded a series of significant IP cases that clarified adjudication rules with global impact. These cases effectively protected the intellectual property rights of China's core technologies in key fields, maintained competition order in emerging industries, and thus promoted innovation-driven development.

Improving Judicial Mechanisms for the Protection of the Ecology, the Environment, and Natural Resources. The SPC strove to build a judicial protection mechanism for the ecology, the environment, and natural resources with Chinese characteristics and international influence. It put great efforts into providing reliable judicial protection for the commonwealth, the prosperity of the nation, and the construction of a beautiful China, as well as safeguarding the ecology and environmental interests of the state, the public, and the people. Under such mechanisms, the SPC guided courts at all levels to handle relevant cases and engage in international exchanges and cooperation. In 2021, courts nationwide concluded approximately 265,000 first-instance environmental and natural resources cases. The SPC issued judicial interpretations to impose punitive damages and injunctions on ecological infringements and implemented the principle, implemented “Whoever Pollutes Shall Restore, Whoever Damages Shall Compensate”, and explored establishing a mechanism for ecological damages in public interest litigation to be collected into the specified fund. As required by the pilot reform on the ecological damages system, the SPC actively explored adjudication rules on EENR litigation initiated by provincial governments. Courts in Jiangsu, Jiangxi and other provinces entrusted third-party supervision over funds for ecological restoration to ensure exclusive expenditure. Fujian courts carried out alternative restoration measures such as subscribing to the “Carbon Sink”, which effectively contributed to carbon peak and carbon neutrality. Qinghai courts established ecological tribunals in the Sanjiangyuan (the source of the Yangtze, Yellow and Lancang rivers), Qilian Mountain and Qinghai Lake to jointly protect the “the Water Tower of China”.

XI. Advancing the Construction of Internet Judiciary and Smart Courts

Since 2013, the people's courts have implemented the Innovation-driven Development Strategy, the National Cyber Development Strategy, the Big Data Development Strategy, and the New-generation Artificial Intelligence Development Scheme. By encouraging institution innovation based on the rule of law, the people's courts have promoted the Internet judiciary, constructed smart courts, and constantly improved digital governance rules. These efforts have greatly accelerated the modernization of the judicial system and judicial capability.

Establishing and Optimizing Online Litigation. To evolve with the development in the Internet era, courts at all levels have been promoting online litigation and fostering innovations in litigation. Internet courts in Hangzhou, Beijing and Guangzhou took the lead and brought forth a new mechanism of “online trial for online disputes”, which was gradually promoted nationwide. The mechanism realized cases processed online, including case filing, service and enforcement. Especially during the COVID-19 pandemic, courts nationwide vigorously optimized and applied online litigation to ensure judicial efficiency and justice. In 2021, 11.439 million cases were filed online, accounting for 30.9% of total filing, and 1.275 million hearings were conducted online. The application range,

quality and efficiency of online litigation have been gradually improved, marking the formation of litigation mode offering both online and on-site options. Withal, the people's courts strenuously explored the “asynchronous trial” approach, which allows the litigants to log in at different times and places to participate in mediation, evidence exchange, cross-examination and other litigation activities. The approach effectively eased the litigation burden caused by time difference and geographical distance.

Forming Internet Judicial Procedural Rules. To clarify the procedural and practical rules for online litigation, online mediation and the construction of an online judicial platform, the SPC successively issued the *Online Litigation Rules of the People's Courts*, the *Online Mediation Rules of the People's Courts* and the *Online Operation Rules of the People's Courts*. These documents cover all fronts of judicial activities, which are applicable in the whole process of adjudication and enforcement, ensuring that all types of online judicial activities can be conducted in accordance with the law. With the issuance of the above documents, China's online procedural rule system has taken shape. On 1 January 2022, the amended *Civil Procedure Law of the People's Republic of China* was in effect. The Law incorporated experiences of and granted legal effect to online litigation and entitled it as a basic litigation option, paralleling the traditional on-site litigation. The above efforts have vigorously promoted the legal system of litigation in the Internet era to keep pace with the times.

Reshaping and Upgrading Judicial Service Propelled by Smart Courts. The SPC issued the *Five-year Development Scheme on Informatization*

of the People's Courts to specify the critical tasks and requirements for the construction of Smart Courts. The people's courts have been more proactively and comprehensively advancing the building of Smart Courts, shifted the focus from infrastructure construction to all-round application, and transformed the network-based system into a data-based system. Bearing the principles of “fully covered, mobile accessible, interconnecting and integrating, deeply applicable, transparent and convenient, and safely controlled”, people's courts at all levels have built Smart Courts to provide comprehensive intelligent and transparent services for all stages. Smart Courts have achieved remarkably in facilitating the service for the people, the work of adjudication and enforcement, as well as court management and anti-corruption efforts.

Integrating Emerging Technologies with Every Aspect of the Judiciary.

Emerging technologies, such as 5G, Big-Data, cloud computing, blockchain, and AI, have been widely applied in various areas, including litigation service, pre-litigation mediations, court trials, adjudicative management, and enforcement. The SPC launched the *Unified Judicial Blockchain Platform*, which has already preserved over 2.77 billion pieces of evidence in digital form, effectively overcoming the difficulties in collecting, preserving and authenticating evidence. In May 2022, the SPC issued an unprecedented opinion on enhancing blockchain application in the judicial field applying the blockchain technology in the judicial field. The people's courts have established several intelligent supporting platforms, gradually achieving multiple functions, such as automatic diversion of simple and complex

cases, digital recognition of texts, files, and voices, case analysis, evidence authentication, and cross-reference of rules and precedents. These intelligent supporting functions have effectively alleviated judicial personnel's workload and significantly promoted adjudication quality and efficiency.

Establishing and Refining Rules and Guidelines on Cyberspace Governance. To create an enabling legal environment for digital economy development, the SPC issued judicial interpretations concerning various issues, including facial recognition, online shopping, anti-unfair competition and internet-related IP infringement, which further clarified and unified the adjudication criteria over such newly emerging disputes. The people's courts, with the Internet Courts taking the lead, concluded a number of cutting-edge and complex cases with internet features covering issues of network infrastructure security, algorithm regulation, data ownership transaction, personal information protection and online platform governance. These cases complemented and enriched the Internet adjudicative rules, determining protection criteria for data, virtual property, digital currency, AI works and other new objects, further regulated livestreaming marketing, algorithm recommendation, pay-per-view and other emerging business, cracked down click farming, money laundering and other grey industries, and clamped down on online casinos, online fraud, digital asset theft and other cybercrimes. These efforts effectively safeguarded the order of cyberspace and facilitated the digital economy and industries.

Constructing Information Infrastructure and Data Security Protection System with the Integration of Cloud and Network Technologies. The

SPC, responding to network, computing and storage infrastructure needs, constructed an integrated information system covering five major networks and three major cloud platforms. These infrastructures enabled courts nationwide to work and handle cases on “one network” and realized secured sharing and data exchange across the networks. The SPC has also built an information security system for the people’s courts, covering physical security, network security, host security, software security, and data security. To meet information system security requirements, the SPC deployed the security protection system to prevent computer viruses, cyber-attacks, intrusions, and other cyber security threats. The SPC has set up a unified user identity authentication system, a classified data protection regime, and data security emergency response and review systems, which improved the data security protection mechanism. In addition, the SPC utilized information technologies to automatically exclude sensitive personal information in the publication of adjudicative instruments and to ensure that privacy and personal information are kept confidential in judicial activities, including online mediation and litigation. These efforts ensured network security, data security and personal information protection during the operation of Smart Courts.

Applying the Big-Data Technology to Court Management and Social Governance. The SPC has built a Big-Data database to collect, manage, and analyze judicial information from the courts nationwide and provide data services. The database collects real-time information on case acceptance and closure by courts across the country, automatically updated every 5 minutes.

So far, it has accumulated 270 million entries of case information and automatically generated 7.5 million judicial statistical reports annually. In 2016, judicial statistical work in the people's courts ultimately merged into the database, marking the end of an era when judicial statistical work was conducted manually. The database incorporated the collected information concerning judicial personnel and cases to improve quantitative performance evaluation, transitioning the traditional qualitative performance evaluation method to a new quantitative one. The people's courts fully exploited the advantage of judicial Big-Data in reflecting the realities of the national economy and society, thus proactively facilitating social governance. Over 1,000 special reports have been formed in the past few years concerning the misdeed of throwing objects from heights, telecom fraud, financial fraud, and online shopping disputes. The above reports comprehensively analyzed developing trends of conflicts and disputes in the economy and society, then offered valuable reference for promoting the digital economy, social governance and the Peaceful China initiative.

Conclusion

The judicial reform of China's courts has always been problem-oriented and goal-oriented, targeting the deep-rooted problems affecting judicial impartiality and inhibiting judicial capability, and focusing on the problems relating to the direct and realistic interests that the people care most; such reform adhered to the principles of justice while subjected to China's context and condition, explored the road of reform of the judicial system with Chinese characteristics, focused on building and improving the judicial system under Socialism with Chinese characteristics, and has been pushed forward step by step by operation of law, and combined top-down design with exploration through pilot programs, so as to ensure that the reform is conducted in a vigorous and steady manner.

The people's endorsement is the driving force for judicial reform, and the people's sense of gain is the standard for evaluating the achievements of judicial reform. In light of the new era's challenges, the people's new expectations and innovations in science and technology, the judicial reform of China's courts is always an ongoing task and will never end. In the next step, the people's courts will follow the guidance of Xi Jinping Thoughts on Socialism with Chinese Characteristics for a New Era, hold high the great banner of reform, deepen comprehensive and integrated reform of the judicial system, fully and faithfully enforce judicial accountability, and

accelerate the development of a fair, efficient, and authoritative socialist judicial system according to the deployments on judicial reform of the 20th National Congress of CPC, so as to create a better environment for socialist rule of law, advance the judicial civilization to a higher level, and strive to let the people experience fairness and justice in each judicial case.

Chronology

2013

From January 7 to 8, the National Teleconference on Political and Legal Work was convened.

On July 1, *China Judgments Online* was in service, judgments of the SPC were open to the public online for the first time.

On October 26, the SPC implemented the pilot plan on deepening reform of judicial transparency and adjudicative powers in Shanghai, Jiangsu, Zhejiang, Guangdong, Shanxi courts and other selected courts.

From November 9 to 12, the 3rd Plenary Session of the 18th Central Committee of the CPC was held in Beijing. The Session adopted the *Decision of the CCCPC on Some Major Issues concerning Comprehensively Deepening the Reform*, proposing that to build the rule of law in China, we must deepen the judicial reform, build a fair, efficient and authoritative judicial system under socialism and protect the interests of the people.

From November 27 to 28, the National Conference on Judicial Transparency of People's Courts was held in Shenzhen.

On December 11, *China Court Trial Online* was officially opened.

On December 19, the SPC issued *the Reform Plan on Judicial Police*

Officer's Ranks and Posts.

2014

From January 7 to 8, the Central Conference on Political and Legal work was convened in Beijing. Xi Jinping, General Secretary of the CCCPC, Chinese President and Chairman of the Central Military Commission attended the conference and delivered an important speech.

On June 6, The 3rd Session of the 18th Central Leading Group for Comprehensively Deepening Reform approved the *Framework Opinions on Several Issues concerning the Pilot Reform of the Judicial System*, the *Work Plan on Shanghai Judicial Pilot Reform* and the *Plan on the Establishment of Intellectual Property Courts*.

On June 27, the 9th Session of the Standing Committee of the 12th NPC adopted the *Decision on Authorizing the Supreme People's Court and the Supreme People's Procuratorate to Launch the Pilot Plan of Fast-track Sentencing Procedure for Criminal Cases in Selected Regions*.

From October 20 to 23, the 4th Plenary Session of the 18th CCCPC was held in Beijing. The Session adopted the *Decision of the CCCPC on Major Issues concerning Comprehensively Advancing Rule of Law*, proposed to improve the judicial management system and judicial power operation mechanism, to standardize judicial behavior, and to strengthen the supervision of judicial activities, so that the people could see fairness and justice in every judicial case.

On November 1, *China Enforcement Information Online* was officially launched.

On November 6, Beijing Intellectual Property Court was established.

On December 16, Guangzhou Intellectual Property Court was established.

On December 28, Shanghai Intellectual Property Court was established.

2015

On January 20, the Central Conference on Political and Legal Work was convened in Beijing.

On January 28, the SPC established the First Circuit Court in Shenzhen, and issued the *Provisions of the Supreme People's Court on Several Issues concerning the Hearing of Cases by Circuit Courts*.

On January 31, the SPC established the Second Circuit Court in Shenyang.

On February 4, the SPC issued the *Opinions on Comprehensively Deepening the Reform of People's Courts — the Framework of the Fifth Five-year Judicial Reform for People's Courts 2014–2018*.

On March 30, the General Offices of the CCCPC and the State Council jointly issued the *Provisions on Recording, Reporting and Pursuing Accountability of Leading Cadre interfering with Judicial Activities and the Handling of Specific cases*. On the same day, Central Political and Legal Affairs Commission issued the *Provisions on Recording and Accountability Responsibility of Judicial Personnel for Intervention in Case Handling*.

On April 15, the SPC issued the *Opinions on Launching the Reform of Case-filing Registration of the People's Courts* and the *Provisions on the Case-filing Registration of the People's Courts*. The Opinions and The Provisions shall come into force as of May 1, 2015.

On April 24, the 14th Session of the Standing Committee of the 12th NPC adopted the *Decision on Authorizing the Pilot Reform of the System of People's Assessors in Selected Regions*.

On May 12, the National Committee of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference held the thematic consultative seminar "*Promoting the Judicial Reform of the People's Courts*". Zhou Qiang, President of the SPC, attended the seminar.

On September 21, the SPC issued the *Opinions on Improving Judicial Accountability of the People's Court*.

On October 15, the Organization Department of the CCCPC, the Central Political and Legal Affairs Commission, the SPC, and the Supreme People's Procuratorate jointly issued the *Pilot Plan on the Reforms of Independent Ranks of Judges and Procurators*.

On December 6, the General Office of the CCCPC and the General Office of the State Council issued the *Opinions on Improving the Diversified Dispute Resolution Mechanism*.

On December 15, the English website of the SPC was launched and simultaneously a new version of the *China Judgments Online* was released.

2016

From January 22 to 23, the Central Conference on Political and Legal Work was convened in Beijing.

On April 13, the SPC issued the revised version of the *Court Rules of People's Courts, PRC*.

On June 27, the 25th Session of the 18th Central Leading Group for Comprehensively Deepening the Reforms approved the *Opinions on Advancing the Reform of Criminal Procedure with centering on Trials* and the *Opinions on Accelerating the Construction of a Credit Supervision, Warning and Punishment System of Discredit Persons Subject to Enforcement*.

On June 27, the Organization Department of the CCCPC, the Central Political and Legal Affairs Commission, the SPC, and the Supreme People's Procuratorate jointly issued the *Pilot Plan on the Reforms of Ranks of Judge Assistants, Prosecutor Assistants and Clerks*.

On June 28, the SPC issued the *Opinions on Further Deepening the Reform of the Diversified Dispute Resolution Mechanism by People's Courts, and the Provisions on Specially Invited Mediation of the People's Courts*.

From July 18 to 19, the National Conference on Promoting the Judicial Reform was convened in Changchun.

On July 22, the 26th Session of the 18th Central Leading Group for Comprehensively Deepening Reform approved the *Pilot Plan on reform*

of the Leniency System for Admitting Guilt and Accepting Punishment and the Opinions on Establishing the Disciplinary System for Judges and Prosecutors (for Trial Implementation).

On September 3, the 22nd Session of the Standing Committee of the 12th NPC adopted the *Decision on Authorizing the Supreme People's Court to Launch the Pilot Plan on Application of the Leniency System for Admitting Guilt and Accepting Punishment in Selected Regions.*

On September 12, the SPC issued the *Opinions on Further Promoting the Complex and Simple Cases Diversion and Optimizing the Allocation of Judicial Resources.*

On September 25, the General Office of the CCCPC and the General Office of the State Council issued the *Opinions on Accelerating the Construction of Credit Supervision, Warning and Punishment Mechanism of Discredited Persons Subject to Enforcement.*

On September 27, *China Court Trial Online* was officially in service.

On November 1, the 29th Session of the 18th Central Leading Group for Comprehensively Deepening Reform approved the *Request from the Supreme People's Court to Set Up Additional Circuit Courts*, permitting the SPC to set up circuit courts in Nanjing, Zhengzhou, Chongqing and Xi'an besides the First and the Second Circuit Court established in Shenzhen and Shenyang respectively.

On November 17, the 3rd World Internet Conference on Smart Court &

Forum on the Rule of Law in Cyberspace was held in Wuzhen, Zhejiang. All parties at the meeting adopted *the Wuzhen Consensus*.

From December 27 to 28, the National Conference on Advancing and Supervising Judicial Accountability Reform was held in Kunming, Yunnan Province.

From December 28 to 29, the SPC set up the Third to the Sixth Circuit Courts in Nanjing, Zhengzhou, Chongqing and Xi'an respectively.

2017

On February 7, the SPC issued the *Guiding Measures for the People's Courts to Implement the Provisions on Protecting Judicial Personnel to Perform Their Duties in Accordance with the Law*, and published 10 Typical Cases correspondingly.

On February 16, the National Conference on Deepening the Reform of Diversified Dispute Resolution Mechanism was held in Ma'anshan, Anhui, and selected courts delivered and shared practical experience during the conference.

On April 1, the SPC, the Supreme People's Procuratorate and the Ministry of Justice jointly issued the *Opinions on Gradually Implementing the Attorney Representation in Petition Cases*

On April 7, the National Video Conference on Report of Supervision and Rectification on Judicial Accountability & Promotion the Reform of Complex and Simple Cases Diversion was held in Beijing.

On April 18, the 34th Session of the 18th Central Leading Group for Comprehensively Deepening Reform approved the *Provisions on the Several Issues concerning the Strict Exclusion of the Illegally Collected Evidence in the Handling of Criminal Cases*.

On April 28, the SPC, the Supreme People's Procuratorate, the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Human Resources and Social Security, issued the *Plan on Reforming the Management of Contracted Clerks for the People's Courts and the People's Procuratorates (for Trial Implementation)*.

On June 26, the 36th Session of the 18th Central Leading Group for Comprehensively Deepening Reform approved the *Plan on the Establishment of Hangzhou Internet Court*.

On July 3, the first-appointed quota judges took an oath of allegiance to the Constitution in the SPC. Zhou Qiang, the Chief Justice and President of the SPC, led the oath.

On July 9, Xi Jinping, the General Secretary of the CCCPC, Chinese President and Chairman of the Central Military Commission, made a remarkable instruction to the National Conference on Advancing Judicial Reform. Xi pointed out that since the 18th CPC National Congress, judicial authorities followed the right path for reform, made great efforts to tackle critical and complicated issues, and achieved some goals that were long planned, intensively debated and efforts ended in vain. All the achievements promoted judicial credibility and well-maintained social fairness and justice.

On August 18, Hangzhou Internet Court was established.

On August 29, the 38th Session of the 18th Central Leading Group for Comprehensively Deepening Reform approved the *Opinions on Promoting the Professionalization of Judges and Prosecutors and Implementing the Judicial Accountability* and the *Framework of the Pilot Plan on the Comprehensive Integrated Reform for Judicial System in Shanghai*.

On November 1, Zhou Qiang, President of the SPC, delivered the specific report on comprehensively deepening judicial reform in the 30th Session held by the Standing Committee of the 12th NPC.

2018

On January 16, the SPC issued the *Opinions on Further Accelerating the Simultaneous Generation and In-depth Application of Electronic Case Files*.

On January 22, the Central Conference on Political and Legal Work was convened in Beijing.

On January 23, the 2nd Session of the 19th Central Leading Group for Comprehensively Deepening Reform approved the *Decision on the Establishment of the Belt And Road International Commercial Dispute Resolution Mechanism and Institutions*.

On April 27, the 2nd Session of the Standing Committee of the 13th NPC adopted the *Decision on the Establishment the Shanghai Financial Court*.

On June 29, the First and the Second International Commercial Court of the

SPC were established in Shenzhen and Xi'an respectively.

On July 5, the “Yangcheng Cup” Seminar on Deepening the Comprehensive Integrated Reform for the Judicial System of People's Court in the New Era was held in the Guangzhou, at the Judicial Reform and Innovation Research Institution(Guangzhou) of the SPC.

On July 6, the 3rd Session of the Central Commission for Comprehensively Deepening Reform considered and approved the *Plan on the Establishment of the Beijing Internet Court and the Guangzhou Internet Court*.

On July 24, the Conference on Comprehensively Deepening Judicial Reform was held in Shenzhen.

On August 20, Shanghai Financial Court was established.

On August 26, the SPC established the International Commercial Expert Committee, and held the first Seminar.

On September 6, the SPC issued the *Provisions on Several Issues concerning the Case Handling of Internet Courts*.

On September 9, Beijing Internet Court was established.

On September 28, Guangzhou Internet Court was established.

On October 24, Zhou Qiang, President of the SPC, delivered *the Report of the Supreme People's Court on Resolving Enforcement Difficulties by the people's courts* at the 6th Session of the Standing Committee of the 13th NPC.

On October 26, the 6th Session of the Standing Committee of the 13th NPC adopted the *Decision on Several Issues concerning Judicial Procedures for Patent and Other Intellectual Property Cases*.

On October 26, the 6th Session of Standing Committee of the 13th NPC approved the revised version of the *Organic Law of the People's Courts of the People's Republic of China* and adopted the *Decision to Amend the Criminal Procedure Law of the People's Republic of China*.

On November 16, the Legal Experts Symposium on Deepening the Comprehensive Integrated Reform for the Judicial System of People's Courts in New Era was held in Beijing. The experts and scholars shared their opinions and advice on the *Guidelines of the Supreme People's Court on Deepening the Comprehensive Integrated Reform for the Judicial System of the People's Courts*. Zhou Qiang, President of the SPC, attended the meeting and delivered a speech.

From December 10 to 11, the SPC held the National Conference on Promoting the Comprehensive Integrated Reform for the Judicial System in Shanghai.

2019

On January 1, the Intellectual Property Tribunal of the SPC was established.

From January 15 to 16, the Central Conference on Political and Legal work was convened in Beijing. Xi Jinping, the General Secretary of the CCCPC, Chinese President, and Chairman of the Central Military Commission

attended the conference and delivered an important speech.

On January 22, the World Enforcement Conference was convened in Shanghai. Zhou Qiang, President of the SPC attended the opening ceremony and delivered a speech.

On February 27, the SPC issued the *Guidelines on Deepening the Comprehensive Integrated Reform for the Judicial System of People's Court—Framework of the Fifth Five-year Judicial Reform for the People's Courts (2019–2023)*.

On March 19, based on the of the practical experience of “Zhejiang Mobile Micro Court”, the SPC extended the pilot plan to more courts in 12 provinces and equivalent administrative units including Beijing.

On April 23, the 10th Session of the Standing Committee of the 13th NPC approved the *Amendment of the Judges Law of the PRC*.

On May 29, the Organization Department of the CCCPC, the SPC, and the Supreme People's Procuratorate jointly issued the *Notice on the Management of Ranks of Judge Assistants, Prosecutors Assistants and Clerks*.

On June 3, the SPC issued the *Opinions on Deepening the Enforcement Reform and Improving the Long-term Mechanism for Resolving Enforcement Difficulties (2019-2023)*.

On July 19, the Conference on the Comprehensively Deepening Reform in Politics and Law Affairs was held in Chengdu.

On October 11, the SPC, the Supreme People's Procuratorate, the Ministry of Public Security, the Ministry of State Security, and the Ministry of Justice issued the *Guidelines on the Application of the Leniency System for Admitting Guilt and Accepting Punishment*, to promote the minor crime litigation with Chinese characteristics.

On December 5, The World Forum on Rule of Law on the Internet was convened in Wuzhen, Zhejiang Province, hosted by the SPC of the PRC. Representatives of the participating parties jointly adopted the *Wuzhen Declaration of The World Forum on Rule of Law on the Internet*.

On December 6, Nanjing Maritime Court was established.

On December 17, the National Conference on Deepening the Comprehensive Integrated Reform for the Judicial System was held in Guangzhou.

On December 28, the 15th Session of the Standing Committee of the 13th NPC adopted the *Decision on Authorizing the Supreme People's Court to Implement the Pilot Plan on the Simple and Complex Cases Diversion under Civil Procedure in Selected Regions*.

2020

On February 14, the SPC issued the *Notice on Strengthening and Regulating the Online Litigation during the COVID-19 Pandemic*.

On May 6, the SPC, the Ministry of Public Security, the Ministry of Justice and the China Banking and Insurance Regulatory Commission issued the *Notice on Advancing the Pilot Reform of Resolving Traffic Accident*

Damages Disputes on Online Data Processing Platform Nationwide.

On July 15, Hangzhou Internet Court established the Cross-border Trade Tribunal. It was the first People's Tribunal to have centralized jurisdiction over cross-border e-commerce disputes in accordance with law.

On July 31, the SPC issued the *Guiding Opinions on Deepening the Integrated Reform of Judicial Accountability.*

On August 27, the Video Conference on the Deepening Reform in Politics and Law Affairs was convened.

On September 23, the SPC held the Working Conference on Internet Courts. Zhou Qiang, President of the SPC, attended the meeting and delivered a speech.

On December 3, the National Conference on Deepening the Comprehensive Integrated Reform for the Judicial System was held in Guangzhou.

On December 31, Hainan Free Trade Port Intellectual Property Court was established.

2021

On February 19, the 18th Session of the Central Commission for Comprehensively Deepening Reform approved the *Opinions on Mitigating Litigation at Source and Resolving Conflicts and Disputes at Early Stage.*

On February 27, the 26th Session of the Standing Committee of the 13th NPC reviewed the Interim Report of the SPC on Pilot Reform of the Simple

and Complex Cases Diversion in Civil Procedures.

On March 18, Beijing Financial Court was established.

On May 14, the SPC issued the *Opinions on Advancing the Reform of Complex and Simple Cases Diversion in Administrative Procedures*.

On June 16, the SPC issued the *Online Litigation Rules of the People's Courts*.

On June 21, the SPC “One-stop” Diversified International Commercial Dispute Resolution Platform was launched.

On July 24, the Conference on the Comprehensively Deepening Reform in Judicial Fields was held in Beijing.

On August 20, the 30th Session of the Standing Committee of the 13th NPC adopted the *Decision on Authorizing the Supreme People's Court to Organize and Implement the Pilot Reform of the Four-tier Hierarchy and Functional Orientations of Courts*.

On September 30, the SPC, the Supreme People's Procuratorate, and the Ministry of Justice jointly issued the *Opinions on Establishing Mechanisms for Prohibiting Improper Contact or Communication between Judges, Procurators and Lawyers* and *The Opinions on Further Regulating the Practice of Law by Former Personnel of People's Courts and People's Procuratorates as Lawyers*.

On October 12, the SPC issued the *Guiding Opinions on Improving the Judges Performance Evaluation*.

On November 18, the SPC issued the *Opinions on Refining the Rotation Program for Court Personnel*.

On December 8, the SPC issued the *Provisions on Disciplinary Procedures on Misconducted Judges (for Trial Implementation)*.

On December 15, The SPC held the National Video Conference on Deepening the Comprehensive Integrated Reform for the Judicial System.

On December 24, the 32nd Session of the Standing Committee of the 13th NPC adopted the *Decision to Amend the Civil Procedure Law of the PRC*.

On December 31, the SPC issued the *Online Mediation Rules of the People's Courts*.

2022

On January 19, the Internet Judicial Research Institute of Tsinghua University was established. Zhou Qiang, President of the SPC, inaugurated for the Institute.

On January 26, the SPC issued the *Online Operation Rules of the People's Courts*.

On February 27, at the 33rd Session of the Standing Committee of the 13th NPC, Zhou Qiang, President of the SPC, delivered the Report Regarding the Implementation of the *Decision of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress on Several Issues concerning the Litigation Procedure of Patent and Other Intellectual Property Cases*.

On February 28, the 33rd Session of the Standing Committee of the 13th NPC adopted the *Decision on the Establishment of the Chengdu-Chongqing Financial Court*.

On March 3, the People's Court Judicial Reform Research Base, jointly built by the SPC and China University of Political Science and Law, was established. Zhou Qiang, President of the SPC, inaugurated for the Research Base.

On March 23, the Internet Judicial Research Institute of Tsinghua University held the First Tsinghua Internet Judicial Forum under the theme of "Network Intelligent Service Algorithms: Fairness, Accountability and Transparency".

On April 22, the Publicity Department of the CPC Central Committee held a series of press conferences under the theme of "Dynamic Decade", introducing the measures and achievements of judicial reform since the 18th National Congress of the CPC.

On May 18, the Inaugural Conference of the International Judicial Dispute Resolution Network (JDRN) was convened.

On May 21, Zhou Qiang, the Chief Justice of the PRC and President of the SPC, attended the closing ceremony of the 10th Cuban International conference on Justice and Law by video and delivered a speech.

On May 23, the SPC issued the *Opinions on Strengthening Blockchain Application in the Judicial Field*.

On May 26, the SPC held the Forum on Rule of Law in Digital Economy.

Zhou Qiang, President of the SPC, made the keynote speech, and delivered speeches on the opening and closing ceremony respectively.

On June 23, the 35th Session of Standing Committee of the 13th NPC considered the *Civil Enforcement Law of the People's Republic of China (Draft)*.

On July 8, the People's Court Conference on Judicial Reform was held in Beijing. Zhou Qiang, President of the SPC, attended the conference and delivered the keynote speech.

On August 30, at the 36th Session of the Standing Committee of the 13th NPC, Zhou Qiang, President of the SPC, delivered the *In-term Report regarding the Implementation of Pilot Reform of the Hierarchy and Functional Orientations of the Four-tier Courts*.

On October 26, the SPC issued the *Opinions on Standardizing the Operation of Collegiate Benches*.

