International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change. www.ijicc.net
Volume 13, Issue 5, 2020

Administrative Interrogation: A Comparative Study

Waleed Khashan Zughair[a*], Hanadi Fawzi Hussein[b], [a,b]Univeristy of Thi-Qar/ College of Law, Email: [a*]Waleedkashankw11@yahoo.com

Administrative interrogation is a formal guarantee prior to imposing penalties including striking, issuing warnings, and salary deductions. This is mentioned by the legislator as an exception, because the general rule is that the administration must achieve written editorial control with the employee through the formation of an investigative committee, and it has, as an exception, recourse to these. Since the administrative interrogation is considered an exception from the original, it is not permissible to expand it by imposing other disciplinary penalties that differ from those specified by the legislator exclusively. In the event that this happens, the administrative decision becomes defective in form and procedures, which makes it deserve nullity. The administrative interrogation differs from the interrogation carried out by the investigative committee in the administrative investigation. This is because the administrative interrogation is a stand-alone procedural method. The legislator has the choice, in certain cases, to oversee the administration between the investigation or the interrogation, provided that the results of the interrogation are represented by the employee's conviction of the charges attributed. The employee must be punished with specific penalties, namely, (striking, issuing a warning, or salary deduction).

Keywords: *Administration, interrogation, criminal.*

Introduction

The legislator works to protect the employee with a set of guarantees in the area of employee discipline. Some of which precede the imposition of disciplinary sanctions, others are concurrent with it, and some are subsequent to the imposition of the penalty. The legislator neglects those guarantees by the administration to cancel the decision to impose the disciplinary penalty, regardless of its gravity (Chwastiak, 2015). Among the most important of these guarantees is the administrative interrogation, which is considered an exception from the original. The legislator obligated the administration in both Egypt and Iraq to investigate the employee before imposing the disciplinary punishment, and gave the right to the

administration, as an exception, to interrogate the employee without investigating him. The administration was then able to impose some disciplinary measures with less impact compared to other penalties. In the event the administration ignores the formation of an investigation committee to investigate the employee and promises to question the employee before imposing the disciplinary punishment, it makes the administration's decision void because it did not fulfil the form and procedures (De Keijser, 2012).

Literature Review

The Meaning of Administrative Interrogation

a) Definition of Administrative Interrogation

The legislator for the requirements of the workflow and the height of the public interest over the employee's guarantees allowed an exception to punish the employee with some disciplinary punishments after being questioned. If the administration does not pay attention to this formality, its disciplinary decision will be illegal due to the form and procedures required in the resolution. The judicial rulings did not include a definition of administrative interrogation, but the administrative interrogation was considered a formality (Maher, 1996). When the administration punishes the employee with penalties without there being a written warning or investigation, some legal specialists g define administrative questioning as directing questions from the competent authority to impose disciplinary punishments to the offending employee. Clarification about the reasons for committing the violation or not as well as citing witnesses, and written evidence to reach the decision of the violation committed and imposing the punishment that is appropriate with the violation must be sought. This must be conducted bearing in mind that the punishment is issued by an editorial decision and the protection of the administrative chief for administrative interrogation is the only person who accuses, investigates, and imposes a penalty (Ahmad, 2011). Administrative interrogation can be defined as a means granted by law to the administration by way of exception. Through this process, the authority responsible for imposing disciplinary punishment is known from the employee accused of committing a specific violation for the reasons for its commission and imposing penalties included in the law. The employee's statements includes their right to defence and the statements of witnesses in the interrogation,. This is recorded before imposing the plenty on the employee (Othman, 2012).

b) The Legal Basis for Administrative Interrogation

The administration must conduct a written investigation with the employee before imposing the penalty. This is the general rule in the field of employee discipline, and the Egyptian Civil Service Law No (81) for the year 2016, in Article (59) stipulated that a penalty may not be

imposed on a worker unless an investigation is provided in writing. The administration must hear statements and deliberating upon the defence, and issuing a justified decision impose a penalty. As stated in Article (8) of the internal regulations of the Administrative Prosecution, the investigation shall be in writing and fixed in serial minutes or minutes regarding each of them stating the date, place and hour of its opening and completion, and every paper is signed from the investigation papers by the prosecutor and the author (if any) Majed, 2006). In the same context, the Iraqi legislators require a written investigation with the employee, as Article (10 / first) of the State and Public Sector Employees Discipline Law stipulates that the minister or the head of the department must compose an investigation committee from a president and two experienced members, one of whom should have a university degree Preliminary in law.

The second paragraph of the above article stipulated that the committee undertakes a written investigation with the employee and in order to perform its mission of hearing and writing the statements of the employee and witnesses and perusal of all documents and data that it deems necessary to be examined, either by not holding the employee accountable, closing the investigation, or by imposing one of the penalties stipulated in this law, and all administrative investigation papers are sent to the authority that sent the employee (Omar, 1979). However, this rule is not absolute, but the Egyptian and Iraqi legislators are allowed, as an exception, to depart from the rule of administrative investigation, which is a basic guarantee for the employee before imposing the punishment. However, the administration sometimes uses administrative interrogation when it comes to imposing certain penalties. The Iraqi legislator also authorises interrogation when stipulating in Article (10 / IV) of the Law on the Discipline of State and Public Sector Employees that an exception to the provisions of the two paragraphs (first and second) of this article for the minister or head of the department after questioning the offending employee to impose directly any of the penalties stipulated It is mentioned in paragraphs (first, second and third) of Article (8) of this law. In this regard, the Supreme Administrative Court in Egypt states that if it appears from the punishment decision, and the recognition of the worker himself in the case, that the general manager has invited the worker to his office and confronted him with the accusations and what their sources are, then they must listen to the employees defence in each of them (Chwastiak, 2015). The charges, according to its sources, so that this oral investigation has completed the basic guarantees upon which every written or oral investigation is based.

There is no specific form of administrative investigation with the worker in a form and the fact that the worker did not sign the verbal investigation record does not nullify the investigation (Amr, 2014). The administrative judiciary in Iraq, in relation to this, stated that, upon scrutiny and deliberation by the General Authority of the State Shura Council, the discriminatory appeal was submitted within the legal period. It was decided to accept it in form and upon sympathy to consider the distinct judgment. It was found that it was true and

in conformity with the law. Because the defendant (the distinguished) had issued the administrative order No. (7/733) on August 4, 2009, it includes imposing a penalty for a number of employees, including the plaintiff (the defendant No. (9), .It was found that there are no investigative papers on the subject of the penalty, and the plaintiff (the defendant) has not been questioned about the subject of the objectionable decision. Whereas, the formation of an investigation committee with the employee or the interrogation of the plaintiff in such punishment is considered one of the formal rules that should not be neglected. It is considered from the public system and failure to observe these rules leads to the invalidity of the elected legal procedures and where the defendant (the distinct) has violated the provisions of the provisions (first) (Majed, 2006). Article (10) of the State and Public Sector Law No. (14) for the year 1991 necessitates the abolition of the penalty for striking the right imposed on the plaintiff (distinguished against him), and that the General Discipline Council has committed itself in the face of this legal consideration. It was decided to cancel paragraph (9) of the contested administrative order, challenge discrimination, and load distinctive drawing of discrimination. The decision was made by agreement on a 20 / second spring / 1432 H corresponding to 24/03/2011 AD (Omar, 1979).

Self-Administrative Interrogation

a) Distinguishing Between the Administrative Interrogation and the Administrative Investigation

The legislator obliges the administration in terms of origin to investigate the employee, before imposing the disciplinary decision. The investigation is carried out by an investigative committee, consisting of a president and two members. One of whom has an initial certificate in law at least. The committee undertakes a written investigation with the employee and it must listen to the employee's statement and transcribe it. During this process, the investigator will make use of witnesses. If the administration if does not observe this guarantee, the employee's penalty decision can be cancelled because the administrative decision has become incompatible with the form and procedures stipulated by the law (Othman, 2012). The legislator has opted for management between administrative investigation and administrative interrogation in penalties (draw attention to the problem, issue a warning, cutting salary) an exception from the original that the competent authority can impose disciplinary punishments to punish the employee with one of the three penalties without the need to form an investigation committee. It should be emphasised that the administrative interrogation is not considered a stage of the administrative investigation as it is an independent measure sufficient on its own to punish the employee with the above penalties, and the administrative decision is considered in time to meet its formal requirements (De Keijser, 2012). A distinction must be made between the interrogation and the investigative committee and must follow the investigation of the employee and the administrative

interrogation. If the investigation committee fails to observe this procedure and makes the penalty decision, an illegal decision will be made because the decision is incomplete according to the procedure which is required by law in the administrative decision (Sultan, 2006).

b) Distinguishing between Administrative Interrogation and the Criminal Interrogation

The interrogation process can be defined as listening to the accused's statements and discussing the accusation, and allowing the accused to defend themselves. as he is known as discussing the accused with the crime attributed to him, and the evidence presented against him with all its details, as he refutes it if he is a perpetrator and admits it if he wants to confess,. The Iraqi Code of Criminal Procedure No. 23 of 1971 amended the questioning of the accused. This law obliged the investigating judge and the investigator to question the accused within twenty-four hours of his presence after verifying his identity and personality. The investigators can re-examine the accused at any time in what they deem as necessary for interrogation if the criminal interrogation and administrative interrogation aim to reach the truth and enable the person guilty of the offense or crime to defend themselves. However, they differ in several aspects, including the one that practices the investigation (Raouf, 1979). A judicial authority practices criminal interrogation, while interrogation is practiced by the responsible authority to impose the penalty, as they create in terms of the rules regulating, in criminal interrogation. The accused is surrounded by a set of guarantees stipulated in the Criminal Code Procedure, while the law of discipline of state and public sector employees did not stipulate guarantees that the employee enjoyed the interrogation administratively. If the crime is proven to be the result of the interrogation, criminal responsibility will arise (Chwastiak, 2015). If the employee is found to have committed a violation, their disciplinary responsibility entails, a specific punishment commensurate with the gravity of the act committed within the limits set by law Discipline of State and Public Sector Employees (James, 1973).

c) Distinguishing between the Administrative Interrogation and Criminal Investigation

The interrogation of the accused is one of the procedures stipulated in the Code of Criminal Procedures, which is a necessary measure to reveal the truth of the crime or to confess the charge against the accused (Sultan, 2006). An interrogation is defined as listening to the accused's statements and discussing the facts attributed to the accused, while providing evidence of innocence regarding the charge against them or a confession to reach the reality of the incident and the responsibility in it. There is another definition for the interrogation accused that stipulates that the accused discusses the crime attributed to them, and the evidence is presented against them in a detailed discussion. The accused may refute this if they are a perpetrator and they admit it if he wants to confess (James, 1973). The Iraqi

legislator handled the investigation of the accused under the Criminal Procedure Law No. 23 of 1971 amended in Article 123, whereby the investigating judge and the investigator were required to question the accused within twenty-four hours of his presence after verifying his identity and personality. It was also allowed that the investigators were able to repeat the investigation with the accused at any appropriate time so the criminal investigation and the administrative interrogation would be able to reach the truth. There are many differences among them, the authority that conducts the investigation (Omar, 1979). The interrogation component of a criminal investigation is practiced by a judicial authority, while administrative interrogation is practiced by the authority responsible for imposing the punishment as they create in terms of the rules in the criminal investigation. The accused is surrounded by a set of guarantees stipulated in the Criminal Code Procedures. However, the law on the discipline of state and public sector employees does not stipulate guarantees of the employee, when they are being interrogation administratively (Raouf, 1979). In terms of the effect of the interrogation procedure, if the crime is proven to be committed as a result of the investigation, the criminal responsibility will arise. If the employee is found guilty of a violation, their disciplinary responsibility entails, which requires punishing them with a specific punishment which is suitable with the gravity of the act committed within the limits set by the law of discipline of state and public sector employees (Majed, 2006).

Administrative Interrogation Procedures

a) Facing the Employee with Charges

The principle of confrontation is one of the basic principles guaranteed by constitutions and laws, whether in the area of criminal investigation or administrative investigation. Most laws stipulate the need to respect this principle because it allows the beneficiary to defend their rights against the charges as the judiciary emphasised in many of its provisions· (Mohamed, 2010). A confrontation in the field of administrative investigation is defined as telling the accused employee about the administrative violation that requires the imposition of a disciplinary penalty. The accused is informed of the violation and they are granted the ability to view the evidence that proves his violation with a statement that the administration intends to inflict one of the penalties stipulated in the law if it is proved that the accused committed that violation· (Nofan, 2007).

b) The Right of the Interrogator to Defend

The right of defence is considered one of the basic guarantees that must be available before imposing the penalty and disciplinary authorities must observe it. Otherwise, its decision is considered a defective administrative decision with a defective form and procedures. In addition, this right is one of the general principles that govern the interrogation procedures,

and it does not need a text. This is because it is one of the established principles in the human conscience. The administration authorities must provide the employee accused of committing the violation . The defence guarantee does not aim to achieve a special interest for the employee who commits the violation but must aim to achieve the interest for all by showing facts and ensuring justice as a human right guaranteed by the constitution and laws (Saad, 2007). The Iraqi Constitution of 2005 stipulated the right of defence by stating that the right to defence is sacred and guaranteed in all stages of investigation and trial. Based on this statement, this guarantee cannot achieve its goals unless the employee has enough opportunity to make their statements in full freedom. The accused has the right to choose their defence style in the manner they deem necessary to achieve this goal to ward off the charges against them (Saad, 2007). Therefore, the appearances of the right of the defence in the administrative interrogation do not differ from that prescribed for the employee in the administrative investigation. This is the inadmissibility of the defendant employee being sworn in, and the right to silence because the employee questioned has complete freedom to defend themselves. In addition, the competent authority imposing disciplinary sanctions must inform the accused of this guarantee because empowering the employee to do so makes them comfortable with the administrative procedures, which makes the decisions taken based on them in line with the principle of legality (Chwastiak, 2015).

Complete the Written Form of the Interrogation

The legislator did not provide the written interrogation, unlike the administrative investigation, as the Egyptian legislator stipulated in the Civil Service Law that "parts of the employee may not be signed except after investigating him in writing by hearing his statements and achieving his defence" . The Iraqi legislator also stipulated in the Law on the Discipline of State and Public Sector Employees No. (14) for the year 1991 amending the recording of the investigation, which stipulated that the committee undertakes the investigation in writing with the violating employee referred to it (Othman, 2012). The investigation committee was obligated to write the report of the investigation, where it stated that "a report was prepared in which it confirmed the measures it had taken and what it had heard" (Muhammad, 2015). Regarding the interrogation as an exception to the administrative investigation, the legislator did not clarify its form, is it written or oral? Some consider that obliging the administration to prove the content of the verbal interrogation in the record that includes the penalty. This allows for the details of what happened during questioning to be in the record. This occurs by listing all the violations attributed to the employee and clarifying the assets obtained from them and verifying all the facts and evidence contained therein. The interrogation is in writing which disrupts the purpose of the verbal interrogation leave, but what is meant to prove the content of the interrogation in the record is to prove the interrogation took place and resulted from the employee's conviction of the charges attributed to the accused's innocence (Amr, 2014). As for the Iraqi legislator, when the minister or the

head of the department granted an exception to the provisions of Article (10 / First and Second from the law of the discipline of state and public sector employees, the questioning of the offending employee directly imposes penalties (drawing attention to the problem, issuing a warning, cutting salary). This did not indicate whether the questioning was written orally, therefore, the disciplinary authorities used to question the employee orally before imposing disciplinary sanctions. This makes it difficult to prove that the disciplinary authorities have interrogated the employee and listened to their statement regarding the charges attributed to him before imposing the disciplinary sanctions that the administration can impose based on interrogation or not M thus 0. As for the position of the Iraqi judiciary, and after reviewing some of its rulings, the researchers found that it went through two stages (Majed, 2006). The first did not require that the interrogation be written, but rather that the administration conduct the investigation orally. The reprimand, without noticing that the decision issued for the degree of lowering penalty, was not based on valid legal procedures (Ghazi, 2015). There is a fundamental error in these procedures where the penalty was imposed based on the interrogation of the employee.

While it is not permissible to impose the penalty of lowering the degree based on interrogation, the formation of a committee to investigate with the employee may be required. According to the provision of paragraph (fourth) of Article (10) of the Law of Discipline of State and Public Sector Employees No. (14) of 1991 and that the authority of the Council to reduce the disciplinary punishment is held concerning the imposed penalty based on correct fundamental procedures, but there is no proportion between the punishment imposed and the act of punishment. (De Keijser, 2012). In addition, the council reduced the punishment to reprimand after it indicated that the punishment imposed based on a valid interrogation, while the punishment for reprimand does not fall within the penalties that may be imposed based on an interrogation. The interrogation is not correct because it relied on sending the questions to the employee by mail and receiving the answer to them in writing. This contradicts the interrogation rules stipulated in the aforementioned paragraph that requires that it be verbal, and it is one of the employee's guarantees in imposing the disciplinary penalty(Majed, 1992). There is a disciplinary punishment for not following the fundamental procedures in the way they are imposed. It was informed of him on 04/19/2018 and he complained against him on 4/30/2018 and he refused the grievance On 14/5/2018. since he filed the lawsuit on 5/6/2018, he. The defendant will have a lawsuit from the legal period stipulated in Paragraph (Second) of Article (15) of the Law for Discipline of State and Public Sector Employees No. (14) for the year 1991 (De Keijser, 2012). It was decided to accept it as a form of sympathy concerning its subject. The court noted that the sentence contested was imposed on the objector after being interrogated orally according to when the clause no. 3867 of the Oil Training Institute came into effect on 8/10/2018. It was also noted that paragraph (four) of Article (10) of the State and Public Sector Employees Discipline Law No. (14) for the year 1991 (Suleiman, 1989) authorised the minister or head of the department to punish the

employee after being questioned. Whereas, paragraph (four) of Article (15) of the law states that this court must be observed when considering the appeals based on the provisions of the Code of Criminal Procedure and in a manner consistent with its provisions. This is because article (123) of the Code of Criminal Procedure No. (23) for the year 1971 was obliged upon interrogation of the accused to transcribe his statements. Since the objector did not record the questioning of the objector, the penalty order is defective in form (Omar, 1979). Therefore, it was decided by the majority to cancel the administrative order no. (1832) on 18/4/2018 and to charge the objector in addition to his job fees and expenses. The ruling was issued in accordance with articles (156, 161 and 166) of the Civil Procedure Law and Article (63) of the Law of Attorney as a presence that is subject to discrimination before the Administrative Court Supreme publicly on 11/27/2018) (De Keijser, 2012).

The Scope of Administrative Interrogation

a) Disciplinary Penalties that may be Imposed Based on the Interrogation of the Employee

The legislator did not give the administration a hand in inflicting disciplinary penalties on the employee after questioning them, but rather restricted it with some penalties that are considered simple in terms of impact. In the Civil Service Law, the Egyptian legislator restricted the authority of the administration to impose disciplinary punishments with warning and deduction wages for a period not exceeding three days when resorting to administrative interrogation, with the exception of the investigation. As for the Iraqi legislator, the authority to impose disciplinary sanctions after being questioned was limited to the following penalties (Ali, 20080):

- Draw attention to the problem: It is the lightest disciplinary punishment that can be imposed on the employee, and the employee must be notified in writing of the violation they committed, and directs them to improve their behaviour. This punishment results in delaying the increase for a period of three months.
- Issue a Warning: The employee must be notified in writing of the violation they committed, and warned that a breach of future job duties will result in delaying the promotion or pay increase for a period of six months. ***(Ghazi, 2015)***
- Salary Deduction: The daily instalment of the employee's salary will be deducted for a period not exceeding ten days by a written order stating the violation committed by the employee and necessitating the imposition of the penalty. This will result in delaying the promotion or visit according to the following: 1)Five months in the event of a salary cut for a period not exceeding five days 2) One month for each day of the salary cut if the punishment period exceeds five days. (Muhammad, 2015).

b) The Authority Responsible For Conducting Administrative Interrogation In Egypt

The authorities that specialise in conducting administrative interrogation in Egypt are competent to punish employees with penalties such as warning and deduction from wages for a period not exceeding three days according to the text of Article (59) of the Civil Service Law. The law allowed the issuance of penalties in the following bodies: 1)The direct superiors: means the employees who supervise the work of their subordinates, direct them and review their work, and for this community to exercise the power to impose disciplinary punishments (Muhammad, 2015). The legislator requires that a decision be issued by the minister, the governor, or the head of the board of directors of the public authority that gives 2) High-level employees: They are both the undersecretary and those who hold excellent and high grades 3)Responsible Minister: who has the authority to impose a set of disciplinary punishments on employees and incumbents of higher grades, including penalties that can be imposed based on an administrative interrogation. 4)The Governor: The law permits the governor to impose all penalties granted to the concerned minister within the limits of the governorate's scope (Mohamed, 2010) 5) Chairman of the Board of Directors: The powers granted to him in the imposition of sanctions are not different from those granted to the competent minister and the governor in relation to their employees in the general assembly whose board is headed (De Keijser, 2012).

c) The Competent Authority to Conduct Administrative Interrogation in Iraq

The authorities concerned with conducting administrative interrogation in Iraq are some of the authorities specialised in imposing disciplinary penalties stipulated in the Law on the Discipline of State and Public Sector Employees referring to the text of Article (10 / IV) of the State Employee and Public Sector Discipline Law No. (14) for the year 1991. The researchers found that the following (except for the provisions of the first and second paragraphs) of this article for the minister or head of the department after questioning the offending employee, directly imposes any of the penalties stipulated in paragraphs (First, Second and Third) of Article (8) of this Law state that he head of the department: who has the authority to impose penalties to draw attention, warn, and cut the salary for a period not exceeding five days (Ghazi, 2015). It is also stated that the Minister has the authority to impose all disciplinary punishments on employees, and penalties to draw attention, warn, and cut off the salary of a person who holds the rank of Director General and above. It should be noted here that the head of the entity not affiliated with a ministry is considered a Minister for the purposes of the law of discipline of state and public sector employees. The text omitted reference to the competence of the President of the Republic to interrogate an employee because he is competent or whoever authorises him to punish his employees with all disciplinary penalties, or makes him competent to impose penalties (salary reduction, degree reduction, dismissal, dismissal as he did with the Prime Minister when he granted him

imposing penalties (salary reduction, degree reduction, dismissal, dismissal) on his employees) (De Keijser, 2012). These penalties are not imposed until after conducting an administrative investigation with the employee. Therefore, the researchers recommend the legislator to amend the text of Article (10 / IV) to include the President of the Republic as he is also competent to impose penalties that can be imposed on the employee based on his interrogation. From the aforementioned, the disciplinary authorities referred to above are the competent authority to refer the employee to the investigation (Mohamed, 2010). If they decide to investigate the employee by forming a committee to undertake an editorial investigation, according to the principles stipulated in the law for the discipline of state and public sector employees, they choose the method of interrogation. It is the one who takes charge of doing provided that the guarantees granted by the law to the employee are taken into account, otherwise his decision becomes defective (Muhammad, 2015).

Results

1) Administrative interrogation is a formal guarantee prior to imposing penalties (striking, warning, salary deduction) mentioned by the legislator as an exception. This is because the general rule is that the administration must achieve written editorial control with the employee through the formation of an investigative committee, and it has, as an exception, recourse to these means in the above sanctions.

2) Since the administrative interrogation is considered an exception from the original, it is not permissible to expand it by imposing other disciplinary penalties that differ from those specified by the legislator exclusively. In the event that this happens, the administrative decision becomes defective in form and procedures, which makes it deserve nullity.

3) The administrative interrogation differs from the interrogation carried out by the investigative committee in the administrative investigation. This is because the administrative interrogation is a stand-alone procedural method. The legislator has the choice, in certain cases, to choose the administration between the investigation or the interrogation, provided that the results from the interrogation represented by the employee's conviction of the charges attributed. The employee must be punished with specific penalties, namely, (striking, warning, salary deduction).

Conclusions

1- The researchers conclude the legislator to inform the employee of clear guarantees when the administration resorted to administrative interrogation, especially those related to the right to defence and the use of witnesses because it is sufficient to prove or deny the charges against him. This also prevents the administration from making decisions quickly, because

the provision of these guarantees has positive effects. The employee, on the one hand, should ensure that they are not punished for actions they did not commit because it ensures the fairness of disciplinary accountability.

2- The researchers conclude that the Iraqi legislator limits the authority of the administration to impose penalties (draw attention to the problem, issue a warning) when interrogating an employee without extending the penalty (salary cut) because it is a severe punishment compared to other penalties (eye-catching and warning).In addition to the possibility of cancelling these penalties in the event of an occurrence, the employee has a letter of thanks from the Minister or whomever he authorises.

3- The researchers conclude the legislator to amend the text of Article (10/4) of the Law on the Discipline of State and Public Sector Employees, which limits the right to interrogate the minister and the head of the department on the understanding that they are competent to punish the employee with the penalties imposed after the interrogation of the employee, as well as the authority of the minister responsible for imposing other penalties. The legislator has missed that the President of the Republic also has the authority to punish his employees with all disciplinary punishments, which enables them to conduct administrative interrogation if they intend to punish the employee with penalties (drawing attention to the problem, issue a warning, salary deduction).

REFERENCES

Ahmad Talal Abdul-Hamid, 2011, Administrative Investigation, One of the Guarantees of the Accused, Study in Iraqi Law, published on the website: www0iasaj.net

Ali Khattar Shnawi, 2008, Studies in the Public Employment, University of Jordan Press, Amman.

Amr Fouad Ahmed Barakat, 2014, the decision of the Egyptian Supreme Administrative Court is considered on 2/26/1966, Q4

Azi Faisal Mahdi, 2016, Guide to Employee Rights, 2nd Edition,

Chwastiak, Michele. (2015). Torture as normal work: The Bush Administration, the Central Intelligence Agency and 'Enhanced Interrogation Techniques'. Organization. 22. 493-511. 10.1177/1350508415572506.

De Keijser, Jan & Malsch, Marijke & Kranendonk, Robin & de Gruijter, Madeleine. (2012). Written records of interrogation: Differential registration as determinant of statement credibility and interrogation quality. Psychology. Crime & Law. 613-629. 10.1080/1068316X.2010.526119.

Ghazi Faisal Mahdi, 2014, Comments and Articles in the Field of Public Law,

James W. Wit, 1973, Non-Coercive Interrogation and the Administration of Criminal Justice: The Impact of Miranda on Police Effectuality, 64 *J. Crim. L. & Criminology*.

Maher Abd al-Hadi, 1996, Procedural Sharia in Discipline, 2nd Floor, Dar Gharib Press, Cairo

Majed Ragheb Al-Helou, 1992. Administrative Law, University Press, Alexandria,

Majed Yaqout, 2006, Explanation of the Disciplinary Law for Public Service, Al-Maaref Establishment, Alexandria

Mohamed Saad Fouda, 2010, The General Theory of Administrative Punishments, New University House, Alexandria.

Muhammad Misbah al-Qadi, 2015, The Criminal Protection of Personal Freedom in the Pre-Criminal Phase, Arab Renaissance House, Cairo

Nofan Aqil Al-Ajarmah, 2007,Public Employee Disciplinary Authority, Dar Al-Thaqafa, Amman

Omar Fouad Ahmed Barakat, 1979, Disciplinary Authority - A Comparative Study, the Arab Renaissance Library, Cairo

Othman Salman Ghaidan, 2012, Explaining the Law of Discipline of State and Public Sector Employees, Baghdad

Raouf Ebeid, 1979, Principles of Criminal Procedure in Egyptian Law, 12th Edition, Ain Shams Press, Cairo

Saad Al-Shtaiwi, 2007, Administrative Investigation in the Domain of Public Service, Dar Al-Fikr Al-Arabi, Alexandria

Suleiman Muhammad Al-Tamawi, 1989, Disciplinary Judiciary, Comparative Study, Book Three, Dar Al-Fikr Al-Arabi

Sultan Al-Shawi, 2006, Origins of the Criminal Investigation, Legal Library, Baghdad.