

## SUMMARY

One of the most important themes of the epidemic is how the state uses its law enforcement apparatus. Here, unfortunately, we are dealing with many problems.

The legal basis that constitutes the rationale for punishing citizens and businesses, have been changed with great frequency. The quality of new regulations has been widely criticized: their constitutionality was questioned, and in the case of regulations – also their compliance with the laws based on which they were issued.

The courts, to which citizens turned, in the majority of cases, ruled in their favor, indicating in the justifications both that the law was defective and that the enforcement apparatus had acted improperly. The courts are yet to deal with cases resulting from the actions of the police in the third phase of the epidemic. Thus, they will have to rule on, *inter alia*, the grounds for unannounced inspections or indictments under Article 165 of the Penal Code (bringing danger to life or health of many persons or property of large size).

A separate category of cases, which will only begin to soon reach the courts, will be those for compensation for specific conduct of the police officers (this applies mainly to the third stage of the fight against the epidemic). We are talking here about cases such as interventions that were characterized by the violence and aggression of police officers.

Public services whose tasks do not include matters directly related to maintaining order – the State Fire Service and the Customs and Fiscal Bureau – were also involved in exerting pressure on entrepreneurs in the third phase. The police have already suffered the consequences of their involvement in the form of a drastic drop in the level of public trust.

The pandemic should force us to re-think the law-making process, including in emergencies. It is also necessary re-think the use of various uniformed services on such occasion, as well as their very organization and use.