

DIGEST

on the Regulatory Decisions Adopted by the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Kazakhstan in the First Half of 2026

The Constitutional Court Clarified Issues Concerning Pension Payments to Citizens Who Have Moved Abroad

May 19, 2026



The Constitutional Court reviewed a submission from the East Kazakhstan Regional Court regarding the constitutionality of Paragraph 1 of Article 196, Paragraph 2 of Article 202, Subparagraph 2) of Paragraph 3 of Article 204 of the Social Code, and the fifth part of Paragraph 5 of the Rules regulating procedural issues of pension provision, approved on June 22, 2023, No. 232.

Background of the Case

The submission was initiated following an appeal by a citizen who argued that the above-mentioned provisions, when interpreted together, treat a citizen's permanent residence in Kazakhstan as a prerequisite for exercising the right to receive the state basic pension and age-based pension payments. In her view, this contradicts Article 14 and Paragraph 1 of Article 28 of the Constitution.

Position of the Constitutional Court

The Constitutional Court noted that, by their legal nature, pension payments are linked to the attainment of a certain age and the resulting social vulnerability of a person, rather than to the place of residence.

The Court stated that, based on the meaning of the constitutional provisions, Paragraph 1 of Article 196 of the Social Code does not imply that citizens of Kazakhstan must reside permanently in the country in order to acquire the legal right to pension benefits.

Paragraph 2 of Article 202 and Subparagraph 2) of Paragraph 3 of Article 204 of the Code establish the general period during which age-based pension payments and state basic pension payments are made, as well as the grounds for their termination in the event that the recipient permanently relocates outside the Republic of Kazakhstan.

Under these provisions, the fact of permanent departure abroad has legal significance and results in the termination of pension payments only with respect to those persons for whom such a residency requirement applies when the pension is initially granted.

Interpreted in this manner, the Constitutional Court found no inconsistency between Paragraph 2 of Article 202 and Subparagraph 2) of Paragraph 3 of Article 204 of the Code and the Constitution.

The challenged provisions contained in the fifth part of Paragraph 5 of the Rules concern the mechanism for verifying an applicant's compliance with statutory

requirements and do not establish prohibitions or restrictions on pension entitlement. Therefore, there are no grounds for declaring this regulatory legal act unconstitutional. At the same time, the authorized state body was recommended to introduce clarifying amendments to the Rules.

Conclusions of the Constitutional Court

Following its constitutional review, the Constitutional Court declared the following provisions to be consistent with the Constitution:

1) Paragraph 1 of Article 196 of the Code, interpreted as follows:

“In exercising the right to be granted and receive a state basic pension payment and an age-based pension payment, a citizen of the Republic of Kazakhstan is not required to reside permanently in the territory of the Republic of Kazakhstan, provided that all other statutory conditions for the granting of such payments are met.”

2) Paragraph 2 of Article 202 and Subparagraph 2) of Paragraph 3 of Article 204 of the Code, interpreted as follows: “The fact that a recipient of pension payments has permanently relocated outside the country has legal significance and entails the termination of such payments only with respect to those persons for whom this requirement applies at the time the pension is granted (taking into account the interpretation set out in Paragraph 1 of the operative part of this Regulatory Resolution), unless otherwise provided by the laws of the Republic of Kazakhstan or by international treaties ratified by the Republic of Kazakhstan.”

The full text of the Regulatory Resolution of the Constitutional Court is available at

<https://www.gov.kz/memleket/entities/ksrk/documents/details/1013205?lang=ru>

Constitutional Court: Differences in the Application of Administrative Arrest to Parents Do Not Constitute Discrimination

May 19, 2026



The Constitutional Court reviewed a petition submitted by a citizen challenging the constitutionality of Part Two of Article 50 of the Code of the Republic of Kazakhstan on Administrative Offenses. The contested provision stipulates that administrative arrest shall not be applied to women who have children under the age of fourteen, as well as to men who are raising children of that age on

their own.

Background of the Case

The applicant argued that this legal regulation violates the principle of equality before the law and the prohibition of discrimination based on sex (Paragraph 2 of Article 14 of the Constitution). According to the applicant, for women, the mere existence of a child under the age of fourteen is sufficient to exempt them from

administrative arrest, whereas men must additionally prove that they are raising such a child alone.

Position of the Constitutional Court

The Constitutional Court noted that the difference in legal regulation is based not on gender, but on the degree of a parent's actual involvement in ensuring continuous care for the child, and therefore does not constitute discrimination. The category of a “child under the age of fourteen” used in the challenged provision reflects the heightened dependence of such children on constant care and upbringing.

The differentiation established by Part Two of Article 50 of the Administrative Offenses Code is intended to prevent situations in which a child may be left without proper care due to the isolation of the person who is solely responsible for the child’s maintenance and upbringing. The constitutional principle of equality permits such distinctions where they are objectively and reasonably justified and are aimed at achieving a constitutionally significant objective.

At the same time, the Constitutional Court stated that Part Two of Article 50 of the Code does not fully satisfy the requirements of legal certainty and allows for ambiguous interpretation. The provision does not clearly define the categories of persons covered by the exception, limiting itself to a reference to gender. Nor does it specify the meaning of the criterion “raising children alone” or identify the legally significant circumstances required to establish this status. This creates a risk of inconsistent application of the law in practice.

Furthermore, the Constitutional Court noted the absence of a special legal mechanism to ensure guardianship and care for children during the period of execution of an administrative penalty. In the Court’s view, postponement of administrative arrest cannot fully compensate for the potential adverse consequences for the child or substitute for a dedicated mechanism to ensure the child’s protection.

Conclusions of the Constitutional Court

While declaring Part Two of Article 50 of the Code consistent with the Constitution, the Constitutional Court simultaneously recommended that the Government consider improving legislation concerning the application of administrative arrest to categories of persons exempt from such a penalty, in accordance with the legal positions set out by the Constitutional Court.

The Court also recommended that the Supreme Court review and summarize judicial practice in this category of cases and provide additional clarifications.

The full text of the Constitutional Court’s Regulatory Resolution is available at <https://www.gov.kz/memleket/entities/ksrk/documents/details/1013209?lang=ru>

Constitutional Court: Time Limit for Filing Labor Disputes Does Not Restrict Recovery of Unpaid Wages



June 8, 2026

The Constitutional Court reviewed a petition submitted by a citizen challenging the constitutionality of Subparagraph 2) of Part One and the third paragraph of Part Five of Article 160 of the Labor Code, which establishes a one-year period for employees to bring labor disputes before a court.

Background of the Case

After being dismissed from employment, the citizen applied to the court seeking protection of his constitutional right to remuneration for work. The claim concerned payment for overtime work performed between January 2021 and April 2024. However, the court awarded compensation for overtime work only for the final year preceding the filing of the lawsuit. The remaining claims were dismissed on the grounds that the one-year time limit for bringing labor disputes had expired.

Referring to the general three-year limitation period applicable to civil disputes, the citizen argued that the challenged provision of the Labor Code infringed upon his right to remuneration for work.

Position of the Constitutional Court

Following its review, the Constitutional Court noted that the one-year period for an employee to file a claim in court does not preclude the application of the general three-year statute of limitations. The legislature has the authority to establish special limitation periods and filing deadlines for particular categories of disputes, provided that such periods pursue constitutionally significant objectives, including legal certainty and the stability of legal relations.

The Constitutional Court stated that the establishment of a one-year filing period may result in the loss of remuneration for work, including payment for overtime work that was actually performed. Where an employer has failed to fulfill its obligation to make the required payments, courts must uphold the constitutional guarantees of an employee's right to judicial protection and the right to remuneration for work. Courts must also take into account the legal nature of a continuing violation arising from an employer's failure to pay wages and other earned monetary amounts.

Conclusions of the Constitutional Court

The Constitutional Court declared the challenged provisions of Article 160 of the Labor Code to be consistent with the Constitution, subject to the following interpretation:

The one-year period for bringing labor disputes before a court, as established by this article, does not prevent an employee from exercising the right to judicial protection in claims seeking recovery of unpaid wages and other mandatory labor-related payments, including compensation for overtime work, where the employer

has failed to fulfill its obligation to pay the relevant amounts, provided that such claims are brought within the general three-year statute of limitations established by Article 178 of the Civil Code (General Part).

The Government was recommended, no later than one year from the publication of this Regulatory Resolution, to initiate draft legislation introducing amendments and additions to the Labor Code in accordance with the legal positions set out by the Constitutional Court.

The full text of the Constitutional Court's Regulatory Resolution is available at <https://www.gov.kz/memleket/entities/ksrk/documents/details/1023078?lang=ru>

Constitutional Court: Actual Serving of Part of a Sentence Is Not an Automatic Ground for Parole



June 10, 2026

The Constitutional Court reviewed a petition submitted by a citizen challenging the constitutionality of Paragraph 1 of Article 39 of the Constitution in relation to the first paragraph of Paragraph 9 of the Regulatory Resolution of the Supreme Court dated October 2, 2015 No. 6, “On judicial practice regarding conditional early release from serving a sentence, substitution of the unserved part of a sentence with a milder form of punishment, and reduction of the imposed sentence.

The Supreme Court's Regulatory Resolution provides that the fact that a convicted person has served part of the sentence does not constitute an unconditional ground for granting conditional early release (parole) or for replacing the unserved portion of the sentence with a milder punishment.

Background of the Case

According to the applicant, the courts' refusal to grant his requests for consideration of parole and sentence substitution allows for an overly broad and ambiguous interpretation of the law and grants judges excessively wide discretionary powers when deciding such matters.

Position of the Constitutional Court

After reviewing the case, the Constitutional Court concluded that the challenged interpretative provision of the Supreme Court was issued within its authority, is consistent with the Constitution, and is aimed at ensuring uniformity in judicial practice.

Conclusions of the Constitutional Court

The Constitutional Court noted that there are existing issues related to the legal assessment of a convicted person's rehabilitation, the consideration of the victim's opinion in parole and sentence substitution proceedings, as well as the determination of the amount of harm caused—issues that require legislative regulation.

The Court also emphasized that the absence of clearly defined statutory criteria for establishing a convicted person's rehabilitation in criminal and penal legislation creates a risk of a formalistic approach to evaluating behavior. This, in turn, may lead to broad judicial discretion in decisions on parole and sentence substitution.

In this regard, the Court recommended that the Government consider improving criminal legislation, and that the Supreme Court provide additional normative clarifications.

The full text of the Constitutional Court's Regulatory Resolution is available at <https://www.gov.kz/memleket/entities/ksrk/documents/details/1023861?lang=ru>

Constitutional Court Upholds Constitutionality of Temporary Communication Restrictions for Security Purposes

June 10, 2026



The Constitutional Court reviewed a petition submitted by a citizen challenging the constitutionality of Paragraph 1-2 of Article 41-1 of the Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan “On Communications.”

Background of the Case

The citizen contested the application of the above provision in court proceedings; however, the courts rejected his claims. The applicant argued that the challenged norm restricts his constitutional rights to freedom of speech and expression, the free receipt and dissemination of information by any means not prohibited by law, as well as the right to access information and judicial protection.

Position of the Constitutional Court

According to the contested provision of the Law, in urgent cases that may lead to the commission of serious and especially serious crimes, as well as crimes being prepared or committed by an organized criminal group, the Chair of the National Security Committee, their deputies, heads of territorial bodies, or persons acting in their capacity are authorized to suspend the operation of communication networks and/or communication means, the provision of communication services, access to internet resources and/or information posted on them, in the interests of all subjects of operational-search activities. Such measures must be followed by notification of the authorized bodies in the fields of communications and mass media, as well as the Prosecutor General's Office, within twenty-four hours. The procedure for applying these measures is determined by a joint regulatory legal act of the operational-search authorities and the authorized bodies in the field of communications and mass media, in coordination with the Prosecutor General's Office.

Conclusions of the Constitutional Court

Following its review, the Constitutional Court found no contradiction between Paragraph 1-2 of Article 41-1 of the Law “On Communications” and the Constitution. The Court of constitutional review stated that the restrictions provided by law are not aimed at arbitrary limitation of the right to freely receive information, but are intended to protect the constitutional order, safeguard public order, and ensure the protection of human rights and freedoms, as well as life and health of citizens. The measure is temporary in nature and is applied for the prompt prevention or suppression of unlawful acts, without depriving individuals of the constitutional right to freely receive and disseminate information.

At the same time, the Constitutional Court noted that the challenged provision requires further clarification of evaluative terms, the establishment of reasonable time limits for the application of such measures, and clearer criteria for restrictions in order to maintain a balance between public and private interests. In this regard, the Government was recommended to consider improvements to the legislation.

The full text of the Constitutional Court’s Regulatory Resolution is available at <https://www.gov.kz/memleket/entities/ksrk/documents/details/1023865?lang=ru>

Constitutional Court: Mandatory Dismissal for Corruption Offenses Applies with Consideration of Employee Status

June 10, 2026



The Constitutional Court reviewed a petition submitted by a citizen challenging the constitutionality of Subparagraph 2) of Paragraph 1-1 of Article 52 of the Labor Code in relation to Paragraph 1 of Article 24 of the Constitution. According to the provision, an employment contract with an employee of the quasi-public sector is subject to termination at the employer’s initiative in the event that the

employee commits a corruption-related offense.

Background of the Case

The citizen was dismissed by his employer following a conviction for a corruption offense (bribery), which included an additional punishment of lifelong disqualification from holding positions in state organizations and entities of the quasi-public sector. The applicant argued that the challenged provision violates his constitutional right to freedom of labor, as he worked as a locomotive driver and is now unable to continue working in his profession.

Position of the Constitutional Court

The Constitutional Court stated that the contested provision must be applied in conjunction with other provisions of current legislation. In particular, Subparagraph 2) of Paragraph 2 of Article 26 of the Labor Code establishes

restrictions on employment in quasi-public sector entities for persons who have committed corruption offenses.

Under the Criminal Code, subjects of corruption offenses include: (1) persons authorized to perform state functions; and (2) persons equated to persons authorized to perform state functions.

The defining criterion for imposing such restrictions is the functional nature of the person's activity.

Thus, applying the challenged provision to all employees of the quasi-public sector without taking into account their functional status leads to a disproportionate expansion of restrictions on the right to work.

Conclusions of the Constitutional Court

Following its review, the Constitutional Court declared Subparagraph 2) of Paragraph 1-1 of Article 52 of the Labor Code to be consistent with the Constitution, in conjunction with the provisions of the Criminal Code and the Law "On Counteracting Corruption," under the following interpretation:

Mandatory termination of an employment contract at the employer's initiative for the commission of a corruption offense by an employee of the quasi-public sector applies only to persons equated to persons authorized to perform state functions.

At the same time, the Government was recommended to consider improving legislation in light of the Constitutional Court's final decision.

The full text of the Constitutional Court's Regulatory Resolution is available at <https://www.gov.kz/memleket/entities/ksrk/documents/details/1023866?lang=ru>

Constitutional Court: Detention in Custody Is Not Permissible Beyond the Maximum Time Limits Established by Law

June 10, 2026



The Constitutional Court reviewed petitions submitted by citizens challenging the constitutionality of Part One of Article 136, Part Four of Article 140, Part One of Article 153, and Parts One, Two, Three, and Four of Article 342 of the Criminal Procedure Code (CPC), which regulate the grounds and procedures for applying preventive measures, as well as the time limits for keeping a

defendant in custody during the main court proceedings.

The applicants questioned the constitutionality of the existing rules governing the calculation of time limits when courts consider requests involving the repeated restriction of a person's liberty through detention in custody or house arrest.

Background of the Cases

In the first case, the issue concerned the extension of detention after the expiration of the statutory period. The six-month period calculated from the date the

case was received by the court had expired, yet the court extended the detention after the deadline had already passed.

In the second case, the preventive measure of detention in custody was changed by court decision to house arrest due to the expiration of the statutory twelve-month limit. At the same time, the court allowed for the possibility of changing the preventive measure back to detention in custody.

Position of the Constitutional Court

Конституционный Суд по итогам проверки оспариваемых гражданами норм указал, что, гарантируя право каждого на личную свободу, Конституция допускает арест и содержание под стражей только в предусмотренных законом случаях, что означает обязательность установления в законе не только оснований, но и предельных сроков такого ограничения свободы. Любое превышение предусмотренного законом срока содержания подсудимого под стражей нарушает это конституционное право и не соответствует принципу правовой определенности. Following its review of the challenged provisions, the Constitutional Court stated that while the Constitution guarantees everyone the right to personal liberty, it permits arrest and detention only in cases provided for by law. This means that the law must establish not only the grounds for restricting liberty but also the maximum permissible duration of such restrictions. Any detention of a defendant beyond the period expressly prescribed by law violates the constitutional right to personal liberty and is inconsistent with the principle of legal certainty.

Conclusions of the Constitutional Court

The Constitutional Court declared Part Three of Article 342 of the Criminal Procedure Code unconstitutional insofar as it contains the words: “upon expiration of the period specified in Part Two of this Article.” The Court also provided an interpretation of the other reviewed provisions that excludes the possibility of placing a defendant in custody again after the expiration of the twelve-month period, where doing so would exceed the maximum permissible duration established by the Code.

At the same time, the Government was recommended, no later than six months from the publication of the final decision, to initiate draft legislation aimed at bringing the criminal procedural legislation of the Republic of Kazakhstan into conformity with the legal positions set out by the Constitutional Court in its Regulatory Resolution.

The full text of the Constitutional Court’s Regulatory Resolution is available at <https://www.gov.kz/memleket/entities/ksrk/documents/details/1024707?lang=ru>

Constitutional Court: Provisions on the Allocation of Private Bailiff Fees in the Enforcement of Child Contact Orders Contradict the Constitution

June 12, 2026



The Constitutional Court, upon a petition filed by a citizen, reviewed the constitutionality of Part Two of Paragraph 1 of Article 118 of the Law “On Enforcement Proceedings and the Status of Bailiffs” and the third paragraph of the Note to the Schedule of Fees for the Activities of Private Bailiffs, approved by Order No. 416 of the Minister of Justice dated June 27, 2023, with regard to

Paragraph 2 of Article 13, Article 27, and Paragraph 3 of Article 76 of the Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

Under the challenged provisions, the cost of a private bailiff’s activities in the compulsory enforcement of a court decision establishing a procedure for communication with a child is borne equally by the creditor (claimant) and the debtor.

At the same time, the general mechanism of enforcement proceedings is based on the principle that the burden resulting from the non-enforcement of a court decision should be borne by the debtor.

Background of the Case

According to the applicant, the existing legal mechanism for recovering enforcement costs restricted his parental rights by creating financial obstacles to maintaining personal contact with his children, who live separately from him.

Position of the Constitutional Court

In its decision, the Constitutional Court emphasized that current legislation clearly provides that divorce, annulment of marriage, or the separate residence of parents cannot serve as grounds for restricting a child’s full communication with both parents and other relatives, nor for limiting the exercise of the rights and interests of either the child or the parents.

Each parent has a duty to participate directly in the upbringing and development of their child. The mechanism for the compulsory enforcement of court decisions must ensure effective protection of the child’s interest in maintaining family relationships and must not make the realization of that interest dependent on the financial situation of the parents.

The Constitutional Court stated that the established procedure reduces the effectiveness of the constitutional guarantee of the binding force of court decisions, as it imposes the obligation to pay for the services of a private bailiff on the person in whose favor the court decision was issued.

Conclusions of the Constitutional Court

The Constitutional Court declared the challenged provisions inconsistent with the Constitution and recommended that the Government take measures to improve the legislation governing the payment of private bailiffs’ fees in enforcement

proceedings concerning court orders that determine arrangements for communication with a child, in accordance with the legal positions set out by the Constitutional Court in this Regulatory Resolution.

The full text of the Constitutional Court's Regulatory Resolution is available at: <https://www.gov.kz/memleket/entities/ksrk/documents/details/1025491?lang=ru>

Constitutional Court Declares Entry Restriction to the Shymbulak Area Unconstitutional and Emphasizes the Need to Balance Environmental Interests and Citizens' Rights



June 12, 2026

The Constitutional Court reviewed the constitutionality of Paragraph 1 of Resolution No. 2/122 of the Akimat of Almaty City dated April 8, 2016, “On Restricting the Entry of Vehicles into Certain Areas of Almaty City.”

The challenged provision restricts the entry of vehicles into the specially protected natural area of the Shymbulak tract, with the exception of electric vehicles.

Background of the Case

The review was initiated following a petition submitted by a citizen residing in the Tuyuksu tract, which forms part of the Ile-Alatau National Park but is territorially located within the city of Almaty. Access to housing for residents of the Tuyuksu tract is possible through the Shymbulak tract, which forms part of the Medeu Regional Natural Park, via the Medeu–Shymbulak road. However, access is significantly complicated by the absence of a paved road within the Tuyuksu tract. According to the applicant, the Akimat's resolution restricted access to her home and limited her freedom of movement without taking into account the specific transportation conditions of the area.

Position of the Constitutional Court

In its final decision, the Constitutional Court emphasized that when establishing legal restrictions on rights and freedoms, the State must ensure a fair balance between individual rights and freedoms, the rights and freedoms of others, and public interests.

Legal regimes applicable to specially protected natural areas, as well as environmental requirements, involve a range of measures aimed at protecting and preserving natural territories. Such measures may include prohibitions and restrictions on various activities where necessary to achieve the constitutionally significant objective of environmental protection and the preservation of an environment conducive to human life and health, which constitute fundamental and inalienable values.

Such restrictions and prohibitions may be imposed only in strict accordance with the law, within the competence of the relevant state authorities, and in

compliance with constitutional requirements, including the conditions governing permissible limitations under Paragraph 1 of Article 39 of the Constitution.

Following its review, the Constitutional Court determined that the adoption of the challenged resolution did not fall within the authority of the Akimat of Almaty City. Under the Environmental Code, the authority to restrict vehicle access and adopt the corresponding regulatory legal act belongs to the local representative body (maslikhat) of a region, a city of republican significance, or the capital.

At the same time, legislation contains specific provisions defining the competence of the Akimat in matters of environmental protection and road traffic regulation related to environmental protection. In particular, under the third paragraph of Subparagraph 8) of Paragraph 2 of Article 17 of the Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan dated April 17, 2014, “On Road Traffic,” executive authorities, within their competence and territorial jurisdiction, are authorized to establish special traffic management zones by introducing various restrictions on vehicle access to certain urban areas, including through traffic-control measures such as road signs and road markings.

In this regard, the Constitutional Court noted that restrictions on vehicle movement within specially protected natural areas may pursue the constitutionally significant objective of environmental protection and ecological safety. However, even where such an objective exists, the restriction must take into account the rights and legitimate interests of the persons affected and must not impose an excessive burden on them.

Conclusions of the Constitutional Court

Following its review, the Constitutional Court declared Paragraph 1 of Resolution No. 2/122 of the Akimat of Almaty City dated April 8, 2016, inconsistent with the Constitution.

The full text of the Constitutional Court’s Regulatory Resolution is available at <https://www.gov.kz/memleket/entities/ksrk/documents/details/1026173?lang=ru>

Constitutional Court Declares Unconstitutional Provisions Restricting Citizens’ Right to Judicial Protection in Employment Reinstatement and Review of Court Decisions



June 13, 2026

The Constitutional Court of the Republic of Kazakhstan received petitions from citizens requesting a review of the constitutionality of the first and second paragraphs of Part Five of Article 160 of the Labor Code (LC) and Parts Two and Three of Article 455 of the Civil Procedure Code (CPC).

Background of the Cases

In the first case, a citizen was dismissed from the internal affairs bodies based on the findings of an internal service investigation. The courts dismissed his claim

for reinstatement on the grounds that he had missed the statutory time limit for filing a lawsuit established by the challenged provisions of the Labor Code, without taking into account the specific nature of employment relations within law enforcement agencies.

Subsequently, during criminal proceedings, the court found no evidence that the applicant had committed violations of official discipline. However, the existing provisions of the Civil Procedure Code did not allow him to seek a review of the earlier court decisions denying reinstatement.

In the second case, the applicant also challenged the provisions of the Civil Procedure Code, arguing that they restricted her right to judicial protection by allowing contradictory judicial acts to coexist. The court refused to review the civil judgment, stating that a decision of a specialized administrative court did not constitute a valid ground for reopening the case.

Position of the Constitutional Court

Following its review, the Constitutional Court noted that the challenged provisions of the Civil Procedure Code violate the general principle governing the review of judicial acts based on newly discovered or new circumstances. As a result, citizens are deprived of the opportunity to protect their rights in situations where another court decision that has entered into legal force disproves the facts that formed the basis of an earlier judgment. The Court concluded that the challenged provisions of both the Labor Code and the Civil Procedure Code restrict a citizen's right to effective judicial protection.

Conclusions of the Constitutional Court

In its final decision, the Constitutional Court declared the reviewed provisions inconsistent with the Constitution and ruled that, until amendments are introduced into labor legislation, disputes concerning the reinstatement of employees of law enforcement agencies and other state bodies must be subject to a one-year period for filing a claim in court. The Court further held that, until the relevant legislation is amended, courts reviewing civil cases on the basis of newly discovered or new circumstances should be guided by Part One of Article 455 of the Civil Procedure Code, which provides that grounds for review include legal facts previously unknown to the court that are of substantial significance for the proper resolution of the earlier case.

The full text of the Constitutional Court's Regulatory Resolution is available at <https://www.gov.kz/memleket/entities/ksrk/documents/details/1026176?lang=ru>