Journal of Danubian Studies and Research

Modern Intellectual Slavery

Mihaela Agheniței[1], Oana Chicoș[2]

Abstract: Slavery from the medieval Latin *sclavus - slavus* refers to the human condition of persons (slaves) who work for a master without remuneration and who do not have rights over their own person. Slaves must obey all orders of the master from birth or capture (transition from freedom to slavery) to death or release (transition from slavery to freedom). From a historical point of view, slavery means, by definition, the denial of equality between people, and philosophically slaves were considered a separate and inferior species. This is also the condition of the expert before the court. The court may order at its discretion, without recourse to another expert in the field, the cutting of explanatory estimates regarding the costs involved in carrying out expertise's in civil or criminal cases, the use of expert reports in cases after their annulment and taking the money back. The works of experts are most often accompanied copyright because many experts come from academic field, people who most often publish their work for teaching purposes. The profession of expert is a liberal profession, but through legislation and the attitude of magistrates, it has become a slavery, because most of the time the works of experts remain unpaid or at best, poorly paid far below their intrinsic value.

Keywords: expert; courts; slaves; copyrights; work

1. Introduction

We started the research from a case study, as there are many at national level, because there is the possibility created by law, to determine at discretion the value of expertise performed by experts on the lists of the Ministry of Justice, by the courts, which considers the expert a subject who can work for free or unjustly fined, who

[1] Senior Lecturer, PhD, "Dunărea de Jos" University of Galati, Romania, Legal Research Institute – Romanian Academy, ESIL member, ELI member, Romania, Address: 111 Domneasca Str., Galati 800201, Romania, Corresponding author: aghenitei.mihaela@ugal.ro.
[2] Senior Lecturer, PhD, "Dunărea de Jos" University of Galati, Romania, Address: 111 Domneasca Str., Galati 800201, Romania, E-mail: oana.chicos@ugal.ro.

has only obligations but not rights before magistrates and who bears a regime similar to that of slaves on plantations. If their work does not correspond to the idea formed by the magistrate or lawyer, from the other evidence in the file, there is a possibility that the expertise will be canceled and the advance payment for transport and research expenses on the spot will be reimbursed in full, in the conditions in which 10% are already transferred to the Ministry of Justice-money that are no longer recoverable, and the paper can be used in the motivation of the decision, although it is requested for return for publication.

2. Body of Paper

Thus, in the analyzed case, on 15.10.2015 an expert was appointed by the court T. B., in a civil case, to perform a technical judicial expertise in the civil litigation of servitude between B. D. and C. A., lawyer in B.B.

The expert summoned the parties on 23.11.2015 respecting the entire summons procedure, but the lawyer C. A. refused to lift the summons, reason for which the expert summoned the parties again on 21.12.2015, when the expert also took photos of the participants in the expertise, asking those present to sign for compliance, which was not considered by the court of first instance and the court of appeal. Moreover, Judge R. E. fined her 500 lei for not fulfilling the summons procedure. The investigation was also attended by C. A.'s lawyer, H. M., who did not admit that she was present at the investigation, although she had signed the presence, coming in support of her client's criminal activity (Negrut & Stancu, 2013, pp. 110-115).

Although it was proved that the procedure was followed, the desire to have in the case file another expertise that would be favorable to the lawyer C. A., made the judges involved in the crime completely cancel the expertise made by me and turn to an expert which was not certified by the relevant ministry, and which should have refrained from carrying out expertise where it was not competent.

The expert attached her attestations to the case file:

University training

- Engineer in the field of Civil Engineering graduate of Gh Asachi Technical University of Iasi, Faculty of Civil, Industrial and Agricultural Constructions 1976.
- Doctor in Seismic Engineering 1994.

- University professor OVIDIUS University of Constanta, holder of disciplines: Civil Constructions, Reinforced concrete constructions, Consolidation and rehabilitation of constructions.
- PhD supervisor at OVIDIUS Constanta University in the field of Civil Engineering 2006.

Acquired competences

- Judicial technical expert certified by the Ministry of Justice 1991 in the field of civil and industrial constructions.
- Highly specialized technical expert of the Ministry of Justice since 1996.
- Verifier of construction projects regarding the resistance and stability of masonry, reinforced concrete, and wood constructions 1993 certified by MRDPA (former MLPAT) in accordance with Law 10/1995.
- Technical expert in the field of strength and stability of constructions, industrial and agricultural civil constructions, real estate appraiser certified by the Ministry of Justice 2011.
- Expert certified by the Ministry of Justice for works carried out in Romania with the support of the EU since 2007.
- Expert certified by the Ministry of Culture for the rehabilitation of historical monuments in accordance with Law 422/2001 of 2004.
- Project verifier certified by the Ministry of Culture and National Identity for the rehabilitation of historical monuments.
- Project manager certified by the Ministry of Culture and National Identity for the rehabilitation of historical monuments.
- Specialist certified by the Ministry of Culture and National Identity for the rehabilitation of historical monuments.
- MDRAP certified non-destructive testing specialist.
- MDRAP certified energy auditor.
- Real estate appraiser expert, ANEVAR member.
- Expert evaluator of commercial companies, member of ANEVAR - UNEAR.
- Land assessor certified by the Ministry of Education and Research.
- Investment consultant based on CNVM Decision 1368/1997.

Member of the following professional associations:

- CRIFST Southeastern Science History Commission within the Romanian Academy.
- Asian Real Estate Society.

- American Real Estate and Urban Economics Association.
- National Union of Historic Monuments Restorers.
- Zonal Commission of Historical Monuments.
- The Body of Technical Experts from Romania and president between October 2015 and November 2017.
- General Association of Romanian Engineers.
- Association of Structural Design Engineers.
- The National Association of Evaluators in Romania.

It was normal for the courts of first instance and appeal to ask the appointed expert to carry out the expertise again, the same documents, which did not happen.

Moreover, although he requested that the work be returned to him, it was still used even in the statement of reasons for the solutions in question.

The work of the expert is, as evidenced by the highlighted training, a work that can be published as a research paper, which is why he considered that it was abusively taken from its heritage.

The fact that he worked unpaid hours and worked at the level presented without being remunerated, is a modern intellectual slavery, as it is defined in the specialized books.

Not only did he not have the necessary qualification, but the expert appointed in place of the expert also made unrealistic statements about the possibility of affecting the building, with consequences that will affect the strength of the building.

To put pressure on the expert and a judge from the court panel, C. A. filed a criminal complaint against them, which resulted in dismissal, the law enforcement bodies not finding any illegality in carrying out the activity of the expert as the designated expert in question.

Regarding the cancellation of the expertise, this was done in violation of the provisions of GEO no. 2/2000 republished after the last modification, respectively without respecting the limitation period of 30 days expressly provided by law.

Moreover, the latter ordinance regulates the entire activity of judicial experts, allowing the courts to take discretionary measures.

Between October 2018 and March 2019, the European Commission carried out checks on the operation of the G.U. and identified several shortcomings.

With regard to Romania, the European Commission issued, on 06.06.2019, the Letter of Delay - 2018/2393, C (2019) 4158 final, in which it drew attention that the Romanian authorities have established a One-Stop Shop, called G.U. but that it has a limited scope and, as such, does not comply with the requirements of Directive 2006/123 / EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 December 2006 on services in the internal market, hereinafter referred to as on services, as well as Directive 2005/36 / EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 7 September 2005 on the recognition of professional qualifications, as amended by Directive 2013/55 / EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 November 2013 amending Directive 2005/36 / EC on the recognition of professional qualifications and Regulation (EU) No 182/2011. 1204/2012 on administrative cooperation through the Internal Market Information System (IMI Regulation), OJ L 255, 30.9.2005, hereinafter referred to as the Professional Qualifications Directive.

The Services Directive establishes the general legal framework aimed at facilitating the exercise of the freedom of establishment for service providers and the free movement of services, while maintaining a high level of service.

The Professional Qualifications Directive lays down rules according to which a Member State, which makes access to or pursuit of a regulated profession conditional on the possession of a particular professional qualification, recognizes professional qualifications obtained in another Member State which allow the holder of those qualifications to have access to and pursue the same profession in that Member State.

The Services Directive contains provisions concerning the right to information of both service providers and beneficiaries, as well as the right of service providers to carry out procedures by electronic means.

According to these provisions, Member States are obliged to create a G.U., and to ensure that both information and electronic procedures are accessible and made available to providers through the G.U.

Regarding Romania, the European Commission issued, on 06.06.2019, the Letter of delay - 2018/2393, C (2019) 4158 final, in which it drew attention that the Romanian authorities have established a G.U., but that it has a limited scope and, as such, does not comply with the requirements set out in the Services Directive and the Professional Qualifications Directive. Even when providing such information for a particular sector, it has some shortcomings, which raise issues under the same directive.

Regarding the achievement of the objective of fully fulfilling the procedures at a distance and by electronic means through the G.U., the Commission is of the opinion that "fulfillment of a procedure", mentioned in art. 6 para. (1) and to art. 8 para. (1) of the Services Directive, contains all the steps that the service provider must go through to obtain from the competent authority a formal decision or an implicit decision on access to or exercise of a service activity.

The European Commission emphasizes in the Letter of Delay that a procedure requiring the user to submit a physical document does not comply with the requirements set out in art. 6 para. (1) and to art. 8 para. (1) of the Services Directive or to art. 57a of the Procedural Qualifications Directive.

To be able to run in full through the G.U., the procedures should comply with the following requirements:

- the documents necessary for the recognition of the professional qualification can be submitted in photocopy.
- certified copies of the documents may be requested only "if there are justified doubts and when strictly necessary".
- it is not necessary to fulfill any special formality meant to certify the authenticity of the document.

These union legislative requirements are transposed into national legislation by several primary level normative acts (such as Law no. 200/2004) or by amendments to special normative acts regulating certain professions, including Government Ordinance no. 2/2000 regarding the organization of the activity of judicial and extrajudicial technical expertise and Government Ordinance no. 75/2000 regarding the organization of the forensic expertise activity.

From the perspective of the obligations established in charge of the Romanian competent authorities for each regulated profession, at points 22 and 23 of Annex no. 3 of Law no. 200/2004 designates the Ministry of Justice as the corresponding competent authority, among others, for the professional qualifications of judicial technical expert and forensic expert.

In Romania, the platform "Electronic point of single contact" was established, which fulfills the role of One-Stop Shop, application in which the Ministry of Justice operates as a competent authority, among others, for the professional qualification of judicial technical expert and forensic expert in the case of citizens' requests. other Member States of the European Union or belonging to the European Economic Area, as well as those formulated by Romanian citizens who have obtained the necessary

professional qualifications in another Member State of the European Union or belonging to the European Economic Area, who may acquire these professional qualifications according to the Ordinance Government no. 2/2000 regarding the organization of the activity of judicial and extrajudicial technical expertise and the Government Ordinance no. 75/2000 regarding the organization of the forensic expertise activity.

Therefore, for the applications submitted through the Electronic Single Contact Point, the provisions of the two mentioned normative acts apply, according to which the applications must be accompanied by certain supporting documents, among which the "legalized copy" of the document attesting the professional qualification of judicial technical expert or expert Forensic scientist in the state of origin.

Analyzing the provisions of the two directives mentioned above, the criticisms made by the European Commission in the Letter of Delay, as well as the invitation to the Romanian authorities to take the necessary measures to ensure online compliance with all procedures and formalities occasioned by the process of recognition of professional qualifications, in relation to the provisions of Government Ordinance no. 2/2000 regarding the organization of the activity of judicial and extrajudicial technical expertise and with the provisions of the Government Ordinance no. 75/2000 regarding the organization of the forensic expertise activity, were identified in these normative acts of primary level provisions that contradict these European legislative requirements, in terms of the form of documents necessary for the recognition of professional qualification.

We specify that by Law no. 37/2009 for the amendment and completion of the Government Ordinance no. 2/2000 regarding the organization of the activity of judicial and extrajudicial technical expertise and of the Government Ordinance no. 75/2000 on the authorization of forensic experts who may be recommended by the parties to participate in the conduct of forensic examinations, the Directive on professional qualifications has been transposed, as regards judicial technical experts, extrajudicial technical experts and authorized forensic experts.

Although judicial experts are self-employed and members of civil organizations defending their rights and interests, the initiative for legislative changes belongs to the Ministry of Justice, in a position like that adopted by magistrates in relation to judicial experts.

In the present case, this discretionary attitude, of flagrant violation of the provisions of the law, precisely to favor the offender who wanted at any cost to achieve its goal, also contradicts the C.E.D.O. on national court decisions.

As a guarantee of respect for human rights, the Convention provides in art. 6, point 1, the right of every person to a fair trial: "Every person has the right to have his or her case examined fairly, publicly and within a reasonable time by an independent and impartial tribunal established by law […]".

Free access to justice is enshrined, as a fundamental citizen right, both by art. 6 point 1 of the Convention, as well as by art. 8 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (according to which any person has the right to effectively address the competent courts against acts that violate the fundamental rights recognized by the constitution or by law) and by art. 14 point 1 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. It is also found in the provisions of art. 21 para. (1) of the Romanian Constitution, according to which any person may address the justice for the defense of his rights, freedoms and legitimate interests, no law being able to restrict the exercise of this right, according to par. (2) of the same article. At the same time, according to art. 6 para. (2) of Law no. 304/2004 on judicial organization, republished, access to justice cannot be restricted.

As the concrete procedural means that citizens can use to access the Code of Justice civil procedure provides for the request for summons and ordinary and extraordinary appeals against court decisions: appeal, recourse, appeal for annulment and review, and the Code of Criminal Procedure provides for prior complaint, appeals against measures ordered by the prosecutor during the criminal investigation and ordinary and extraordinary remedies against judgments.

The procedural means provided shall ensure that the persons concerned have access to a court which, by law, has been given jurisdiction to rule in civil or criminal matters.

This way of regulating the right of access to justice is in line with the European approach of the same concept, because, according to the Convention, the exercise of the right of access to justice involves ensuring the access of any person to a court established by law, i.e. guaranteeing a judicial procedure before which this right can be effectively realized (Johns, 2009).

However, the right to bring an action before the courts is not absolute, and limitations on the part of States are permitted, if they pursue a legitimate aim and that there is a

reasonable relationship of proportionality between the means employed and the proposed purpose[1].

According to the Convention, the right to a fair trial has several components, namely: free access to justice; examination of the case fairly, publicly and within a reasonable time; examination of the case by an independent, impartial tribunal established by law; publicity of the pronouncement of court decisions (Rosen, 2008).

These provisions are the expression of the concept of a fair trial, like that of the Anglo-Saxon countries, known as the fair trial. It calls for the establishment, throughout the trial, of a set of rules of procedure designed to strike a balance between the parties to the proceedings and the application of an organization capable of guaranteeing the independence and impartiality of judges (Karaganis, 2011).

The right to a fair trial is a component of the principle of the rule of law in a democratic society.

The Romanian system ensures the implementation of the provisions of art. 6 of the Convention. In this sense, we mention the provisions of art. 20 of the Romanian Constitution, according to which: "the constitutional provisions regarding the rights and freedoms of citizens will be interpreted and applied in accordance with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, with the pacts and other treaties to which Romania is a party. In case of discrepancy between the pacts and treaties regarding the fundamental human rights, to which Romania is a party, and the domestic laws, the international regulations take precedence".

On the other hand, the constitutional provisions contain precise regulations that provide the appropriate framework for the observance of citizens' rights in the field of justice, in a general way, and for a fair trial, in a special way.

Within the common provisions specified in Title II of the Basic Law on fundamental rights and freedoms, free access to justice is regulated as follows: "Any person may apply to the judiciary for the protection of his rights, freedoms and legitimate interests. No law may limit the exercise of this right" (art. 21).

The new Code of Civil Procedure contains a series of rules that ensure the resolution, within a reasonable time, of requests submitted to the court, regardless of their nature.

[1] Case Bellet v. France - December 4, 1995, Osman v. Great Britain - October 28, 1999, Garcia Manibardo v. Spain - February 15, 2000.

If, regarding the provisions of art. 6 point 1 of the Convention, they concern civil rights and obligations, the notion having an autonomous character, art. 6 of the new Code of Civil Procedure is applicable to all lawsuits in civil matters as well as in other matters - insofar as the laws governing them do not exclude from application the new Code of Civil Procedure.

According to these provisions, any person who is a party, regardless of his procedural capacity, in a civil proceeding or to whom the provisions of the New Code of Civil Procedure apply has the right to a fair trial, in an optimal and predictable time, by an independent, impartial, and law-abiding court.

The first guarantee granted to any litigant for the existence of a fair trial derives from the very text of art. 6, which provides "the right (of the person) to the judgment of his case (…) by a court", being as such represented by his right to a court. This judicial authority must meet the conditions of independence and impartiality and be established by law. Guarantee of a in a fair trial, the right to a court cannot be conceived in the absence of the person's initial right to apply to that court.

Unlike art. 6 para. 1 of the European Convention, the new Code of Civil Procedure expressly provides, in the content of art. 5 para. (1), the duty of the judge to receive a request addressed to the court, an obligation correlated to the right of the persons to notify the court.

The second guarantee for a fair trial concerns the requirements imposed on the trial procedure, being necessary for it to take place in an optimal and predictable term, according to art. 6 para. (1) of the new Code of Civil Procedure.

The optimal term for solving a case implies the duration that ensures the best efficiency in the administration of justice, and its predictability gives the parties the opportunity to estimate the evolution of procedural steps over time (Rosen, 2008).

Affecting the public image, questioning the professionalism of the expert, contradicts European and constitutional provisions.

The right to privacy, which also involves the development of professional life as a component part of private life, is a fundamental right guaranteed by both national and international law. Thus, making a synthesis of art. 12 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, art. 17 of the Universal Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, art. 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), art. 26, art. 27, art. art. 28, art. 29 and art. 30 of the Romanian Constitution, we conclude that everyone has the right to respect for his private and professional life, family life,

home and correspondence and no one may be subjected to any arbitrary or illegal interference in private life. First of all, we are going to clarify the notion of "privacy". Starting from the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights (hereinafter the European Court), in the light of some judgments (Van Oosterwijk v. Belgium; Schüssel v. Austria; Von Hannover v. Germany; Petrina v. Romania), the following interpretation of the notion has been introduced: the right to privacy is the right to privacy, the right to live as you wish, protected by advertising. The notion of privacy includes elements that relate to a person's identity, including his or her professional identity, such as his or her name, photograph, physical and moral integrity. The guarantee offered in art. Article 8 of the Convention is intended, in essence, to ensure the development, without external interference, of the personality of everyone in relation to his fellows.

In order not to create confusion, we should mention that art. 8 of the ECHR (which guarantees the right to privacy) has a horizontal character, meaning that it protects the individual not only from arbitrary interference by public authorities, but states will also be held liable and violations by private individuals. Thus, states can adopt some measures aimed at respecting privacy even in terms of relations between individuals. This also applies to the protection of the right to an image against abuse by third parties[1].

Another criterion from which the finding of an interference in intimate life starts is the notoriety of the person. In this regard, it is necessary to distinguish between private individuals and persons acting in a public context, as political figures, or public figures. Thus, while a person of private law unknown to the public may claim special protection of his right to privacy, this also applies to public persons in relation to their professionalism and notoriety[2] (No 2), applications Nos 40660/08 and 60641/08) (Horten, 2012).

These obligations and responsibilities may be relevant when there is a question about the attack on the reputation of private individuals and the undermining of the rights of others[3].

A second important direction followed by the jurisprudence of the Court was that of identifying the sphere of rights defended by the text, with successive changes over

[1] Case no 42409/98 of 21 February 2002 [2002] Schüssel v. Austria.
[2] Case von Hannover v. Germany
[3] Case no 28957/95 of 27.03.1996 [1996] Goodwin v. The United Kingdom.

time, especially in the sense of increasing the number and situations in which the guarantee provided by art. 1 of the Additional Protocol.

The Court's choice was to create an autonomous notion, specific to the Convention system, which it developed from the original notion contained in the text "Everyone has the right to respect for his property." In 1995 the Court explicitly stated that " the notion of property in Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 has an autonomous meaning and is obviously not limited to the ownership of tangible property: certain other rights and interests that constitute assets can be considered "property rights" and, therefore, "property" within the meaning of this provision "1-Unlike Romanian law, the Strasbourg bodies (Court and, prior to the reform made by Protocol No. 11, Human Rights) have avoided defining the right to property protected by Article 1 of the Additional Protocol, and have consistently avoided identifying gradually, through extensive interpretation, of the only provision of the Convention dealing with a right with economic content.

Moreover, the Court does not even use the term property right to identify the rights protected by art. 1 of the Additional Protocol but the notion of "good" or rights over "goods". The doctrine stated that "the right to property is the core of protected rights, but there is still a periphery with broad outlines, which may one day be protected by Article 1 of the Additional Protocol 2.

The European Court of Human Rights and, previously, the Commission have established the scope of Article 1 of Protocol no. 1 by means of a succession of judgments, in which he showed, in principle, the types of rights guaranteed by the conventional text, in other words, what is the meaning of the autonomous notion of "good" within the meaning of the Convention (https://www.coe.int/en/web/human-rights-convention, 22 August, 2022).

The notion of "good" includes, first, the right of ownership over movable and immovable property and other real rights (Horten, 2012).

According to the case law of the ECHR, the adoption of a tax rule or general legislative measures whose effect is to make the investment unprofitable, the tax rule having the nature of a "confiscation", may constitute a case of indirect expropriation.

In the sense of the ECHR practice, there is a "violation of the substance of the right to property" when there are measures of public authorities regarding the exercise of the use of property, which can be "considered, more directly, directly or indirectly, a deprivation of property".

Thus, in the case of Sporrong et Lonnroth v. Sweden (A52 (1982), the cornerstone of the ECHR case-law on de facto expropriation, the Court ruled: It is important to examine whether the situation in question does not have the meaning of a de facto expropriation" (https://www.coe.int/en/web/human-rights-convention, 29 August 2022).

The property right has a quality in addition to other subjective rights, even real ones, an immanent and irrepressible quality of it: exclusivism. The opposability of the property right is characterized by "exclusivism", so it is more energetic in relation to the other rights, especially in terms of "material intangibility" of the property.

Exclusivism expresses the vocation of this right to be necessarily sanctioned in kind, even in the absence of prejudice and despite the good faith of the one who violated the right. And the "exclusivism" of the property right is not only a matter of doctrine, but one of constitutionality, in the sense of art. 135, para. 6 of the Constitution, the inviolability of property or within the meaning of art. 44 para. 3 of the fundamental law, the interdiction of expropriation for other reasons than for a cause of public utility, established according to the law, with right and prior compensation.

Article 1 of the European Convention on Human Rights - Protection of property:

Every natural or legal person has the right to respect for his property. No one shall be deprived of his possessions except in the public interest and under the conditions laid down by law and by the general principles of international law (https://www.echr.coe.int/Pages/home.aspx?p=home, 22 August 2022).

"The right to compensation also exists when it intervenes, through measures taken by the state, within the meaning of art. 4 paragraph (2), in an enterprise that is the object of capital investment, and, through such measures, its economic substance is severely impaired".

According to the case law of the ECHR, the adoption of a tax rule or general legislative measures whose effect is to make the investment unprofitable, the tax rule having the nature of a "confiscation", may constitute a case of indirect expropriation.

The obligation of the expert by the Civil Decision pronounced in question, to the full payment of the equivalent value of the expertise carried out in question without considering the percentage of 10% of the amount transferred to the Ministry of Justice and the fees and taxes paid by the firm of the expert. Also, a free act of revenge and which attests once again that all the defendants have formed a criminal group to solve their problems in this way. Moreover, from the exhibition side of the

decision it results that my expertise report was used to motivate the decision, which thus became public, and could no longer be published for educational or research purposes.

Intellectual property (IP) refers to creations of the mind: inventions and creative expressions, literary and artistic works, drawings, names, and images used in commerce. Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) refers to the legal rights granted for certain types of IP, to protect the creations of the intellect. These rights include Industrial Property Rights (for example, patents, industrial designs, and trademarks), Copyright (copyright or creator rights), and Related Rights (rights of performers, producers, and broadcasters) (Johns, 2009).

Intellectual property is the set of rights associated with intellectual activity in the field, literary, artistic, and scientific. Intellectual property, as opposed to property in general, which is linked to the possession of material goods, has been established as an objective reality in view of "spiritual goods." It includes two categories: - literary, artistic, and scientific property; - industrial property.

Article 1 of law no. 8/1996 updated 2022 (1) The copyright on a literary, artistic, or scientific work, as well as on other works of intellectual creation is recognized and guaranteed under the conditions of this law. This right is related to the person of the author and includes moral and patrimonial attributes. (2) The work of intellectual creation is recognized and protected, independently of bringing it to public knowledge, by the simple fact of its realization, even in unfinished form.

Article 4 1. The person in whose name the work was first made public is presumed to be the author until proven otherwise.

When you create an original literary, scientific, and artistic work, such as poems, articles, films, songs, or sculptures, you are protected by copyright. Nobody apart from you has the right to make the work public or reproduce it. It is about Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works Berne Convention (1886), completed at Paris (1896), revised at Berlin (1908), completed at Berne (1914), revised at Rome (1928), at Brussels (1948), at Stockholm (1967) and at Paris (1971), and amended in 1979.

In EU countries, copyright protects your intellectual property until 70 years after your death or 70 years after the death of the last surviving author in the case of a work of joint authorship.

Outside of the EU, in any country which signed the Berne Convention the duration of copyright protection can vary but it lasts until at least 50 years after the author's death.

If you want to prove the existence of your work at a certain point in time, a registration can be useful.

Copyright protection grants you the following exclusive rights:

- economic rights – guaranteeing you have control over your work and remuneration for its use through selling or licensing;
- moral rights – usually protecting your rights to claim authorship (right of attribution) and to refuse a modification of your work (right of integrity).

3. Conclusion

Respect for human rights and especially the right to work, properly remunerated, is an attribute of the rule of law. Disregarding one's own laws should be a wake-up call for society, because from small things, a rollover leads to a reversal of the situation that contradicts the provisions of the ECHR Convention, with repercussions on the entire European system. What is more serious is the fact that all this is happening not at a lower level but at the level of those who should defend the law and justice, the work being thus an alarm signal in view of the elimination of abuses, by judiciously modifying the permissive legal provisions that it is based on the good faith of those who apply it.

4. Acknowledgment

This paper is financed from the funds of the research project carried out by the "Dunărea de Jos" University of Galati, Financing Contract no. 14713/10.05.2022.

5. Bibliography

Horten, M. (2012). *The Copyright Enforcement Enigma Internet Politics and the Telecoms Package.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Johns, A. (2009). *Piracy. The Intellectual Property Wars from Gutenberg to Gates.* The University of Chicago Press: Piracy. The Intellectual Property Wars from Gutenberg to Gates.

Karaganis, J. (2011). Media Piracy in Emerging Economies. *Social Science Research*.

Negrut, G., & Stancu, A. (2013). Legal Person – Active Topic of Corruption Infractions. *AGORA International Journal of Juridical Sciences, www.juridicaljournal.univagora.ro, No. 4*, 110-115.

Rosen, R. (2008). *Music and Copyright Oxford Oxfordshire.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

https://www.coe.int/en/web/human-rights-convention, 29 August 2022.

https://www.echr.coe.int/Pages/home.aspx?p=home, 22 August 2022.