

**Speaker:** Tarja Koskela (University of Eastern Finland, Finland)

**Presentation title:** Decision not to prosecute on the basis of unreasonableness or inappropriateness

Criminal law and criminalisation are the last resort of social policy to solve the problems of not desirable behaviour. However, the criminal justice system can only work effectively when criminal liability is also implemented in practice. In criminal law, punishment is one of the most important means used in criminal policy. Whereas the objective of criminal policy has been defined as minimising the suffering and costs of crime, humanity and rationality. Discretionary non-prosecution contributes to the goal of minimising criminal suffering. It gives the prosecutor wide discretion, in which case it ultimately comes to valuation solutions. In Finland, the prosecutor shall bring a charge for a suspected offence if the prosecutor deems that: (1) it is punishable according to law; (2) the right for prosecution is not time-barred; and (3) probable grounds exist to support the guilt of the suspect. Even though there are probable grounds to support the guilt of the suspected person, the prosecutor may waive charges on the grounds laid down in law. According to Criminal Procedure Act, unless an important public or private interest requires otherwise, the prosecutor may decide not to prosecute if criminal proceedings and punishment are to be deemed unreasonable or purposeless in view of a settlement reached by the suspect in the offence and the injured party, the other action of the suspect in the offence to prevent or remove the effects of the offence, the personal circumstances of the suspect in the offence, the other consequences of the act to the suspected person, the welfare and health care measures undertaken and the other circumstances. I analyse decisions not to prosecute made on the basis described above in relation to crimes in general and especially in crimes against animals.