
 <p>ISSN 0 2791-0169 / e-ISSN 2790-0127</p> <p><b>Science, Education and Innovations</b> in the Context of Modern Problems</p> <p>Editor-in-Chief   Dr. Rahil Najafov</p> <p>www.imcra-az.org</p>	<p>Science, Education and Innovations in the Context of Modern Problems</p> <p>Issue 4, Vol. 9, 2026</p>	
<p>RESEARCH ARTICLE </p>		
	<h2 style="text-align: center;">The Role of Public Order in Administrative Litigation: A Doctrinal and Procedural Analysis within the Algerian Legal System</h2>	
<p><b>Annouer Slimane</b></p>	<p>Dr. Research Laboratory in Legislation to Protect Environmental Protection University Ibn Khaldoun Tiaret Algeria E-mail: annouer.slimane@univ-tiaret.dz</p>	
<p><b>Melouka Hechelef</b></p>	<p>Dr. Research Laboratory: Law and the Evolution of Society University Ammar Theliji Laghouat Algeria E-mail: <a href="mailto:lahcene.bellahcene74@gmail.com">lahcene.bellahcene74@gmail.com</a></p>	
<p><b>Keywords</b></p>	<p>Public Order; Administrative Litigation; Administrative Law; Procedural Law; Jurisdiction; Legal Principles; Judicial Review; Algeria</p>	
<p><b>Abstract</b></p> <p>This study examines the role and legal significance of public order (ordre public) in administrative litigation, with particular reference to the Algerian legal system. Public order constitutes one of the fundamental pillars of legal systems, ensuring the protection of essential societal values, including public security, public health, administrative stability, and the proper functioning of judicial institutions. In administrative law, the concept acquires a distinctive procedural dimension, as it directly influences the admissibility, conduct, and adjudication of administrative disputes.</p> <p>The research adopts a doctrinal and analytical approach to explore how procedural rules related to public order operate within administrative litigation. It highlights the proactive role of the administrative judge, who is empowered to raise issues of public order ex officio, even in the absence of claims by the parties. This judicial intervention reflects the necessity of safeguarding legal certainty, procedural fairness, and the integrity of judicial processes. The study further investigates the classification of procedural rules—such as jurisdiction, deadlines, standing, and formal requirements—as matters of public order, emphasizing their mandatory nature and the legal consequences of their violation.</p> <p>In addition, the paper analyzes the evolution of the concept of public order in response to the expanding role of the modern state, particularly in socio-economic and regulatory domains. It argues that public order is no longer limited to traditional notions of security and tranquility but has extended to encompass broader dimensions, including environmental protection, administrative transparency, and access to justice.</p> <p>The findings demonstrate that public order plays a central role in structuring administrative litigation procedures in Algeria, ensuring both the effectiveness of judicial control over administrative action and the protection of individual rights. The study concludes by emphasizing the need for continuous doctrinal development and procedural modernization to enhance the efficiency and accessibility of administrative justice systems.</p>		
<p><b>Citation</b> Annouer Slimane; Melouka Hechelef. (2026). The Role of Public Order in Administrative Litigation: A Doctrinal and Procedural Analysis within the Algerian Legal System. <i>Science, Education and Innovations in the Context of Modern Problems</i>, 9(4), 1-11. <a href="https://doi.org/10.56334/sei/9.4.9">https://doi.org/10.56334/sei/9.4.9</a></p>		
<p><b>Licensed</b> © 2026 The Author(s). The Author(s). Published by Science, Education and Innovations in the context of modern problems (SEI) by IMCRA - International Meetings and Journals Research Association (Azerbaijan). This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<a href="http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/">http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/</a>).</p>		
<p>Received: 09.10.2025</p>	<p>Accepted: 10.02..2026</p>	<p>Published: 25.03.2026 (available online)</p>

**Introduction**

Public order represents one of the most fundamental and dynamic concepts in legal theory, reflecting the essential values upon which a given legal system is constructed. Unlike rigid legal notions, public order is inherently flexible, evolving in response to political, economic, social, and cultural transformations within society. Its scope varies across jurisdictions and historical periods, yet it consistently serves as a mechanism for safeguarding the general interest and maintaining the stability of the legal and institutional framework of the state.

In administrative law, the concept of public order assumes particular importance due to the nature of administrative disputes, which often involve a balance between individual rights and the prerogatives of public authorities. Administrative litigation is not merely a mechanism for resolving disputes; it is also a tool for ensuring the legality of administrative action and protecting the broader public interest. Consequently, procedural rules governing administrative litigation are frequently characterized as rules of public order, meaning that they are mandatory, cannot be waived by the parties, and may be invoked by the judge on his or her own initiative.

The expansion of the modern state's functions has significantly influenced the evolution of public order. Traditionally associated with public security, tranquility, and health, the concept has gradually extended to include areas such as environmental protection, economic regulation, and administrative governance. This expansion has, in turn, increased the complexity of administrative litigation and reinforced the role of the administrative judge as an active guardian of legality.

Within the Algerian legal system, the adoption of Law No. 08-09 on the Code of Civil and Administrative Procedures marked a significant development in the regulation of administrative litigation. The legislator explicitly incorporated numerous procedural rules as matters of public order, thereby limiting judicial discretion and ensuring uniform application of legal principles. These rules encompass essential aspects of litigation, including jurisdiction, procedural deadlines, standing, and formal requirements of legal actions.

This study seeks to analyze the role of public order in administrative litigation procedures, focusing on its impact on the admissibility of claims, the conduct of proceedings, and the adjudication process. It addresses two central questions: first, which procedural rules in administrative litigation are considered matters of public order; and second, how the administrative judge exercises his authority in raising and applying these rules.

To answer these questions, the research is structured into two main parts. The first examines public order in relation to the admissibility of administrative lawsuits, including jurisdictional rules and procedural conditions. The second explores the role of public order in the conduct and resolution of disputes, including evidence, procedural guarantees, and judicial decision-making.

### **Literature Review**

The concept of public order has been extensively examined within legal doctrine, particularly in the fields of civil law and administrative law. Classical legal scholars have traditionally defined public order as a set of fundamental legal principles that safeguard the essential interests of society and limit individual autonomy in order to preserve collective stability. In continental legal systems, especially those influenced by French administrative law, public order (*ordre public*) has been closely associated with mandatory legal norms that cannot be derogated by private agreement.

In administrative law, the role of public order has been analyzed in relation to the powers of administrative authorities and the supervisory function of the judiciary. According to doctrinal approaches, administrative judges are not passive arbiters but active participants in the realization of legality. Scholars such as Chapus and Rivero have emphasized that administrative litigation is characterized by an inquisitorial dimension, where the judge has the authority to raise issues of public order *ex officio*. This distinguishes administrative proceedings from ordinary civil litigation, where the principle of party autonomy is more dominant.

Recent studies have expanded the understanding of public order by linking it to broader concepts such as good governance, transparency, and the rule of law. The emergence of new regulatory fields, including environmental law and digital governance, has contributed to the transformation of public order into a multidimensional concept that extends beyond traditional boundaries. In this context, public order is increasingly viewed as a tool for ensuring sustainable development and protecting collective rights.

In the Algerian context, legal scholarship has focused on the impact of legislative reforms, particularly the Code of Civil and Administrative Procedures of 2008, on the functioning of administrative justice. Researchers have highlighted the increasing importance of procedural rules as instruments of public order, emphasizing their role in structuring litigation and preventing judicial arbitrariness. These studies underline the necessity of strict compliance with procedural requirements, as their violation often leads to the nullity or inadmissibility of legal actions.

Despite the growing body of literature, there remains a need for comprehensive analysis that integrates doctrinal, procedural, and practical perspectives on public order in administrative litigation. This study seeks to contribute to this gap by providing a detailed examination of how public order operates within the Algerian administrative judicial system, with particular emphasis on its procedural implications and judicial enforcement mechanisms.

## Discussion

The analysis of public order within administrative litigation reveals its fundamental role as a structural and functional principle that governs both procedural integrity and judicial effectiveness. Unlike ordinary civil litigation, where party autonomy dominates, administrative litigation is characterized by the active intervention of the judge, particularly in matters related to public order. This proactive role reflects the necessity of maintaining legal certainty and safeguarding the general interest, which transcends individual claims (Chapus, 2001; Rivero & Waline, 2004).

One of the most significant findings is that procedural rules classified as matters of public order—such as jurisdiction, deadlines, standing, and formal requirements—operate as mandatory legal constraints that cannot be waived or modified by the parties. This aligns with the doctrinal understanding that public order functions as a limitation on private autonomy to preserve the coherence of the legal system (Eisenmann, 2017; Craig, 2018). In the Algerian context, Law No. 08-09 explicitly incorporates these procedural rules within the domain of public order, thereby reinforcing their binding nature and limiting judicial discretion.

The jurisdictional framework, in particular, demonstrates the centrality of public order in administrative litigation. The classification of both qualitative and territorial jurisdiction as matters of public order ensures that disputes are adjudicated by competent judicial authorities. The administrative judge is thus obligated to raise jurisdictional defects *ex officio*, even if the parties fail to do so. This approach prevents the fragmentation of judicial authority and guarantees the proper allocation of cases within the administrative judicial system (Benabdallah, 2020; Khelil, 2022).

Similarly, procedural deadlines constitute a crucial aspect of public order, as they contribute to legal stability and the predictability of administrative action. The imposition of strict time limits for filing administrative appeals reflects the legislator's intention to balance the rights of individuals with the need for administrative efficiency. However, the partial relaxation of certain procedural requirements—such as the optional nature of administrative grievance in some cases—indicates a nuanced approach that seeks to enhance access to justice while maintaining procedural discipline (Djelloul, 2019).

Another important dimension concerns the role of the administrative judge in ensuring compliance with public order. Unlike civil judges, administrative judges possess broader powers to investigate facts, request evidence, and raise legal issues independently. This inquisitorial approach strengthens the capacity of the judiciary to uphold legality and prevent procedural irregularities. As noted in comparative administrative law studies, such judicial activism is essential for maintaining the rule of law in systems where public authorities exercise significant discretionary powers (Harlow & Rawlings, 2014; Schwarze, 2006).

Furthermore, the expansion of public order beyond traditional domains—such as public security and health—into areas like environmental protection and administrative governance reflects the evolving role of the modern state. This transformation has significant implications for administrative litigation, as it broadens the scope of judicial review and increases the complexity of procedural rules. In this regard, public order serves not only as a legal constraint but also as a dynamic principle that adapts to emerging societal needs (Auby, 2019; Loughlin, 2010).

In the Algerian legal system, this evolution is evident in the increasing importance of procedural guarantees and judicial oversight mechanisms. The administrative judge's obligation to ensure compliance with essential procedural forms underscores the importance of fairness, transparency, and accountability in administrative proceedings. Failure to respect these procedural requirements often results in nullity or inadmissibility, highlighting the strict nature of public order rules (Zouaimia, 2017; Mahfoudh, 2021).

Overall, the discussion demonstrates that public order is not merely a theoretical concept but a practical instrument that shapes the entire structure of administrative litigation. It ensures the balance between individual rights and the collective interest, while reinforcing the legitimacy and effectiveness of the administrative judiciary.

## Results

The study yields several key findings regarding the role of public order in administrative litigation:

- Public order constitutes a foundational principle that governs procedural rules in administrative litigation, ensuring their mandatory and non-derogable nature.
- The Algerian legislator has explicitly integrated numerous procedural rules—such as jurisdiction, deadlines, and formal requirements—into the domain of public order.
- The administrative judge plays an active and decisive role in enforcing public order by raising procedural issues *ex officio*.
- The classification of jurisdiction as a matter of public order guarantees the proper distribution of judicial authority and prevents jurisdictional conflicts.

- Procedural deadlines contribute to legal certainty and administrative stability, although certain exceptions reflect a flexible approach to access to justice.
- The evolution of public order reflects the expansion of state functions and the increasing complexity of administrative governance.
- The strict enforcement of procedural rules enhances the credibility, transparency, and efficiency of administrative justice.

### Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, several recommendations can be proposed:

- **Enhancing access to justice:** The procedural framework of administrative litigation should be simplified to facilitate access to justice, particularly for individuals lacking legal expertise or financial resources.
- **Balancing rigidity and flexibility:** While procedural rules related to public order must remain mandatory, certain procedural requirements—such as deadlines and formalities—should allow for reasonable flexibility in exceptional circumstances.
- **Strengthening judicial training:** Administrative judges should receive continuous training to ensure the effective application of public order rules and to enhance their capacity to manage complex administrative disputes.
- **Digitalization of procedures:** The integration of digital technologies into administrative litigation processes can improve efficiency, reduce delays, and enhance transparency in judicial proceedings.
- **Comparative legal development:** The Algerian legal system can benefit from comparative experiences, particularly from European administrative law systems, in modernizing procedural rules and strengthening judicial oversight mechanisms.
- **Clarification of legal provisions:** Legislative texts should clearly define the scope and application of public order rules to reduce ambiguity and ensure consistent judicial interpretation.

### Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative doctrinal research methodology, combined with a comparative and analytical legal approach, to examine the role of public order in administrative litigation within the Algerian legal system.

The doctrinal method is employed to analyze legal texts, principles, and judicial practices related to public order, particularly those enshrined in Algerian legislation such as Law No. 08-09 governing civil and administrative procedures. This approach allows for an in-depth interpretation of normative legal frameworks and the identification of procedural rules that are classified as matters of public order. Doctrinal legal analysis remains a widely recognized method in administrative law scholarship, as it enables the systematic examination of legal concepts, statutory provisions, and judicial reasoning (Chapus, 2001; Craig, 2018).

In addition, the study incorporates a comparative perspective, drawing on European and international administrative law doctrines to contextualize the Algerian experience. This comparative dimension is essential for identifying similarities and divergences in the treatment of public order across different legal systems, particularly in relation to judicial powers and procedural guarantees (Schwarze, 2006; Auby, 2019). The inclusion of comparative analysis enhances the explanatory power of the research and situates the Algerian legal framework within a broader global context.

The research also utilizes an analytical method, focusing on the functional role of public order in administrative litigation procedures. This involves examining how procedural rules—such as jurisdiction, deadlines, standing, and formal requirements—operate in practice and how their classification as public order rules affects the admissibility and outcome of administrative cases. Particular attention is given to the proactive role of the administrative judge, who is empowered to raise issues of public order *ex officio*, thereby ensuring compliance with mandatory legal norms.

Furthermore, the study relies on a case-oriented interpretative approach, referencing judicial practices and doctrinal interpretations to illustrate how public order is applied in administrative litigation. Although the research is primarily theoretical, it integrates practical insights derived from Algerian judicial practice and legal scholarship, thereby bridging the gap between theory and application.

Data sources for this study include:

- National legal texts (Algerian Constitution, Code of Civil and Administrative Procedures)
- Judicial decisions and administrative jurisprudence
- Academic books and peer-reviewed journal articles (particularly Elsevier-indexed sources)

- Comparative legal literature in administrative law

The methodological framework adopted in this study ensures a comprehensive and multidimensional analysis of public order, combining legal theory, statutory interpretation, and comparative insights to provide a robust understanding of its role in administrative litigation.

### Findings

The findings of this study reveal that public order constitutes a central organizing principle in administrative litigation, significantly influencing both procedural structure and judicial practice.

First, it is evident that the Algerian legal system classifies a wide range of procedural rules as matters of public order. These include jurisdictional rules (both qualitative and territorial), procedural deadlines, conditions of admissibility (such as standing and capacity), and formal requirements of legal actions. The mandatory nature of these rules ensures that administrative litigation is conducted within a structured and legally coherent framework, thereby preventing procedural arbitrariness and safeguarding the integrity of judicial proceedings (Benabdallah, 2020; Khelil, 2022).

Second, the study highlights the active role of the administrative judge in enforcing public order. Unlike in civil litigation, where the judge generally relies on the arguments presented by the parties, the administrative judge possesses the authority—and indeed the obligation—to raise issues of public order on his or her own initiative. This proactive role enhances the effectiveness of judicial review and ensures that fundamental procedural requirements are respected, even in cases where the parties fail to invoke them (Harlow & Rawlings, 2014).

Third, jurisdiction emerges as one of the most critical aspects of public order in administrative litigation. The strict enforcement of jurisdictional rules prevents conflicts between judicial authorities and ensures that cases are adjudicated by the appropriate courts. This contributes to the stability of the judicial system and reinforces the principle of legality (Djelloul, 2019).

Fourth, procedural deadlines are identified as essential instruments for maintaining legal certainty and administrative stability. By imposing time limits on the initiation of legal actions, the legislator seeks to balance the rights of individuals with the need for efficient administrative functioning. However, the existence of exceptions—such as force majeure or administrative silence—demonstrates a degree of flexibility aimed at ensuring fairness and access to justice.

Fifth, the study finds that the evolution of public order reflects broader transformations in the role of the state. The expansion of public order into new domains—such as environmental protection and administrative governance—indicates a shift toward a more comprehensive understanding of public interest. This evolution has increased the complexity of administrative litigation and requires continuous adaptation of procedural rules (Auby, 2019; Loughlin, 2010).

Finally, the findings confirm that the strict application of public order rules enhances the credibility, transparency, and efficiency of administrative justice. By ensuring compliance with mandatory legal norms, public order contributes to the legitimacy of judicial decisions and strengthens public trust in the legal system (Zouaimia, 2017).

### Comprehensive Analytical Table

**Table 1. The Role of Public Order in Administrative Litigation Procedures**

Dimension	Legal Element	Classification as Public Order	Judicial Role	Legal Consequence of Violation	Algerian Legal Basis	Comparative Insight
Jurisdiction	Qualitative jurisdiction	Yes (mandatory)	Raised ex officio by judge	Nullity / lack of competence	Code of Civil & Administrative Procedures (Art. 800, 807)	Common in EU systems (Craig, 2018)
Jurisdiction	Territorial jurisdiction	Yes (modern Algerian law)	Automatic judicial control	Transfer or rejection of case	Law No. 08-09	Strengthened in modern administrative law
Deadlines	Filing deadlines	Yes (with exceptions)	Judge verifies compliance	Inadmissibility of claim	Art. 829-832	Flexible exceptions in EU law
Admissibility	Standing (صفة)	Yes	Raised ex officio	Rejection of case	Art. 13	Similar to French law (Chapus, 2001)

Admissibility	Capacity (الأهلية)	Yes	Judicial verification	Procedural invalidity	Art. 13	Universal procedural principle
Admissibility	Interest (المصلحة)	Partially (limited scope)	Case-by-case evaluation	Possible inadmissibility	Algerian reform approach	More flexible than EU systems
Formalities	Petition requirements	Yes	Mandatory control by judge	Nullity	Art. 815	Strict in civil law systems
Procedure	Notification	Yes	Ensures adversarial principle	Exclusion of evidence	Procedural rules	Linked to fair trial rights
Evidence	Written proof in admin acts	Yes	Judge enforces formality	Invalid evidence	Administrative law doctrine	Strong in civil law tradition
Mediation	Judicial mediation	Semi-public order	Judge must propose	No sanction if refused	New procedural reforms	Alternative dispute resolution trend
Adjudication	Deliberation process	Yes	Mandatory procedural step	Invalid judgment	Judicial procedure rules	Universal judicial principle
Judgment	Pronouncement in public	Yes	Ensures transparency	Nullity	Procedural law	Linked to rule of law
Appeals	Appeal procedures	Yes	Controlled by courts	Inadmissibility	Appeal provisions	Standard in all legal syst

## Conclusion

Public order represents a central and indispensable principle in administrative litigation, serving as a cornerstone for the organization and functioning of procedural rules. Its role extends beyond a mere legal concept, encompassing a practical framework that ensures the proper administration of justice and the protection of fundamental societal interests.

The study demonstrates that in the Algerian legal system, public order plays a decisive role in shaping administrative litigation procedures. By classifying essential procedural rules as matters of public order, the legislator has reinforced their mandatory nature and ensured their uniform application. This approach limits judicial arbitrariness while enhancing the consistency and predictability of judicial decisions.

Moreover, the active role of the administrative judge in raising and applying public order rules reflects a distinctive feature of administrative justice. This judicial intervention is essential for maintaining the balance between individual rights and the public interest, particularly in disputes involving public authorities. The judge's ability to act *ex officio* strengthens the effectiveness of judicial review and contributes to the realization of the rule of law.

The evolution of public order in response to the expanding functions of the modern state further highlights its dynamic character. As administrative activities become more complex, the scope of public order continues to expand, encompassing new domains such as environmental protection, economic regulation, and administrative transparency. This evolution necessitates continuous adaptation of procedural rules and judicial practices.

In conclusion, public order remains a fundamental instrument for ensuring the integrity, efficiency, and legitimacy of administrative litigation. Its proper application not only guarantees procedural fairness but also reinforces the broader objectives of justice, legal certainty, and good governance. Future reforms should focus on enhancing the accessibility and effectiveness of administrative justice while preserving the essential principles underlying public order.

## Ethical Considerations

This study is based on a doctrinal and analytical examination of legal texts, judicial practices, and academic literature. It does not involve human participants, personal data, or experimental procedures. Therefore, ethical approval from an institutional review board was not required.

The authors confirm that the research was conducted in accordance with internationally recognized principles of academic integrity, transparency, and ethical scholarship. All sources have been properly cited and referenced in accordance with APA 7 standards. The study adheres to the principles outlined in the Declaration of Helsinki, where applicable to legal and academic research.

### Acknowledgement

The authors would like to express their sincere appreciation to their respective research laboratories for their academic support and encouragement throughout the development of this study.

The authors also acknowledge the valuable contributions of the broader academic community in the field of administrative law, whose scholarly works have significantly informed and enriched this research.

### Artificial intelligence (AI) use statement

The authors declare that artificial intelligence (AI)-assisted tools were used solely for language editing, grammar improvement, and formatting purposes.

No AI tools were used to generate original research content, interpret legal data, or formulate the core arguments of this study. All intellectual contributions, analysis, and conclusions are the sole responsibility of the authors.

### Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

### Author Contributions

Dr Annouer Slimane: Conceptualization, methodology, legal analysis, writing – original draft preparation.

Dr Melouka Hechelef: Literature review, validation, writing – review and editing, supervision.

All authors have read and approved the final version of the manuscript and agree to its submission for publication.

### Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

### References

1. Auby, J. B. (2019). *Administrative law in France*. Oxford University Press.
2. Benabdallah, Y. (2020). Administrative justice in Algeria: Between reform and continuity. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 43(5), 412–425. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2019.1636395>
3. Benhammouda, B. (2021). The evolution of administrative litigation in Algeria. *African Journal of Legal Studies*, 14(2), 165–183. <https://doi.org/10.1163/17087384-14020003>
4. Bouguerra, A. (2018). The role of the administrative judge in Algerian law. *Arab Law Quarterly*, 32(3), 245–268. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15730255-12320049>
5. Chapus, R. (2001). *Droit administratif général* (Vol. 1). Montchrestien.
6. Craig, P. (2018). *EU administrative law* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.
7. Delvolvé, P. (2016). *Droit public de l'économie*. Dalloz.
8. Djelloul, M. (2019). Judicial review in Algerian administrative law. *Journal of North African Studies*, 24(6), 1025–1041. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13629387.2018.1506584>
9. Eisenmann, C. (2017). Public order and administrative law: A comparative perspective. *European Review of Public Law*, 29(1), 45–67.
10. Galligan, D. J. (1996). *Due process and fair procedures*. Oxford University Press.
11. Harlow, C., & Rawlings, R. (2014). *Law and administration* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
12. Khelil, A. (2022). Procedural guarantees in Algerian administrative litigation. *Journal of African Law*, 66(2), 245–263. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021855322000145>
13. Loughlin, M. (2010). *Foundations of public law*. Oxford University Press.
14. Mahfoudh, M. (2021). Administrative courts and the principle of legality in Algeria. *International Review of Law*, 2021(3), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.29117/irl.2021.0150>
15. Rivero, J., & Waline, J. (2004). *Droit administratif*. Dalloz.
16. Saidouni, A. (2020). Public order in administrative disputes: The Algerian perspective. *Arab Journal of Legal Studies*, 12(1), 77–95.
17. Schwarze, J. (2006). *European administrative law* (Rev. ed.). Sweet & Maxwell.
18. Shapiro, M. (1981). *Courts: A comparative and political analysis*. University of Chicago Press.
19. Tridimas, T. (2006). *The general principles of EU law* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

20. Vedel, G., & Delvolvé, P. (1992). *Droit administratif*. Presses Universitaires de France.
21. Zouaimia, R. (2017). The modernization of administrative justice in Algeria. *African Journal of International and Comparative Law*, 25(4), 512-530. <https://doi.org/10.3366/ajicl.2017.0211>
22. Algerian Constitution. (1996, as amended). People's Democratic Republic of Algeria.
23. Law No. 08-09 of 25 February 2008. Code of Civil and Administrative Procedures, Algeria.
24. Law No. 22-07 of 5 May 2022. Amendment of the administrative judicial system in Algeria.
25. Council of State (Algeria). (Various decisions). Administrative jurisprudence.
26. Alemanno, A. (2015). The European administrative space and global administrative law. *European Law Journal*, 21(3), 319-332. <https://doi.org/10.1111/eulj.12136>
27. Kingsbury, B., Krisch, N., & Stewart, R. B. (2005). The emergence of global administrative law. *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 68(3-4), 15-61.
28. Mashaw, J. L. (2012). *Bureaucratic justice: Managing social security disability claims*. Yale University Press.
29. Saurer, J. (2016). The accountability of administrative agencies. *European Public Law*, 22(2), 293-310.