

# Digital opportunities for promotion of multi-door courthouse concept

## Damir Valeev

Assistant to the Dean for Scientific Work. Faculty of Law of Kazan (Volga Region) Federal University. Honored Lawyer of the Republic of Tatarstan. Holder of an Advanced Doctorate in Law. Professor. E-mail: valeev55@gmail.com. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3233-2400>.

## Anas Nuriev

Deputy Director of the Kazan Branch of the Russian State University of Justice. Honored Lawyer of the Republic of Tatarstan. Holder of an Advanced Doctorate in Law. E-mail: anasnuriev@yandex.ru. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7373-5938>.

---

**Abstract:** The article presents the prospects and new horizons of realization of a multi-door courthouse concept concerning modern digitalization processes. The legal system of contemporary Russia, deprived of several ideological institutions of the Soviet-era past, faced the same problem, which was relevant for the U.S.A. when creating the multi-door courthouse concept. The procedural legislation in force up to October 2019, which provided the possibility of non-judicial forms of protection of rights since the codification of 2002, proved ineffective in creating a worthy alternative to the state judicial procedure for protecting rights. Ground has been established to introduce the multi-door courthouse concept into Russian realities in a new way: a digital multi-door courthouse. This paper analyzes the modern approach to a “multi-door courthouse” in the Russian Federation, addressing its evolution, current issues and future perspectives. To achieve the paper’s aim, the authors used comparative legal analysis to show the development of the concept in different countries and a systemic approach to study the implementation of a “multi-door courthouse” in the Russian Federation.

**Keywords:** Digital economy. Digitalization of law. Digital justice. Multi-door courthouse. Court system.

**Summary:** **1** Introduction – **2** Russian historical experience of the establishment of non-judicial forms of remedy – **3** The modern experience of the establishment of non-judicial forms of remedy in the Russian Federation – **4** Prospects of digital transformation of the “multi-door courthouse” concept in the Russian Federation – **5** Conclusion – References

---

## 1 Introduction

In the 1980s in the United States, the judicial system was under serious stress and faced a number of challenges to ensure the functioning of an effective system of subjective rights defense. Predictably, at this time the concept of “multi-door

courthouse”, proposed by Professor Sander,<sup>1</sup> immediately found supporters.<sup>2</sup> This concept was further developed in the modern period<sup>3</sup> and put on the agenda the very important issue of “access to justice” in general. “Pandemic” restrictions of 2020 and the “post-covid distance” development of society prompted the Russian doctrine to look at the implementation of the “multi-door courthouse” concept in a new digital key as the concept of “digital multi-door courthouse”, taking into account the experience of the world community.

The concept is an idea that not all disputes should be referred to a court and accompanied by complex formalized procedures that require significant material and time resources. A single center for the estimation of complaints and disputes should be created, which would get, sort and forward complaints received by the court to public authorities, which could compete with judicial procedures and offer an alternative to continue proceedings subject to non-judicial forms of protection of rights.

The employees of the center will try to resolve the conflict in one of the ways best suited to the criteria of the dispute and thus alternative ways of resolving the conflict will be institutionalized in the justice system. There are five objectives of creation of the multi-door courthouse: (1) nationals should be aware of the possible ways for dispute resolution available in their society; (2) nationals should be assisted in finding appropriate alternative forms for adjudication of their disputes; (3) rendering aid to alternative ways of protecting rights in receiving relevant applications with regard to cases and improving the level of coordination of services between judicial and non-judicial forms of protection of rights; (4) development of methods of sorting cases based on criteria that may help to choose a particular

<sup>1</sup> Address by Professor of Law at Harvard University Frank E.A. Sander at the National Conference on the Causes of Popular Dissatisfaction with the Administration of Justice (April 7-9, 1976). reprinted in *The Pound Conference*, F.R.D., 70, 79, 111, 1976.

<sup>2</sup> RAY L., CLARE A.L. The Multi-Door Courthouse Idea: Building the Courthouse of the Future... Today // *Ohio State Journal on Dispute Resolution*, 1(1), 7, 1985; FERREIRA, D.B., GROMOVA, E.A. Hyperrealistic Jurisprudence: The Digital Age and the (Un)Certainty of Judge Analytics. *Int J Semiot Law* 36, 2261, 2023; FERREIRA, D.B., GROMOVA, E. & TITOVA, E.V. The Principle of a Trial Within a Reasonable Time and JustTech: Benefits and Risks. *Hum Rights Rev*, 25, 47, 2024; KESSLER, G., FINKELSTEIN, L.J. The Evolution of a Multi-Door Courthouse, *Catholic University Law Review*, vol. 37, no. 3, 577, 1988.

<sup>3</sup> CORTES, P. Using Technology and ADR Methods to Enhance Access to Justice // *International Journal of Online Dispute Resolution*, Vol 5. Is. 1, 103, 2001; SCHMITZ, A.J. Measuring “Access to Justice” in the Rush to Digitize // *Fordham Law Review*, Vol. 88. Is. 6, 2381, 2020; RABINOVICH-EINY, O. Beyond efficiency: the transformation of court through technology. *UCLA Journal of Law & Technology*, Vol. 12. Is. 1, 1, 2008; GROMOVA, E.A., FERREIRA, D.B., BEGISHEV, I.R. ChatGPT and Other Intelligent Chatbots: Legal, Ethical and Dispute Resolution Concerns. *Revista Brasileira de Alternative Dispute Resolution – RBADR*, Belo Horizonte, ano 05, n. 10, p. 153-175, jul./dez. 2023; FERREIRA, D. B., GIOVANNINI, C., GROMOVA, E., SCHMIDT, G. R. Arbitration Chambers and trust in technology provider: Impacts of trust in technology intermediated dispute resolution proceedings”, *Technology in Society*, 68, 101872, 2022; FERREIRA, D.B., GROMOVA, E.A., FARIAS, B.O., GIOVANNINI C.J. Online Sports Betting in Brazil and conflict solution clauses, *Revista Brasileira de Alternative Dispute Resolution*, Vol. 4, nº 7, 75-86, 2020.

form of protection; and (5) stimulate sharing experience of the single center for the estimation of complaints and disputes.

Nowadays there are many followers of this concept in foreign literature<sup>4</sup> and there are many examples of the practical implementation of this concept in individual states.<sup>5</sup>

The authors of the concept associate the reasons for creation of this concept with the following reasons, which should be stated and which are becoming increasingly important for modern Russia:

- the courts are overloaded with the cases under consideration, which results in long delays in considering complaints;
- a number of cases require niche specialization or experience in certain professional activities;
- alternative ways of resolving conflicts may assume the functions of moral and ethical control, which were performed by families and communities more fully in the past;
- alternative forms of dispute resolution can deal with the cause rather than the effect, as it is possible to correct not only the specific legal violation but also to eliminate the cause of it.<sup>6</sup>

The aim of this paper is to analyze the modern approach to the concept of “multi-door courthouse” in the Russian Federation, address its evolution, current issues and future perspectives. To achieve the aim of the paper authors used comparative legal analysis to show the development of the concept in different countries, and systemic approach to study the implementation of the concept “multi-door courthouse” in the Russian Federation.

## 2 Russian historical experience of the establishment of non-judicial forms of remedy

The historical experience of the development of the Russian legal system in the twentieth century shows that great efforts were made to consolidate the role of public institutions as opposed to state institutions, which were understood as

<sup>4</sup> EDWARDS, B.C. Renovating the Multi-Door Courthouse: Designing Disputing Resolution Systems to Improve Results and Control Costs. *Harvard Negotiation Law Review*, 18, 281, 2018; MALACKA, M. Multi-Door Courthouse established through the European Mediation Directive?, *International and Comparative Law Review*, vol. 16, no. 1, Pp. 127, 2016; ABRAMSON, H. Fashioning an Effective Negotiation Style: Choosing Between Good Practices, Tactics, and Tricks, *Harvard Negotiation Law Review*, Vol. 23, 319, 2018.

<sup>5</sup> AJIGBOYE, O. The Concept of Multi-Door Courthouse in Nigeria: Rethinking Frank Sander's Concept (November 16, 2014). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2525677>.

<sup>6</sup> RAY L., CLARE A. The Multi-Door Courthouse Idea: Building the Courthouse of the Future... Today. *Ohio State Journal on Dispute Resolution*, 1, 1, 12, 1985.

old-rule institutions at the initial stage of creation. In other words, the Russian Federation actually had all the prerequisites for the development of non-judicial forms of protecting rights.

Thus, the Council of People's Commissars by the Decree on the Court<sup>7</sup> passed on November 22, 1917 abolished all existing judicial bodies: district courts, chambers of appeals. The Preamble to the Constitution of the RSFSR 1925 expressly provided that the Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic was tasked with destroying the exploitation of a man by a man and there would be no state power.<sup>8</sup> Denying the principle of separation of powers and following the idea of union of both legislative and executive power in one body of is one of the theoretical postulates laying the foundation for creation of the Soviet state.<sup>9</sup>

It should be noted that bodies of non-judicial protection of rights are beginning to play a big role,<sup>10</sup> which Soviet theorists are beginning to include into the number of the bodies that protect violated rights. N. B. Zeider explicitly states in his work, which is of great importance for the Soviet legal science, that during extensive building of communist society in the USSR the consideration of property and other disputes was very important, due to the fact that it was made by various public organizations that is community courts, which considered property and some other civil disputes; trade unions, which considered large group of disputes that is disputes related to compensation of damages caused by the fault of the enterprise; commercial courts; administrative procedure. The implementation of the mentioned methods of protecting rights takes place according to a definite procedure established by law. Simplicity of these rules for the resolution of disputes concerning rights by some bodies and multiplicity and relative complexity of these rules in regulating the activities of dispute resolution by other bodies are caused by the nature of the dispute, the nature of the bodies resolving the dispute, etc. However, the rules of any body for the protection of rights are characterized by the fact that in any case they perform law-based dispute resolution and full and effective protection of rights.<sup>11</sup> Actually, N. B. Zeider laid the ground for the analogous multi-door courthouse concept in the Soviet doctrine.

<sup>7</sup> Decrees of the Soviet regime. T.I. (Moscow: State House for Publishing of Political Literature, 1957).

<sup>8</sup> Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic (adopted under Decree of the 12<sup>th</sup> All Russian Congress date May 11, 1925) // Official website of the Constitution of the Russian Federation. Verified: [http://constitution.garant.ru/history/ussrrsfr/1925/red\\_1925/185477/chapter/baf8d0298b9a3923e3794eece3d1996/](http://constitution.garant.ru/history/ussrrsfr/1925/red_1925/185477/chapter/baf8d0298b9a3923e3794eece3d1996/).

<sup>9</sup> DUBAVITSKAYA, O. N. Approaches to the Essence of Law during the Soviet Political Regime. Herald of Tomsk State University, Vol. 11, 355, 2011.

<sup>10</sup> ARSENYEV, V. D. The Increasing Role of the Public in the Activities of the Soviet State Bodies (Irkutsk, 1961).

<sup>11</sup> ZEIDER, N. B. The Subject-Matter and System of the Soviet Civil Procedure Law, Jurisprudence, No. 3, 69, 1962.

Unfortunately, the actual realization of these postulates, as well as many progressive ideas, lost out to the dogma of the existing ideology based on one-line directive rule<sup>12</sup> and despite the possibility of implementation of the analogous multi-door courthouse concept for protection of the rights of nationals and organizations in the last period of its existence, our Soviet state was able to lay only a state court in the foundation of a new Russian state, which was an only body capable of effectively protecting violated civil rights.

### 3 The modern experience of the establishment of non-judicial forms of remedy in the Russian Federation

The legal system of modern Russia devoid of a number of ideological institutions of the Soviet-era past faced the same problem that was urgent for the United States at the time when the multi-door courthouse concept was created, when a perfectly organized institutional formalized system of protecting rights that is the court being, in fact, the only link that protects violated civil rights, may lose, due to increasing quantitative indicators, its quality and partially express the crisis of the paradigm of the formalized judicial procedure for protecting rights, which can be concisely named as “the wider access for everybody is, the less it is for everybody.”<sup>13</sup> According to the latest public statistics, 26,893,533 civil and administrative cases were submitted to general jurisdiction courts in 2019,<sup>14</sup> the growth was 13.6%, that was all-time record in recent years,<sup>15</sup> with an average annual increase of 12.7% in the number of cases. Of course, the increase in the number of cases only confirms the need of the Russian Federation to study and possibly introduce the multi-door courthouse concept or the analogous concept of the broad subject-matter of the civil process proposed by N. B. Zeider.

Accordingly, the item of development of non-judicial alternative forms of protecting violated rights appeared on the agenda, which forms could, on the one part, relieve state courts of the number of considered cases and thus improve the quality and, on the other part, it was possible to try to eliminate the cause of

<sup>12</sup> AVAKYAN, S. A. Constitution of Russia: Nature, Evolution, Modernity (M.: RYUID. 2000).

<sup>13</sup> ABOLONIN, V.O. Judicial Mediation: Theory - Practice – Perspectives (M.: Infotropik, 2014).

<sup>14</sup> Forensic statistics // Official web-site of Judicial Department under the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation <http://w. Address: ww.cdep.ru/index.php?id=79>.

<sup>15</sup> The following cases were submitted to general jurisdiction courts:

- 23,212,755 civil and administrative cases in 2018 (11.6% increase compared to the previous year);
- 20,507,499 civil and administrative cases in 2017 (13% increase compared to the previous year);
- 17,839,527 civil and administrative cases in 2016 (10.7% increase compared to the previous year);
- 15,928,860 in 2015 (12% increase compared to the previous year);
- 13,935,450 civil and administrative cases in 2014 (13% increase compared to the previous year).

the matter in controversy with the use of non-judicial forms, rather than to try to eliminate the consequences resulting in a number of associated conflict situations.

The procedural legislation in force up to October 2019, which provided the possibility of non-judicial forms of protection of rights since the codification of 2002, proved to be ineffective in creating a worthy alternative to the state judicial procedure for protecting rights. Thus, according to Article 150 of the Civil Procedural Code of the Russian Federation<sup>16</sup> in order to prepare a case for trial, a judge took measures to conclude an amicable agreement between the parties, including the results of the mediation, which the parties had a right to perform at any stage of court proceedings in accordance with the procedure established by federal law, and explained to the parties their right to submit the dispute to arbitration and the consequences of such actions. The Arbitration Procedural Code of the Russian Federation<sup>17</sup> had a separate Chapter 15 dedicated to settlement arrangements, amicable agreement, which reduced itself to an indication of a possibility to settle a dispute, having concluded the amicable agreement or applying other settlement arrangements, including procedure of mediation, if it did not contravene the federal law.

Absence of legally identified non-judicial forms of protecting rights, specific mechanisms for their implementation resulted only in the declaration of such a possibility, which could not affect the reduction of court statistics with an increase in alternative non-judicial one. Thus, according to the information contained in the latest public sources that is the Certificate of Application by Courts of Federal Law No. 193-FZ dated July 27, 2010 On Alternative Procedure for Settlement of Disputes with the Participation of a Mediator in 2015 approved by the Presidium of the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation on June 22, 2016<sup>18</sup> by means of mediation in general jurisdiction courts in 2015, the dispute was resolved in 1,115 cases (total 15,928,860 cases) (0.007% of cases considered during the year), whereof 916 cases were considered with conclusion of an amicable agreement under the mediation. In 2014, 1,329 cases were solved through mediation (0.01 per cent of cases solved). In 2015, a mediator was involved by the parties in 44 arbitration cases (total 1,531,473 cases) (0.002 % of the total number of cases considered), of which 7 cases were considered with conclusion of an amicable agreement by the court and in 37 cases a claimant abandoned a claim or a defendant admitted a claim. In 2014, a mediator was involved by the parties in 51

---

<sup>16</sup> Civil Procedural Code of the Russian Federation dated November 14, 1992, Official Gazette of the Russian Federation - November 18, 2002. No. 46. Art. 4532.

<sup>17</sup> Arbitration Procedural Code of the Russian Federation dated 24.07.2002 No. 95-FZ, Official Gazette of the Russian Federation, 29.07.2002, No. 30. Art. 3012.

<sup>18</sup> Certificate of Application by Courts of the Federal Law dated July 27, 2010 No. 193-FZ "On Alternative Procedure for Settlement of Disputes involving a Mediator for 2015 // Garant reference retrieval system". Address: <https://www.garant.ru/products/ipo/prime/doc/71329664/#review>.

cases, of which in 14 cases the court approved an amicable agreement and in 32 cases a claimant abandoned a claim or a claim was admitted by a defendant. At the same time, other settlement arrangements in generalization of non-judicial forms of protecting rights were not taken into account at all due to their low demand.

Despite the fact that the Russian legal doctrine has been stating for many years that the paradigm of the judicial form of protecting rights is in crisis and that there are prospects for the development of alternative forms of protecting rights,<sup>19</sup> the case law shows that despite the certain crisis and increasing pressure on the judiciary, the will of the State is required to establish new standards for development of non-judicial forms of protecting rights.

In our opinion, such standards are the latest legislative changes in the field of procedural relations. On October 25, 2019, amendments to the Civil Procedural Code came into force, which added new Chapter 14.1<sup>20</sup> to the Code and provided peaceful settlement of a dispute as one of the main tasks of civil proceedings. The new added chapter consolidated the types of settlement arrangements that are negotiation, mediation, judicial conciliation, and leaving the list hanging in midair, provided a possibility of use of other settlement arrangements, unless it contravenes the federal law. A fundamental innovation, a peculiar tectonic upheaval is introduction of judicial conciliation as a settlement arrangement involving a retired judge.

In addition to increase in alternative methods of dispute resolution in court, it has become possible to resolve a dispute in the pre-trial order through a mediation agreement, which, if notarized, has a force of a writ of enforcement.

## 4 Prospects of digital transformation of the “multi-door courthouse” concept in the Russian Federation

Accordingly, there was a ground for introduction of the multi-door courthouse concept into the Russian realities. A quite reasonable question may arise: what has changed nowadays, which may contribute to the promotion of this concept in the Russian Federation and in the world?<sup>21</sup> The answer is the level of digitalization of social relations, which we have seen during the last five years.

According to Decree No. 203 dated 09.05.2017, the President of the Russian Federation approved the strategy of development of an information

<sup>19</sup> PETROVA, N. YE. Crisis of Traditional Justice and Appearance of the Alternative Forms of Resolution of Disputes concerning Rights, *Arbitration Tribunal*, 6 (54), 109, 2007.

<sup>20</sup> Federal Law No. 197-FZ dated 26.07.2019 On Amendments to Certain Legislative Acts of the Russian Federation // *Official Gazette of the Russian Federation* dated 29.07.2019. No. 30. Article 4099.

<sup>21</sup> FERREIRA D.B., SEVERO L. Multiparty Mediation as Solution for Urban Conflicts: A Case Analysis from Brazil. *BRICS Law Journal*. 8(3), 5-26, 2021.



society in the Russian Federation for 2017 – 2030,<sup>22</sup> which defines objectives in the field of application of information and communication technologies aimed at the development of the information society. The Government of the Russian Federation adopted the Decree No. 234 dated 02.03.2019 On the System for Management of Digital Economy of the Russian Federation National Program<sup>23</sup> in order to implement the Digital Economy of the Russian Federation national program. The digital economy program aims to create the necessary conditions for development of the digital economy so that digital data become a key factor in all areas of social relations. According to the demand for digital technologies in the field of administration of justice and gradual transition of public bodies to the use of information infrastructure, it is necessary to identify possible growth areas of the multi-door courthouse concept in the Russian Federation.

Beginning from 2017 a constitutional right to relief in court can be exercised in digital form (Part 1, Article 3 of the Civil Procedural Code of the Russian Federation; Part 2, Article 45 of the Administrative Procedural Code of the Russian Federation; Part 1, Article 474.1 of the Administrative Procedural Code of the Russian Federation)<sup>24</sup> by creating an electronic document or an electronic image of the document. Grounds for institution of a case, listing for trial or rejecting<sup>25</sup> were specified by Order No. 251 of the Judicial Department under the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation dated 27.12.2016 On Approval of the Procedure for Submission of Digital Documents to the Federal General Jurisdiction Courts (hereinafter referred to as Order No. 251).<sup>26</sup>

Only persons, who have an enhanced encrypted and certified digital signature or a confirmed account in the Unified System of Identification and Authentication (hereinafter referred to as the USIA) may bring the matter in digital form before the court. According to statistics, more than 20 million citizens were registered in the USIA<sup>27</sup> as of the effective date of the amendments for filing digital appeals to a court and the number of registered users was over 100 million citizens<sup>28</sup> in three years at the beginning of 2020, there was an increase of 500 % registered users.

<sup>22</sup> Decree of the President of the Russian Federation No. 203 dated 09.05.2017 On Approval of the Strategy of Development of an Information Society in the Russian Federation for 2017 - 2030. // Official Gazette of the Russian Federation dated 15.05.2017. No. 20. Article 2901.

<sup>23</sup> Resolution of the Government of the Russian Federation dated 02.03.2019 No. 234 System for Management of Digital Economy of the Russian Federation National Program // Official Gazette of the Russian Federation dated 18.03.2019. No. 11. Article 1119.

<sup>24</sup> Criminal Procedural Code of the Russian Federation dated December 18, 2001 // Official Gazette of the Russian Federation. - dated December 24, 2001. - No. 52 (part one). - Article - 4921.

<sup>25</sup> It can be identified as a technical phase of presentation of the procedural document in digital form.

<sup>26</sup> Bulletin of Regulations for a Judiciary System. 2017. No. 2 (February).

<sup>27</sup> Rossiyskaya Gazeta. Date of publication 30.12.2016. Access mode: <https://rg.ru/2016/12/30/podat-v-sud-iski-cherez-internet-smogut-20-millionov-grazhdan.html>.

<sup>28</sup> Digital Economy 2024 National Program // Access mode: <https://digital.ac.gov.ru/news/1621/>.



As noted by A. Gusev, Director General of the Judicial Department under the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation, in his last interview,<sup>29</sup> these electronic services became popular among nationals and representatives of legal entities almost immediately (*the author means the period starting from 01.2017*), the demand for them is evidenced by the fact that the number of digital documents submitted to courts increases quarterly by 30-40 percent. Thus, in 2017, federal general jurisdiction courts received about 280 thousand claims and other procedural documents in digital form, almost 700 thousand claims in 2018, already over a million claims in 2019.

Accordingly, in case of exercising the right to judicial protection in digital form, the claimant files its appeal through Pravosudie State Automated System (State Automated System) <https://ej.sudrf.ru/>. It is noteworthy that at this stage the claimant is given only the opportunity to appeal to a judicial authority, no provision of non-judicial alternative forms of protecting rights is stated. In our opinion, the electronic presentation module in the reference and information plan shall include additional modules

1. explaining the possibility of non-judicial forms of protecting rights and their advantages in comparison with formalized court procedures;
2. a service for submission of applications for the alternative non-judicial procedure chosen by a claimant, which provides for a confirmation reply from the defendant. At present, such services can include:
  - service of filing an appeal to a mediator;
  - service of filing an appeal to arbitration;
  - service of filing an appeal to a mediator (with respect to an initiated case).

Availability of an apparent alternative for a claimant on the date of filing an appeal to the court may be an efficient instrument for development of non-judicial forms of protecting rights at the first stage.

The next stage, which today should be the key for the implementation of the multi-door courthouse concept, is the stage of processing of the digital appeal.

According to the provisions of Chapter 2.1 of Order of the Judicial Department under the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation No. 36 dated 29.04.2003 On Approval of a Guide for Judicial Procedure in a District Court,<sup>30</sup> the President Judge appoints a person responsible for processing of the digital documents submitted to the court (Clause 2.1.1). If digital documents are received, an authorized court

<sup>29</sup> Participants to trials may create my accounts on the sites of courts // Rossiyskaya Gazeta - Federal Issue No. 89 (8143) dated April 23, 2020. Address: <https://rg.ru/2020/04/14/uchastniki-processov-mogut-sozdavat-lichnye-kabinety-na-sajtah-sudov.html>. Free access.

<sup>30</sup> Rossiyskaya Gazeta. No. 246. 05.11.2004.

administrator checks compliance with the conditions of submission of documents provided by Order No. 251 and can take the following decision: 1) send a notice on receipt of the documents; 2) send a notice on rejection of the documents.

We propose at this stage to confer additional powers on responsible court administrators to send the parties a proposal for alternative settlement of a dispute concerning a right or send a well-trained court administrator the relevant notice with an order to assume functions of a conflict manager. Here, we face the possibility of implementation of the multi-door courthouse concept at the pre-trial technical stage<sup>31</sup> of filing an appeal to the court, when the claim has not yet been allowed by the court, as noted by Larry Ray and Anne L. Clare<sup>32</sup> it is possible to estimate claims and disputes in order to create competition with judicial procedures. The estimation can be performed in two possible models. That one is at the court administrative office and the other by creating a single digital conflict center, the employees of which will try to resolve a conflict according to one of the alternative ways of conflict resolution. In this context, we can speak of the implementation of the multi-door courthouse concept in a new way that is digital multi-door courthouse.

## 5 Conclusion

The implementation of the “digital multi-door courthouse” concept will contribute to further strengthen the availability of judicial remedy, on the one hand, and the expansion of possible non-judicial forms of remedy for the parties to the disputed legal relations, on the other hand.

In addition, “digitalization” and “institutionalization” of non-judicial forms of remedy at the stage of court proceedings will contribute to the implementation of the principle of equality before the law and the court, regardless of the “geographical” location of the parties to the dispute.

We believe that this paper will contribute to limited literature on the digital multi-door courthouse. Moreover, the key findings of the paper can be used in law-making process in the sphere of alternative dispute resolution and civil procedure.

Mentioned findings and conclusions can also be used as the basis for future research in the sphere of multi-door courthouse.

---

<sup>31</sup> VALEYEV, D. KH., NURIYEV, A.G. Pre-Trial Technical Stage of Submission of a Digital Statement of Claim and its Peculiarities in a Context of Exercise of the Constitutional Right to Judicial Protection in conditions of the Digital Economy, *Rossiysky Sudya*, 4, 3, 2019; SOLHCHI, M. A., & BAGHBANNO, F. Artificial Intelligence and Its Role in the Development of the Future of Arbitration, *International Journal of Law in Changing World*, 2(2), 56, 2023.

<sup>32</sup> RAY L., CLARE A. The Multi-Door Courthouse Idea: Building the Courthouse of the Future... Today. *Ohio State Journal on Dispute Resolution*, 1,1, 12, 1985.

## References

- ABOLONIN, V. O. Judicial Mediation: Theory – Practice – Perspectives (Infotropik, 2014).
- ABRAMSON, H. Fashioning an Effective Negotiation Style: Choosing Between Good Practices, Tactics, and Tricks, *Harvard Negotiation Law Review*, 23, 319-344, 2018.
- AJIGBOYE, O. The Concept of Multi-Door Courthouse in Nigeria: Rethinking Frank Sander's Concept (November 16, 2014). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2525677> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2525677>
- ARSENYEV, V. D. The Increasing Role of the Public in the Activities of the Soviet State Bodies (Irkutsk, 1961).
- AVAKYAN, S. A. Constitution of Russia: Nature, Evolution, Modernity (M: RYUd. 2000).
- CORTES, P. Using Technology and ADR Methods to Enhance Access to Justice, *International Journal of Online Dispute Resolution*, Vol 5. Is. 1, 103-121, 2019.
- EDWARDS, B.C. Renovating the Multi-Door Courthouse: Designing Disputing Resolution Systems to Improve Results and Control Costs, *Harvard Negotiation Law Review*, 18, 281-347, 2013;
- DUBAVITSKAYA, O.N. Approaches to the Essence of Law during the Soviet Political Regime, *Herald of Tomsk State University*, Vol. 11, 355-360, 2011.
- FERREIRA, D. B., GIOVANNINI, C., GROMOVA, E., SCHMIDT, G. R. Arbitration Chambers and trust in technology provider: Impacts of trust in technology intermediated dispute resolution proceedings", *Technology in Society*, 68, 101872, 2022.
- FERREIRA, D.B., GROMOVA, E.A, FARIAS, B.O., GIOVANNINI C.J. Online Sports Betting in Brazil and conflict solution clauses, *Revista Brasileira de Alternative Dispute Resolution*, Vol. 4, nº 7, 75-86, 2020.
- FERREIRA D.B., SEVERO L. Multiparty Mediation as Solution for Urban Conflicts: A Case Analysis from Brazil. *BRICS Law Journal*. 8(3), 5-26, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.21684/2412-2343-2021-8-3-5-29>
- FERREIRA, D.B., GROMOVA, E.A. Hyperrealistic Jurisprudence: The Digital Age and the (Un) Certainty of Judge Analytics. *Int J Semiot Law*, 36, 2261–2281, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11196-023-10015-0>
- FERREIRA, D.B., GROMOVA, E. & TITOVA, E.V. The Principle of a Trial Within a Reasonable Time and JustTech: Benefits and Risks. *Hum Rights Rev* 25, 47–66 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12142-024-00715-w>
- GROMOVA, E.A., FERREIRA, D.B., BEGISHEV, I.R. ChatGPT and Other Intelligent Chatbots: Legal, Ethical and Dispute Resolution Concerns. *Revista Brasileira de Alternative Dispute Resolution – RBADR*, Belo Horizonte, ano 05, n. 10, p. 153-175, jul./dez. 2023. DOI: 10.52028/rbadr.v5i10
- MALACKA, M. Multi-Door Courthouse established through the European Mediation Directive?, *International and Comparative Law Review*, vol. 16, no. 1, 127–142, 2016 DOI: 10.1515/iclr-2016-0009.
- KESSLER, G., FINKELSTEIN, L.J. The Evolution of a Multi-Door Courthouse, *Catholic University Law Review*, vol. 37, no. 3, 577–579, 1988.
- PETROVA, N. Ye. Crisis of Traditional Justice and Appearance of the Alternative Forms of Resolution of Disputes concerning Rights, *Arbitration Tribunal*, 6 (54), 109-115, 2007.
- RABINOVICH-EINY, O., Beyond efficiency: the transformation of court through technology, *UCLA Journal of Law & Technology*, 12. Is. 1, 1-45, 2008.

RAY, L., CLARE, A. The Multi-Door Courthouse Idea: Building the Courthouse of the Future... Today, Ohio State Journal on Dispute Resolution, Volume 1, Issue 1, 7-54, 1985.

SANDER, F.E.A. at the National Conference on the Causes of Popular Dissatisfaction with the Administration of Justice (April 7-9, 1976), The Pound Conference, 70 F.R.D. 79, 111 (1976).

SCHMITZ, A.J. Measuring "Access to Justice" in the Rush to Digitize, Fordham Law Review, 88. Is. 6, 2381-2406, 2020.

SOLHCHI, M. A., & BAGHBANNO, F. Artificial Intelligence and Its Role in the Development of the Future of Arbitration, International Journal of Law in Changing World, 2(2), 56-76, 2023. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54934/ijlcw.v2i2.56>

VALEYEV D. KH., NURIYEV A.G., Pre-Trial Technical Stage of Submission of a Digital Statement of Claim and its Peculiarities in a Context of Exercise of the Constitutional Right to Judicial Protection in conditions of the Digital Economy, Rossiysky Sudya, No. 4, 3-7, 2019.

ZEIDER, N.B. The Subject-Matter and System of the Soviet Civil Procedure Law, Jurisprudence, No. 3, 69-82, 1962.

---

Informação bibliográfica deste texto, conforme a NBR 6023:2018 da Associação Brasileira de Normas Técnicas (ABNT):

VALEEV, Damir; NURIEV, Anas. Digital opportunities for promotion of multi-door courthouse concept. *Revista Brasileira de Alternative Dispute Resolution – RBADR*, Belo Horizonte, ano 06, n. 11, p. 101-112, jan./jun. 2024. DOI: 10.52028/rbadr.v6.i11.ART05.RU.

---