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ABSTRACT

Purpose: The aim of this study was to the system of the trial agencies that resolve civil cases in Vietnam currently.

Theoretical framework: Currently, the number of civil cases tried every year in Vietnam is increasing rapidly. According to statistics from the Supreme People's Court, on resolving civil, marriage and family, business, trade and labor cases, in 2021, the Court handled 411,299 cases, with 324,813 resolved and adjudicated, reaching a rate of 79%. In 2022, the Court handled 444,402 cases, with 386,944 cases resolved and adjudicated, reaching a rate of 87.07% (Supreme People's Court, 2021).

Design/methodology/approach: To meet the needs and demands of judicial work, the People's Court system is increasingly being organized scientifically and strictly. Especially since the establishment of the 2014 Law on Court Organization, the People's Court system in Vietnam has changed greatly compared to the time before this particularly important law took effect.

Findings: However, with the impact and influence of international integration and economic and social development, the adjudication of civil cases in Vietnam always poses demands on the People's Court system. Discussion: Therefore, currently, research on the structure of the judicial agencies that resolve civil cases has become especially important and necessary in Vietnam, to promptly find solutions to improve their operational efficiency and perfect the law.
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RESUMO

Objetivo: O objetivo deste estudo foi o sistema das agências de julgamento que resolvem casos civis no Vietnã atualmente.

Quadro teórico: Atualmente, o número de processos civis julgados todos os anos no Vietnã está aumentando rapidamente. De acordo com as estatísticas do Supremo Tribunal Popular, em 2021, o Tribunal tratou 411,299 casos, tendo sido resolvidos e julgados 324,813 casos civis, matrimoniais e familiares, empresariais, comerciais e laborais, atingindo uma taxa de 79%. Em 2022, o Tribunal tratou 444,402 casos, tendo sido resolvidos e julgados 386,944 casos, atingindo uma taxa de 87,07% (Supremo Tribunal Popular, 2021).

Design/metodologia/abordagem: Para atender às necessidades e demandas do trabalho judicial, o sistema do Tribunal Popular está cada vez mais sendo organizado científica e estritamente. Especialmente desde o estabelecimento da Lei de 2014 sobre Organização Judicial, o sistema do Tribunal Popular no Vietnã mudou muito em comparação com o tempo antes que esta lei particularmente importante entrou em vigor.
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Conclusões: No entanto, com o impacto e a influência da integração internacional e do desenvolvimento econômico e social, a decisão de processos civis no Vietnã sempre impõe demandas ao sistema do Tribunal Popular.

Discussão: Portanto, atualmente, a pesquisa sobre a estrutura das agências judiciais que resolvem processos civis tornou-se especialmente importante e necessária no Vietnã, para encontrar prontamente soluções para melhorar sua eficiência operacional e aperfeiçoar a lei.


EL SISTEMA DE LAS AGENCIAS JUDICIALES QUE RESUELVEN LOS CASOS CIVILES EN VIETNAM ACTUALMENTE

RESUMEN

Propósito: el objetivo de este estudio fue evaluar el sistema de las agencias de juicios que resuelven los casos civiles en Vietnam actualmente.

Marco teórico: Actualmente, el número de casos civiles juzgados cada año en Vietnam está aumentando rápidamente. Según las estadísticas del Tribunal Supremo Popular, sobre la resolución de asuntos civiles, matrimoniales y familiares, empresariales, comerciales y laborales, en 2021, el Tribunal tramitó 411.299 asuntos, de los cuales 324.813 se resolvieron y adjudicaron, alcanzando una tasa del 79%. En 2022, el Tribunal tramitó 444.402 asuntos, con 386.944 asuntos resueltos y adjudicados, alcanzando una tasa del 87,07% (Tribunal Supremo Popular, 2021).

Diseño/metodología/enfoque: Para satisfacer las necesidades y demandas del trabajo judicial, el sistema de la Corte Popular está cada vez más organizado científica y estrictamente. Especialmente desde el establecimiento de la Ley de Organización de Tribunales de 2014, el sistema de tribunales populares en Vietnam ha cambiado mucho en comparación con el tiempo antes de que esta ley particularmente importante entrara en vigor.

Conclusiones: Sin embargo, con el impacto y la influencia de la integración internacional y el desarrollo económico y social, la resolución de los casos civiles en Vietnam siempre plantea demandas al sistema de la Corte Popular.

Discusión: Por lo tanto, actualmente, la investigación sobre la estructura de las agencias judiciales que resuelven casos civiles se ha vuelto especialmente importante y necesaria en Vietnam, para encontrar rápidamente soluciones que mejoren su eficiencia operativa y perfeccionen la ley.
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1 INTRODUCTION

Since the establishment of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam (now the Socialist Republic of Vietnam), the State has always focused on the structure of the judicial agencies that handle civil cases. This is because the People's Court always plays a particularly important role in ensuring justice and protecting the legitimate rights and interests of citizens in the country. In addition, the People's Court is the only agency with the right to adjudicate civil cases in Vietnam. “With its assigned functions, tasks and powers, the Court is a specialized agency
tasked with resolving criminal cases or disputes, civil, marriage and family requirements, business, trade and labor to disputes in the administrative field” (Nguyen Vinh Hung et al., 2023_1, p. 03). For the settlement of civil cases, “the task of the Court is to determine the objective truth of the case, restore the legitimate rights and interests of individuals, agencies and organizations” (Nguyen Vinh Hung, 2016, p. 04).

The 2014 Law on Organization of the People's Courts marked a huge change in the organization of the People's Court system in Vietnam. Compared to the period before 2015, the Court system only existed with District Courts (districts, towns, and cities under the province), Provincial Courts (cities directly under the central government), and the Supreme People's Court. Since the 2014 Law on Organization of People's Courts took effect (June 1, 2015), the Court system for adjudicating cases in general and civil cases in particular has had the appearance of the High People's Courts. Specifically, “On May 28, 2015, the National Assembly Standing Committee issued Resolution No. 957/NQ-UBTVQH13 on the establishment of 03 High People's Courts: The High People's Court in Hanoi, the High People's Court in Da Nang and the High People's Court in Ho Chi Minh City” (Standing Committee Of The National Assembly, 2015). With the appearance of the High People's Court, the jurisdiction to adjudicate civil cases or the order and procedures for resolving civil cases in Vietnam changed. These are important steps for the judicial system to take in resolving civil cases in Vietnam for it to become more professional, methodical, and scientific.

However, from the practice of resolving civil cases, dividing the Courts into different types has both advantages and limitations. With increase in civil cases and the high demand for trials to be handled with speed and timeliness, the system of the judicial agencies needs to be considered and adjusted for it to be more suitable for the needs of the people. This has made research on the structure of the judicial agencies that resolve civil cases in Vietnam today to have greatly contributed to perfecting the law and improving the efficiency of adjudicating and resolving civil cases.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

Research on the judicial system for resolving civil cases in Vietnam is a topic that has attracted the attention of many researchers. Therefore, within a limited scope, the documents aims to address this topic: Nguyen Vinh Hung (2016) with “The process protecting the rights and interests of litigants during the civil procedure and enforcement of civil judgments”; Nguyen Vinh Hung (2021) with “Civil events: Theory - Procedure - Commentary”; Nguyen
Vinh Hung & Tran Cong Thinh (2022) with “Judicial organization, authority, procedures for resolving civil cases”; Nguyen Vinh Hung (2022) with “Civil cases: Procedure - Comments”; Cao Vu Minh (2023) with “Appointing Judges all life to ensure judicial independence”; Nguyen Vinh Hung (2023) with “Vietnamese Civil Procedure Law”; etc.

Basically, many research projects have mentioned several issues related to the system of judicial agencies resolving civil cases in Vietnam. However, due to the research being spread out on many different issues and not closely following the current situation of adjudication and resolution of civil cases in Vietnam, there is a problem with the structure of the adjudication agencies that resolve cases that have not yet been studied in depth. Starting from the practice of resolving civil cases, the authors focused on in-depth research on the judicial system in Vietnam to find its limitations, problems and propose appropriate solutions.

3 RESEARCH METHODS

To research the topic the system on the trail agencies that resolve civil cases in Vietnam currently, the authors have used a combination of traditional research methods of the social sciences and legal sciences in Vietnam such as: legal analysis method, legal efficiency evaluation method, and comparative legal method to achieve the objectives of the research.

In general, the above research methods are used in close and harmonious combination by the authors to achieve the research objectives of the article.

4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 BRIEF HISTORY OF THE SYSTEM OF JUDICIAL AGENCIES THAT HANDLE CIVIL CASES IN VIETNAM FROM SEPTEMBER 2, 1945 UNTIL THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE 2014 LAW ON ORGANIZATION OF PEOPLE'S COURTS

Before the August Revolution of 1945, “due to thousands of years of influence and domination by Northern feudalism, Vietnamese feudal dynasties often faced the risk of invasion. Therefore, in order to affirm their rule and easily manage the country, feudal states in Vietnam often focus on developing public law, in which criminal law is considered as very important, to protect the state” (Nguyen Vinh Hung, 2021, p. 28). In general, feudal dynasties in Vietnam did not want civil cases to be adjudicated and resolved. With the birth of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam (September 2, 1945) and it being a state of the people, by the
people, and for the people's benefit, the state began to pay attention to trial and civil cases, in order to ensure the legitimate rights as well as protect the interests of its citizens. In particular, the judicial agencies that handle civil cases in Vietnam were formed during this time.

The first judicial agencies of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam established included: Military Courts, Special Courts, and Ordinary Courts (judicial Courts). The judicial committee of the Committee Administration at district and provincial levels was temporarily assigned to resolve civil and criminal cases, such as violations of citizens’ health, dignity, honor, property, and social order and safety. According to the provisions of Decree No. 13/SL dated January 24, 1946, in each district (prefecture, district, continent), there will be a primary court; in each province and city of Hanoi, Hai Phong, Saigon, and Cho Lon, there is a second-level court and each period has a High Court located in Hanoi, Hue (Thuan Hoa) and Saigon. The primary court has the jurisdiction to hear first-instance and final-instance civil, commercial, and criminal cases. The second-level court has jurisdiction to hear first-instance and final-instance civil, commercial, and criminal cases. When adjudicating civil and commercial cases, the Chief Justice judges alone, but when adjudicating misdemeanor cases, there must be two additional people's jury, and when adjudicating felony cases, the Second-level Court has 5 people who sit in judgment and have the right to make decisions. The Supreme Court has jurisdiction to hear appeals of the judgments of the Primary Court and the Second-level Court that are appealed. (Nguyen Vinh Hung et al., 2022, p. 15 - 16)

By 1950, according to Decree No. 85/SL dated May 22, 1950, on the reform of the judicial apparatus and procedural law, the Primary Court was changed to the District People's Court. The second-level court was also changed to the Provincial People's Court. In addition, the Council of Appeals was changed to the Court of Appeals, and the People's Court of Appeals was known to this day as the People's Jurors, who were elected by the People's Council at the same level for a term of one year. When participating in proceedings, the People's Jurors have the same voting rights and jurisdiction as Judges. In addition, Decree No. 85/SL stipulates the establishment of a conciliation council at the district level, and at the same time expands the authority of the commune justice board to impose fines and resolve some minor matters important in terms of security.

In April 1958, the system of the judicial agencies in Vietnam had changed greatly when the National Assembly passed a Resolution on establishing the Supreme People's Court and the Central People's Procuracy. Also from this time, the People's Court and the prosecutor's office were separated from the Ministry of Justice and placed under the management of the Government Council. In the 1959 Constitution, this important change was recognized: “The
organization of our state apparatus has had fundamental changes, in which the organization of the judicial agencies is stipulated in Chapter VIII of the Constitution. The People's Courts and People's Procuracy have formed a unified system from the central to local levels and are no longer under the Government Council, but under the National Assembly and the People's Council at the same level. In particular, the People's Court System includes: Supreme People's Court; Local People's Courts (provincial level, centrally run city; district level, provincial city or equivalent administrative unit and autonomous region court), and military courts. The People's Court system is organized according to the principle of two levels of trial. The principles of organization and operation of the People's Court during the period 1946 - 1960 have been inherited and developed at a higher level. Specifically, when adjudicating, the People's Court has the right to be independent and only obey the law (Constitution 1959, Article 100). The trial of the People's Court involves the participation of the People's Jurors. During trial, the People's Jurors have equal powers with the judge (Constitution 1959, Article 99). The court judges according to the principle that all citizens are equal before the law... (Law on Organization of the People's Courts of 1960, Article 3)” (Nguyen Vinh Hung et al., 2022, p. 17 -18).

By 1980, the 1980 Constitution was promulgated and Article 127 provided general regulations on the functions and tasks of the People's Court. Along with that, the 1980 Constitution also has more specific regulations on the functions, tasks, and authority of judicial agencies. In general, the People's Court system in this period still inherited and developed from the organizational model of the People's Court in the previous period. Many new points also appear in the Court organizational system, such as the District People's Court, which conducts first-instance trials of civil, labor, marriage, and family cases and other cases according to law, except for cases where the litigant is a foreigner.

By 1992, the 1992 Constitution was promulgated and in the organizational structure of the adjudication agency handling civil cases, there were some new points, such as the establishment of some specialized courts (Economic Court, Labor Court, Administrative Court); ; adding the principle that the Courts can hold trials in secret “to keep the litigants' secrets according to their legitimate requests” (Law on Organization of People's Courts amended in 1993, Article 7), and the principle of equality before the law of subjects of all economic sectors (Law on Organization of People's Courts amended in 1995, Article 8); eliminate the jurisdiction of the Supreme People's Court to conduct first instance and final trials; The system of appointing judges has been applied and decentralization has been implemented; the Chief Justice of the Supreme People's Court is elected and dismissed by the National
Assembly; Judges of the Supreme People's Court are appointed, dismissed, and dismissed by the President; Judges of local People's Courts are appointed, dismissed, and dismissed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme People's Court at the request of the Judge Selection Council; The Supreme People's Court manages the local People's Courts in terms of organization, etc. (Nguyen Vinh Hung et al., 2022, p. 24)

4.2 THE SYSTEM OF JUDICIAL AGENCIES THAT HANDLE CIVIL CASES IN VIETNAM SINCE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE 2014 LAW ON ORGANIZATION OF PEOPLE'S COURTS

Current Constitution - The 2013 Constitution fully stipulates general regulations on the People's Court on the basis of inheriting the provisions of the 1992 Constitution, while ensuring the streamlining of the system of agencies the judiciary; ensures independence in judicial activities, promoting the judicial role of the Court to protect justice, protect human rights, civil rights, protect the socialist regime, protect the interests of the State, legitimate rights and interests of organizations and individuals for the purpose of building a socialist law-governed state of the people, by the people, for the people, clearly shows that the state power is unified, with division, coordination, and control among state agencies in the exercise of legislative, executive, and judicial powers. Clause 2, Article 102 of the 2013 Constitution stipulates that "The People's Court includes the Supreme People's Court and other Courts prescribed by Law" in accordance with the policy of judicial reform according to Resolution 49 of the Ministry of Political. It is to determine the organization of the Court system according to the trial level, regardless of administrative boundaries, but the Law on Organization of the People's Courts stipulates a basis for innovating judicial activities, in accordance with the Law on the Organization of the People's Courts with the requirements of the rule of law State. (Nguyen Vinh Hung et al., 2022, p. 25 - 27)

In the spirit of the 2013 Constitution, the 2014 Law on Organization of the People's Courts was promulgated and there were huge changes in the organizational structure of the judicial agencies handling civil cases. Article 3 of the Law on Organization of the People's Courts 2014 stipulates the organizational structure of the People's Courts: Supreme People's Court; High People's Court; People's Courts of provinces and centrally run cities; People's Courts of districts, towns, provincial cities and equivalent. For the first time in the history of the organization of the People's Court in Vietnam, there is the appearance of a High People's Court. At the same time, to make a difference compared to the three-level Court model of
previous periods, the current four-level Court system in Vietnam has had an adjustment in the jurisdiction of the People's Court, Provincial people, and the Supreme People's Court. This is shown through the regulation of the authority of the High People's Court: “Appellate of cases whose first-instance judgments and decisions of the People's Courts of provinces and centrally run cities fall within the scope of its jurisdiction, according to territories that have not yet taken legal effect and are appealed or protested against according to the provisions of procedural law; Cassation and re-trial of legally effective judgments and decisions of People's Courts of provinces and centrally run cities, People's Courts of districts, towns, provincial cities and equivalent. The scope of territorial jurisdiction is protested against according to the provisions of procedural law” (Law on Organization of People's Courts 2014, Article 29). Thus, since the High People's Court participated in the trial process to resolve civil cases, the Provincial People's Court no longer has the right to organize cassation and retrial sessions. The Supreme People's Court also no longer has the right to appellate trials of cases in general and civil cases in particular. This clearly demonstrates the professionalism, methodical, and scientific work in adjudicating and resolving civil cases in Vietnam.

Currently, “the 2015 Civil Procedure Code allows individuals, agencies and organizations to have the right to initiate civil lawsuits to request the Court to protect their legitimate rights and interests when they are infringed” (Nguyen Vinh Hung et al., 2023_2, p. 04). Also since the establishment of the 2015 Civil Procedure Code, “the principle that the Court cannot refuse to resolve a civil case because there is no law to apply” (2015 Civil Procedure, Article 4, Clause 2) was stipulated for the first time. This principle has great significance in recognizing the freedom to sue and ensuring the legitimate rights and interests of all citizens.
4.3 ADVANTAGES AND LIMITATIONS OF ORGANIZING THE SYSTEM OF THE JUDICIAL AGENCIES THAT RESOLVE CIVIL CASES IN VIETNAM TODAY

As stated earlier, organizing the Court system according to the current four-level model has advantages and also many limitations compared to the three-level organizational model in the previous period.

4.3.1 Advantages of the four-level Court organizational model

- The Court organizational system is highly professional and can reduce wrongful convictions. It can be seen that, with the four-level Court organizational model, the delineation of functions, tasks, and powers of each level of Courts is very strict and scientific. This ensures the stricter judgment and supervision of the higher Court over the lower Court. At the same time, with the current Court organizational structure, miscarriages of justice in cases in general and civil cases in particular are highly reduced.

- It reduces abuse of power in adjudication by the Provincial People's Court and reduces judicial pressure on the Supreme People's Court. The organization of the four-level Court system contributes to limiting the concentration of jurisdiction to adjudicate trial by the Provincial People's Court. Previously, in the three-level organizational model, the Provincial People's Court had very broad jurisdiction and this easily led to abuse of power. On the other hand, with a three-level organizational model, the Supreme People's Court is the appellate court if a civil case is tried at first instance from the Provincial People's Court. Therefore, the duties of the Supreme People's Court are very broad. The Supreme People's Court handles many important tasks, thus it is often pressurized with too much workload. The Supreme People's Court, besides its task of handling cassation and retrial, is also the highest management agency of the entire People's Court system in Vietnam. Therefore, with the four-level organizational model, the Supreme People's Court’s task is reduced to the appellate trial and mainly focuses on the management of the Court system, or on other activities, such as cassation and retrial trials for particularly serious cases and developing a system of precedents.
4.3.2 Limitations of the four-level Court organizational model

- The expanding payroll of the Court sector causes costs and waste to the state budget. It is easy to see that with the four-level organizational model, the Court system is increasingly expanding. In other words, the number of people working in the Court industry will naturally be larger than in the previous three-level Court model. This is contrary to the policy of downsizing staff in State agencies and units. In addition, expanding the staff of the Court sector causes additional costs to the already tight state budget.

- The authority to protest against the cassation or retrial of those with the right to protest is narrowed. From the practice of adjudicating and resolving cases in general and civil cases in particular in Vietnam, it can be seen that “cassation procedures trial and retrial procedures bring many very important contributions to the process of resolving civil cases” (Nguyen Vinh Hung, 2022, p. 276). However, with the addition of the High People's Court and regulations giving this agency the authority to appeal for cassation and retrial, the Chief Justice of the Provincial People's Court and the Director of the Provincial People's Procuracy have, there is no longer any right to appeal according to cassation and retrial procedures. With the Vietnamese territory being demarcated into many administrative and territorial units, from theory to practice, it shows that only the Courts organized closest to the people are the Courts that understand their wishes and aspirations and easily discover important details and events of civil cases. Therefore, the Provincial People's Court will be more favorable than the High People's Court in cassation and retrial trials. Also, it is easy for people to travel to the province if the cassation or retrial meetings are done there, rather than having to travel up to hundreds of kilometers to attend meetings of the High People's Court.

4.4 SOME SOLUTIONS FOR IMPROVING THE LAW AND THE EFFICIENCY OF ADJUDICATING AND RESOLVING CIVIL CASES IN VIETNAM

“In our modern civil life of today, people are highly concerned about and pay attention to their personal interests more than before” (Nguyen Vinh Hung, 2023, p. 11). Therefore, it can be predicted that civil cases will increase and the pressure on the Court sector to resolve them will be heavier and more complicated than before. Therefore, the authors believe that it is
necessary to consider the following solutions to perfect the Court organizational system and further improve the quality of resolving civil cases in Vietnam:

**First, establish Regional Courts in a number of special areas:**

The authors believe that the current organization of the Court sector according to each territorial administrative unit in Vietnam is not really reasonable and scientific. This is because, in many mountainous, border, and island areas where the population density and number of cases adjudicated annually are relatively small, the organization of a district-level People's Court with full enough judicial positions and the number of people receiving salaries from the state budget are relatively wasteful. Therefore, perhaps first of all, we should conduct a survey and investigation of areas with a relatively small number of annual trials and organize a Regional Court (with jurisdiction equivalent to the District Court) there, to collectively resolve cases for the people of the districts under the jurisdiction of this Court. This can reduce staffing for positions that do not bring more contributions and savings to the state budget.

**Second, shorten the time to resolve civil cases:**

The authors believe that although perfecting the Court system is very important, the direct contribution to improving the trial and resolution of civil cases must be the need to shorten the time to resolve cases in general and civil cases in particular. The basis of this argument is because, it can be seen that, for a long time, procedural law in Vietnam in general and the field of civil litigation in particular often stipulates the maximum time limit for resolving cases, not regulations minimum time limit for resolving cases. This makes it possible for many people conducting legal proceedings to exploit loopholes in the law for personal gain. Therefore, to improve the efficiency of adjudication and resolution of civil cases and create trust among the people, shortening the time limit for resolving civil cases is very necessary. In order to shorten the trial time, on the one hand, it is necessary to promote the application of advanced and modern technological equipment in the process of receiving and responding to petitions. On the other hand, it is necessary to further improve the professional qualifications of those conducting proceedings. In doing so, it can contribute to strengthening the responsibility of those conducting proceedings and improving the efficiency of adjudicating and resolving civil cases.

**Third, research and supplement the provisions on "lifetime tenure of Judges" in the Law on Organization of the People's Courts to contribute to perfecting the Court organization system and further improving the quality of resolving said cases in general cases and civil cases in particular:**
According to the provisions of Article 74 of the Law on Organization of the People's Courts 2014, the first term of a judge is 5 years; if reappointed, the next term is 10 years. This regulation does not really create favorable conditions for the implementation of the constitutional principle: "Judges are independent and obey only the law". When their term of office is only 5 years, "the fear of not being reappointed always hangs over their heads", making it difficult for them to judge independently, objective.

In today's world, Judges' tenure is basically divided into two types: lifetime tenure (working until retirement like in England, France, Canada, and Belgium, etc) and quite long tenure (like in Japan, and Panama, etc). Appointing a Judge for life or for a long term will make the judge feel secure in his work, less or not influenced by so-called "re-appointments", thereby ensuring independence in his judicial work. (Cao Vu Minh, 2023)

Therefore, the authors propose to add regulations on the appointment of judges for life (Judges are reappointed until retirement or transfer to another job) in the new Draft Law on Organization of People's Courts.

5 CONCLUSION

The system of judicial agencies that handle civil cases in Vietnam is increasingly being organized professionally, methodically, scientifically, and modernly. However, there are still unreasonable aspects in the organization of the judicial system, causing problems, disruptions, or waste of the state budget. Therefore, to improve the efficiency of adjudicating and resolving civil cases and the operational efficiency of the Court system, the following are recommended: Establish Regional Courts in a number of localities special tables; shorten the time to resolve civil cases; and consider the mechanism for appointing judges for life. These then will cause the adjudicating agencies that handle civil cases in Vietnam to meet and suit the current and long-term needs and demands.
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