

What Can a Judge Say? A Report by the Advisory Committee on Judicial Ethics on Freedom of Expression in Public Debate, particularly on Social Media

The purpose of this report is to initiate a discussion on judges' activity on social media.

1. Introduction

Established in 2023, the Advisory Committee on Judicial Ethics ("the Committee") has among its aims to promote discussion on the ethical principles for judges endorsed by the Finnish Association of Judges.¹ The Committee may prepare reports, issue recommendations and take initiative on issues of judicial professional ethics. The annual meeting of the Finnish Association of Judges on 4 May 2012 approved the ethical principles for judges, which were made public at the Judges' Days on 12 October 2012.² The ethical principles deal with judges' participation in public discourse in a relatively general manner, and they do not specifically address judges' activity on social media. It is appropriate to consider how the ethical principles approved in 2012 apply to social media in the 2020s.

The number of social media platforms has grown, and algorithms are increasingly shaping the worldview conveyed to the user. It is not only a matter of interaction between people; increasingly, on the one hand artificial intelligence is a tool for the user, and on the other hand it is both a party to and the regulator of the discussion. Social media enables the transmission of information about global phenomena, which involves a certain unpredictability. The functioning of the courts is, however, characterized by a certain stability as one of the fundamental pillars of democracy and the rule of law. This inevitably creates tension, and the judiciary must be able to form an understanding of the ethical dimensions of this tension.

In its meeting on 13 November 2023, the Advisory Committee on Judicial Ethics decided to draft a report on judges' freedom of expression in public debate from a social media perspective. The purpose of this report is to initiate a discussion. Many of the points presented in this report apply to judges' public statements beyond social media also. The Committee has, however, identified a need for ethical discussion related specifically, to conduct in the social media environment. The Committee may later issue a recommendation on the matter. When a judge acts on social media, a situation may arise where the appropriate conduct or way to proceed is open to interpretation. The purpose of an ethical review is to identify general principles and guidelines. The discussion on judges' freedom of expression and activity on social media has a tendency to emphasize a problem-oriented perspective. This report additionally looks at the possible positive impacts of a judge participating in discussion on social media.

To prepare this report, the Committee has engaged in a lively discussion on judges' freedom of expression on social media. In these discussions, the theme of artificial intelligence has often emerged, and the Committee may explore this topic separately at a later time.

¹ For a more detailed account of the background and origin of the ethical principles, see Antti Tapanila, "Tuomarin eettiset periaatteet" (Oikeustiede – Jurisprudentia XLVI, 2013, pp. 223–311) and Tapani Vasama, "Tuomarin etiikan pilareita pystytämässä" (Isännän ääni – Juhlakirja Erkki Kustaa Rintala, 2015, pp. 221–239).

² tuomarin_eettiset_periaatteet.pdf

2. Ethical Principles for Judges as Background to the Report

Of the principles endorsed by the Finnish Association of Judges, the following are the most significant for this report:

- Principle 1. A judge must remain committed to the principle of the rule of law and the respect for human and fundamental rights.
- Principle 2. When administering justice, a judge must remain independent of the legislative and executive branches of the government. In order to remain independent, a judge must also remain free of ties to other parties wielding influence in society, such as politicians and business and media representatives.
- Principle 3. A judge must remain impartial. A judge must carry out their official duties without fear of outside reactions, without prejudice and by maintaining impartiality. When administering justice in a court case, a judge may not be influenced by public debate or pressure groups.
- Principle 4. A judge must act in a manner that strengthens the trust in their ability to carry out their judicial duties in a manner that is based on law and fairness. A judge must also ensure that their private conduct does not put their impartiality at risk or weaken the trust in their ability to carry out their judicial duties.
- Principle 5. A judge enjoys the freedom of speech and freedom of association in the same manner as other members of society. When making use of these rights, a judge must take into account the responsible nature of their official duties and the independence, impartiality and fairness of the courts.
- Principle 15. The decision of the court is the most important statement of the judge in their capacity as a member of the judiciary. When taking part in social or academic debate, the judge must consider their judicial obligations, such as the confidentiality of the meetings in which judgments are decided.

3. Other Background Material

3.1. General

The establishment of the aforementioned ethical principles was underpinned by discussion in other Nordic countries and within the Council of Europe. The Council of Europe had published its recommendation concerning the exercise of judicial functions in 2010.³ Within the United Nations framework, the Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct form the basis for many ethical recommendations.⁴ In preparing this report, the Committee has used the ethical principles endorsed by the Finnish Association of Judges as well as the international sources on judicial ethics that it considers the most important. The latter are outlined below. From the Nordic perspective, it is worth mentioning that Sweden has published the guidelines “God domarsed 2023” (“Good Judicial Conduct 2023”), which aim to promote continued discussion on ethical issues among judges.

3.2. Opinions of the Consultative Council of European Judges (CCJE)

The Consultative Council of European Judges (CCJE), an advisory body of the Council of Europe, has issued opinions⁵ that address important questions from the standpoint of both the status of judges and the functioning of courts. In drafting these opinions, the Council has considered the requirements set by the European Convention on Human Rights in particular. Central to freedom of expression of judges and activity on social media is the opinion on freedom of expression from 2022.⁶ Other opinions also include

³ Recommendation CM/Rec (2010)12 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on judges: independence, efficiency and responsibilities. Adopted by the Committee of Ministers on 17 November 2010.

⁴ UNODC published the principles in 2018 as The Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct. The preparation of the principles had been underway since 2000.

⁵ At the Council of Europe Warsaw Summit in 2005, the Heads of State and Government of the member States decided to adopt an action plan that includes the appropriate use of the opinions issued by the CCJE, so that these help member States to dispense justice fairly and rapidly and to develop alternative means of dispute resolution (CM (2005)80 final, 17 May 2005).

⁶ CCJE Opinion No. 25 (2022) on freedom of expression of judges, [1680a973ef \(coe.int\)](https://www.coe.int/en/web/consultative-council/-/opinion-no-25-on-freedom-of-expression-of-judges)

important viewpoints, for example on judicial ethics and liability (2002)⁷, justice and society (2005)⁸ and the relations between judges and prosecutors in a democratic society (2009)⁹.

The CCJE has formulated ethical principles as guidelines and norms so that they account for the judge's position, the significance of judicial power and the related need for trust. According to the CCJE, ethical principles should be developed together with judges themselves and should be included in judges' training programs.¹⁰

In CCJE Opinion No. 25 (2022), the following recommendations are presented in section IX:

1. A judge enjoys the right to freedom of expression like any other citizen. In addition to a judge's individual entitlement, the principles of democracy, separation of powers and pluralism call for the freedom of judges to participate in debates of public interest, especially as regards matters concerning the judiciary.
2. In situations where democracy, the separation of powers or the rule of law are under threat, judges must be resilient and have a duty to speak out in defence of judicial independence, the constitutional order and the restoration of democracy, both at national and international level. This includes views and opinions on issues that are politically sensitive and extends to both the internal and external independence of individual judges and the judiciary in general. Judges who speak on behalf of a judicial council, judicial association or other representative body of the judiciary enjoy a wider discretion in this respect.
3. Aside from associations of judges, councils for the judiciary or any other independent body, individual judges have an ethical duty to explain to the public the justice system, the functioning of the judiciary and its values. By enhancing understanding and transparency, and by helping to avoid public misrepresentations, judges may help to promote and preserve public trust in judicial activity.
4. In exercising their freedom of expression, judges should bear in mind their specific responsibilities and duties in society, and exercise restraint in expressing their views and opinions in any circumstance where, in the eyes of a reasonable observer, their statement could compromise their independence or impartiality, the dignity of their office, or jeopardise the authority of the judiciary. In particular, they should refrain from comments on the substance of cases they are dealing with. Judges must also preserve the confidentiality of proceedings.
5. As a general principle, judges should avoid becoming involved in public controversies. Even in cases where their membership in a political party or their participation in public debate is allowed, it is necessary for judges to refrain from any political activity that might compromise their independence or impartiality, or the reputation of the judiciary.
6. Judges should be aware of the benefits as well as the risks of media communication. For that purpose, the judiciary should provide training for judges that educates them on the use of media, which can be utilised as an excellent tool for public outreach. At the same time, awareness should be raised that when posting on social media, anything they publish becomes permanent, even after they delete it, and may be freely interpreted or even taken out of context. Pseudonyms do not cover unethical online behaviour. Judges should refrain from posting anything that might compromise public trust in their impartiality or conflict with the dignity of their office or the judiciary.

⁷ CCJE Opinion No. 3 (2002) on ethics and liability of judges.

⁸ CCJE Opinion No. 7 (2005) on justice and society.

⁹ CCJE Opinion No. 12 (2009) on the relations between Judges and Prosecutors in a democratic society.

¹⁰ Summary of CCJE opinions provided on 17 March 2015: <https://rm.coe.int/1680702110>.

Similarly, in the Magna Carta of Judges (Fundamental Principles) drawn up by the CCJE, under the section "Ethics and Responsibility", point 18 states: "Deontological principles, distinguished from disciplinary rules, shall guide the actions of judges. They shall be drafted by the judges themselves and be included in their training." 168063e431 (coe.int)

7. Rules or codes of conduct concerning the extent of judges' freedom of expression and any limitations on its exercise should be drawn up by judges themselves or their judicial associations.¹¹

3.3. UNODC guidelines for judges on social media

The Non-binding Guidelines on the Use of Social Media by Judges by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) also address the issue of judges and social media.¹² These guidelines contain references to the Bangalore Principles. They address social media from a judge's perspective in a wide-ranging manner: judges' awareness of the risks and opportunities of social media use, identification of judges on social media, conduct on social media, social media content, friendships and other connections online, privacy and security, and the training of judges regarding social media.

Social media platforms such as Facebook, X, Instagram and LinkedIn all enable participants to share messages, photos or videos, with others being able to comment on these posts. The platforms generally offer the ability to indicate one's views briefly, for example by "liking" a post. An ethical assessment needs to take into account those specific social media features that can blur the nature of the user's expression as a public statement. Posts may be visible only to a small group, or the audience may be very broad and international. One can often be another user's "friend" or "follower" on social media. In such a case, the friend or follower is able to follow the user's posts, and often others can see that such a "relationship" exists.

The above-mentioned UNODC guidelines note that a social media friendship or follower relationship may in certain cases be equated with a normal author–reader relationship, for example where someone writes an opinion piece in a newspaper and another person reads or subscribes to that newspaper. The recommendation nevertheless states that in other situations the relationship is more personal and can be very close. This requires attention and consideration by the judge. The situation can be assessed from an ethical perspective and often involves considering the possibility of a conflict of interests.

The guidelines also note that social media platforms have been used to subject judges to harassment.

3.4. Case law of the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR)

The Committee does not draft legal analysis that would directly take a view on the interpretation of legal provisions. It is nevertheless worth mentioning that the case law of the European Court of Human Rights has addressed situations where a judge's activity on social media was at issue. In the ECtHR case of Danileț v. Romania¹³, a judge had published two Facebook posts expressing his views on threats to the rule of law. The judge had been given disciplinary sanctions for harming the reputation of the judiciary. The Grand Chamber of the ECtHR found, by a majority, that this was a violation of Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights (freedom of expression). In the case of Kozan v. Turkey¹⁴, a judge had shared in a private Facebook group an article which criticised the decisions of the High Council of Judges and Prosecutors. The judge himself had not commented on the article. A Chamber of the ECtHR unanimously found that the disciplinary sanction imposed on the judge was a violation of Article 10.

¹¹ In the Finnish and Swedish versions of this document these recommendations have been translated by the committee.

¹² [Social_Media_2020.pdf \(unodc.org\)](#)

The guidelines were produced by the Global Judicial Integrity Network, which is a platform to provide assistance to judiciaries in strengthening judicial integrity and preventing corruption in the justice system.

¹³ [https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng#/{%22itemid%22:\[%22001-247839%22\]}](https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng#/{%22itemid%22:[%22001-247839%22]}) judgment of 15 December 2025.

¹⁴ [Kozan v. Turkey](#) (requête no. 16695/19, arrêt du 5 septembre 2022, final, accessed on 1 August 2025)

4. Participation in Public Debate

The question of participation by the courts – and also judges – in public debate is not new. Courts have employed communications officers whose task has been to maintain contact with the press. In the modern social media environment, those responsible for communications often also manage the court social media platforms. Courts have traditionally reported on their activities in annual reports. Courts have websites that provide general information about their activities. These sites publish significant rulings and related press releases. A press release may indicate a referendary (drafting/presenting judicial official) or judge who can provide further information. Practices vary somewhat in this regard. Some courts, for example the supreme courts, post updates on LinkedIn.

It is also worth mentioning that in the Finnish media judge system certain judges are specialised in explaining court decisions to journalists and the general public. Media judges have maintained a media blog in which the authors have discussed various phenomena in the courts. For example, on 11 January 2022 a blog entry entitled “Judges speak through their judgments – is this enough nowadays?” (*Tuomarit puhuvat tuomioidensa kautta – riittääkö tämä nykyään?*)¹⁵ was published. Also noteworthy is a podcast called “The Judge Has Something to Say” (Tuomarilla on asiaa), in which media judges examine the operations of the courts together with their guests.

There is no legislation regulating the activity of courts or judges on social media, nor is the activity directed or planned centrally. However, the National Courts Administration monitors communications as part of the publicity requirements set for the courts.¹⁶ Additionally, individual judges have given interviews and written at least for professional publications. Judges have also been able to publish memoirs of their careers.

5. Judicial Ethics, Conduct on Social Media and Freedom of Expression

5.1. The judge and social media platforms

A typical use case of social media is a situation in which judges have a social media account on which they share photos or thoughts from private life with their circle of acquaintances. A judge may also follow various phenomena, for example on Instagram. A judge may use LinkedIn, where one appears primarily under one's own name and professional title and where one's employer is also stated. LinkedIn is also often used for discussion related to professional topics, publications, events and networking.

5.2. The judge's role and social media

Owing to the judge's position, the ethical expectations and requirements that apply to judges when they operate on social media are heightened even compared to the average citizen or a typical civil servant.¹⁷ A

¹⁵ Written by Helsinki Court of Appeal justices Juha Hartikainen and Miikka Kärki, who have served as media judges at the Helsinki Court of Appeal.

¹⁶ For example, the Judiciary's Sustainability and Responsibility Report 2024 (*Tuomioistuinlaitoksen kestävyys- ja vastuullisuusraportti 2024*), section 3.6, Open and transparent access to information. This section describes, *inter alia*, the operations of the media judge network.

¹⁷ A judge is subject to Chapter 4, Section 14(2) of the State Civil Servants Act, which provides that a civil servant must behave in a manner required by his or her position and duties. The Advisory Board on Civil Service Ethics issued on 15 June 2016 a recommendation concerning civil servants' use of social media in the performance of their duties and in their role as civil servants. According to the recommendation, *inter alia*, a civil servant must in all interaction maintain good manners and absolutely refrain from making any remarks or views concerning individuals or groups that contravene good practice. The recommendations highlight the civil servant's own discretion irrespective of time and place.

(See also, regarding the special legal status of judges as civil servants, Government Bill HE 7/2016 vp, pp. 43, 65–67 and 68, which states that Chapter 1 Section 5 applies to judges rather than judicial positions. With regard to Section 6, it is noted that the independence of the courts under the Constitution requires that judges too are independent when exercising judicial power. Independence is not a privilege of judges, but a guarantee for the realization of fundamental and human rights, which also maintains confidence in the justice system.)

significant aspect of a judge's use of social media is that the judge's position carries over into his or her private life. A judge does not leave behind his or her position as a person exercising judicial power when leaving the courthouse or logging off the case management system and official email. Judges sign the cases they adjudicate with their name on behalf of the court, and they are visible actors in the courtroom. Furthermore, a judge's activity and conduct on social media has a societal dimension. A judge represents the court, which, as an institution exercising judicial power, has a special role in society. The conduct of an individual judge can affect the public's confidence in the courts, in other judges and in the fairness of judgments, as well as the respect for judges and courts.

When engaging on social media and participating in public debate, a judge is expected to exercise judgment and caution that correspond to society's expectations of the judicial role. Generally speaking, a judge is expected to set an example of obedience to the law. In considering the use of social media, it is worth remembering that a judge is a judge 24/7. Judges do not become free of the ethical obligations of judicial office when acting as private individuals on social media. Even when on leave from the bench, a judge cannot assume to be completely freed from the role of a judge.

An ethical assessment may evaluate the question of the extent to which judges can appear on social media under their own name. Judges must also consider how their position affects participation and how or whether to bring up that position. Should a judge avoid using the title "Judge" in discussions? Could using the title cause confusion about the capacity in which the judge is participating in the discussion? In international fora, the question of whether judges may indicate on social media their position has been raised fairly often. Practices vary by country. In the Finnish context, one can likely assume that mentioning the position cannot be completely prohibited. However, the focus will likely be on the purpose for which this information is stated. In international discussion, it has been considered essential that the prestige of the office should not be used to favor businesses or other actors. It may also become a problem if a judge's activity on social media is understood as a statement by the judiciary or a court, even though the judge only intended to present his or her own perspective on a certain issue.

Another issue that has sparked debate is the use of a pseudonym. Even if a judge uses social media without revealing his or her name, this does not free the judge from ethical obligations. Should a judge exercise restraint and generally refrain from taking strong positions on various topics in public? Should any public statements on societal issues generally be signed with one's own name? On social media, there are, for example, groups related to recreational activities in which discussions typically take place under pseudonyms. Can a judge be the only person who participates in the discussion using a real name?

5.3. A judge's participation on social media

Judicial decisions have great significance for the parties to the case, and in addition, those decisions can also have societal significance:

- Can judges take part in public debate about court decisions and/or other societal issues, and should they do so?
- To what extent can a judge participate in such a debate?

In considering the above questions, one must take into account, *inter alia*, the judge's role (a judge cannot completely detach from the requirements related to that role when acting as a private person), technological development (including artificial intelligence) and the court's own internal policies on communication. Judges may take part in scientific research or academic discussion, and they may also participate in political or social debate. The rule of law also entails broad freedom of expression and judicial independence. If we expect that a judge participates in public debate only very cautiously and with an especially factual tone, could this lead to a judge's independence and freedom of expression being unduly

restricted? In public discourse, critical viewpoints can be perceived as inappropriate, even if presented politely and based on facts. Freedom of expression includes a certain margin of maneuver. What could the requirement of propriety mean for a judge?

The Bangalore Principles stress caution when a judge participates in public debate. On the other hand, the commentary on the principles also addresses situations where a judge feels that he or she has a moral duty to take a stand. The commentary points out that a judge is also a human being with a conscience, morals, feelings and values. According to the commentary, a judge can exercise freedom of expression by participating, for example, in anti-war events or demonstrations. The commentary indicates that these are issues that concern the local or global community. If issues related to these matters later come before the court, the judge must opt for recusal if necessary.¹⁸

When a judge participates in public debate, one can assess the matter from the perspective of whether participation in public debate may create potential conflicts of interests. In this respect, CCJE Opinion No. 25 considers that corrective measures, such as withdrawal due to disqualification, should be preferred rather than generally restricting judges' freedom of expression to avoid such situations.¹⁹ The UNODC guidelines on judges' use of social media state that social media should not be used to such an extent that it affects a judge's ability to perform his or her work.²⁰ A judge's primary duty is the resolution of legal questions. Could one consider that a judge has some leeway to participate in public debate, but that, fundamentally, such participation should be fairly limited? Restrictions on a judge's freedom of expression would not primarily concern content.

In their work, judges receive, in certain respects, precise information about societal matters from a unique perspective. A judge may perceive a problem that has not been discussed publicly. Can a judge serve society by bringing this information to the public? However, especially when acting proactively in relation to public debate, judges should always bear in mind how their statements affect the public's perception of the judge's ability to act as an impartial resolver of legal disputes. Judges should also be aware that their perspective is inevitably limited. Nevertheless, these factors should not lead to excessive caution in considering whether to participate in public debate.

How can judges—or can they—participate in discussion about a decision in which they were personally involved? By taking part in a discussion on social media in several roles simultaneously – as the decision-maker in the case, as the communicator of the decision, and as a general commentator – a judge may end up in a delicate ethical situation, even endangering the public's confidence in the judge's impartiality and the judge's ability to fulfil his or her official duties. The confidentiality of deliberations and other secrecy obligations set parameters for the discussion. A judge should draw a distinction between communicating court decisions, on the one hand, and the discussion about them, on the other, and be aware that the court may have given or may give guidance on how court decisions are to be communicated. The contact person designated by the court can, in connection with communicating the decision, respond to questions. As a rule, a judge must thus follow the instructions given by the court on communicating about decisions.

¹⁸ UNODC, *Commentary on The Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct* (2007), para. 140: "Occasions may arise when a judge – as a human being with a conscience, morals, feelings and values – considers it a moral duty to speak out. For example, in the exercise of the freedom of expression, a judge might join a vigil, hold a sign or sign a petition to express opposition to war, support for energy conservation or independence, or funding for an anti-poverty agency. These are expressions of concern for the local and global community. If any of these issues were to arise in the judge's court, and if the judge's impartiality might reasonably be questioned, the judge must disqualify himself or herself from any proceedings that follow where the past actions cast doubt on the judge's impartiality and judicial integrity."

¹⁹ Opinion paragraph 33: "Corrective measures, such as a judge's recusal or voluntary withdrawal, should be preferred to a general preventive infringement of judges' freedom of expression aimed at avoiding such situations."

²⁰ UNODC guideline, point 9: "Judges should ensure that the level of their social media use does not adversely impact their capacity to perform judicial duties with competence and diligence."

Could there be situations in which a judge feels it warranted to publicly comment on his or her own decisions, even if some authority attempts to prevent it? And how should such a situation be assessed from the perspective of the judge's independence and considering the judge's freedom of expression? In case of a societal crisis, could a judge justifiably express a view, for example, on the matters that threaten the foundations of the legal order and the courts? There are examples from other parts of the world where the constitutional division of state tasks and the independence of the judiciary have been under threat, and judges have not remained passive in public debate.

The Committee has formed the view that Sweden has in many respects a more open attitude towards judges speaking in public than Finland does at present. This is apparent in both legislation and in practice. In Sweden, a judge who has decided a case has participated in interviews regarding that decision, for example on television news broadcasts. This has occurred also with respect to sensitive cases, such as sexual offence cases. Should there be readiness in Finland to adopt a similar practice?

According to international recommendations, a judge has an ethical duty to inform the public about the legal system, the functioning of the court and its values, so that these become more widely known, enhancing trust also. The purpose of the media judge system established within the judiciary in Finland is to increase the transparency of court operations. Additionally, the aim is to increase general knowledge of the functioning of the courts and of case law in general.²¹ Judges other than the designated media judges can also participate in this discussion.

5.4. Other ethical perspectives related to the use of social media

Internationally, there has been discussion about friendships and followers on social media. How should one approach the situation in which a lawyer appearing before a court is a judge's friend on Facebook? The question relates more generally to collegiality. The ethical guidelines approved by the Association of Finnish Lawyers state that "A lawyer must behave appropriately in his or her work and act impartially. Collegiality must not influence the matter."²² Should a judge exercise caution if a counsel appearing in the same court seeks to become the judge's friend or equivalent on social media? A more difficult question is whether a lawyer should dissociate from a prior friendship on social media if he or she is appointed to judicial office. In that event, it may happen that the acquaintance is not visible on social media but still exists in reality.

It has sometimes been suggested in international discussions that persons appointed as judges should critically review their earlier social media posts when they are appointed to the bench.

When evaluating a judge's conduct on social media, it is usually not merely a question of pondering a theoretical ideal. Often an ethical assessment includes a practical and educational perspective. What is the appropriate way for a judge to interact with the media? What should a judge know about the different social media platforms? Information collected about judges can also be used against a judge, for example to smear or harass the individual. The Committee considers one important aspect to be that of protecting judges from the harmful effects of using social media and the internet in general.

6. Conclusion

In several countries, ethical guidelines on social media for the judiciary have been issued, particularly following the publication of CCJE Opinion No. 25 (2022). That Opinion considered that judges should themselves draw up rules or codes of conduct on the scope of freedom of expression and the restrictions

²¹ <https://tuomioistuimet.fi/fi/index/asiointijajulkisuus/mediatuomariverkosto.html>

²² [Juristin eettiset ohjeet - Juristiliitto](http://juristin-eettiset-ohjeet-juristiliitto)

related to it. The opinion of the Finnish judiciary is important when considering the need to implement ethical recommendations on the use of social media in Finland.

The Advisory Committee on Judicial Ethics considers it important that a discussion among the judiciary result in a position on, *inter alia*, the following questions:

- Is it necessary to supplement the ethical principles adopted in 2012 with regard to social media?
- Would the recommendations presented in CCJE Opinion No. 25 be suitable as ethical guidelines for the use of social media?
- What other technology-related factors should be considered in drafting a possible recommendation, also bearing in mind rapid technological development?
- Is there a need for guidance or training for practical situations?
- Does the judiciary have concrete examples of issues or situations related to the use of social media?

With this report, the Advisory Committee on Judicial Ethics opens the discussion and encourages the judiciary to participate in the discussion!