

UDC 342.98

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32849/2663-5313/2024.4.11>**Oleh Hryhorov***Applicant, Scientific Institute of Public Law, 2a Heorhii Kirpa Street, Kyiv, 03055**olehhryhorov@ukr.net***ORCID:** [orcid.org/0009-0008-4550-5858](https://orcid.org/0009-0008-4550-5858)

## TYPICAL INVESTIGATIVE SITUATIONS OF THE INITIAL STAGE OF INVESTIGATING CRIMES COMMITTED BY INTERNALLY DISPLACED PERSONS

**Abstract. Purpose.** The purpose of this article is to identify the typical investigative situations at the initial stage of investigating crimes committed by internally displaced persons. **Results.** The article examines the typical investigative situations characteristic of the initial stage of criminal investigation involving crimes committed by internally displaced persons. The author concludes that, in the context of detecting and investigating crimes committed by internally displaced persons, particular significance should be attributed to typical investigative situations and to action algorithms for the initial stage of investigation, since the timely identification of offenders and their apprehension based on collected evidence most frequently occurs at this stage. **Conclusions.** A generalization of different approaches to defining typical investigative situations for the identified groups of crimes, as well as the results of studying criminal case materials, makes it possible to unify the typical investigative situations most characteristic of the priority stage of investigating crimes committed by internally displaced persons, namely: 1. A crime has been detected, but the person (internally displaced person) who committed it has not been identified. 2. A crime has been detected, information has been established regarding the internally displaced person who committed it/them, but the person has not been apprehended: a crime has been detected; it has been established that the internally displaced person who committed it/them remains within the territory of Ukraine; a crime has been detected; it has been established that the internally displaced person who committed it/them has left for another state; a crime has been detected; it has been established that the internally displaced person who committed it/them has left for a territory not controlled by the state authorities of Ukraine and/or for the territory of the aggressor state; a crime has been detected; it has been established that the internally displaced person who committed it/them is a servicemember of the Armed Forces of Ukraine, the National Guard of Ukraine, or other defence forces. 3. A crime has been detected, the internally displaced person who committed it/them has been apprehended, and sources of evidentiary information are available. 4. A crime has been detected, the internally displaced person who committed it/them has been apprehended, but sources of evidentiary information are insufficient and/or absent.

**Key words:** algorithm, variability, apprehension, unidentified person, suspicion.

### 1. Introduction

The scope and content of the initial information detected at the early stage of investigation regarding a criminal offense ultimately determine the operative–investigative situation, which, on the one hand, necessitates a non-template approach to conducting procedural actions and organizational measures, and, on the other hand, necessitates the application of investigative (search) actions, covert investigative (search) actions, and operational measures in a particular sequence and coordination to ensure maximum efficiency (Klimov, 2024).

This method of organizing a criminal investigation is usually referred to as *planning*. In criminal proceedings, an investigation plan

must be thoroughly considered. The investigative (search) actions planned must reflect the investigator's tactical concept and the internal logic of the investigation. At the initial stage of investigation, a distinction is made between *planning* and *subsequent planning* (Orlov, 2005).

On the one hand, the existence of plans and planning provides a number of advantages; on the other hand, it requires additional human resources and time–resources that cannot be lost during the priority stage of conducting urgent procedural actions and operational measures. Such situations require pre-developed variations of actions, determined by the dynamic development of events, changes in the situation at the scene, etc. These varia-

tions of actions in criminalistics and other criminal-law sciences are referred to as *algorithms*. At the same time, there is no single universal algorithm (sequence of actions) for the investigator, even in the investigation of typical crimes of the same type.

The variability of the investigator's actions largely depends on situations that arise due to unpredictable circumstances at certain stages of the investigation. However, the unpredictable nature of these circumstances does not preclude the possibility of anticipating the situations themselves or identifying patterns of their emergence and typology.

This underscores the importance and necessity of studying the typical investigative situations of the initial stage of investigating crimes committed by internally displaced persons (hereinafter – IDPs).

A wide range of works by domestic scholars is devoted to the general theoretical foundations of investigative situations as a whole, including those by V.P. Bakhin, S.V. Velikanov, A.F. Volobuiev, V.A. Zhuravel, A.V. Ishchenko, O.N. Kolesnichenko, V.O. Konovalova, V.S. Kuzmichov, V.P. Korzh, H.A. Matusovskyi, M.V. Salteviskyi, R.L. Stepaniuk, S.S. Cherniavskyi, K.O. Chaplynskyi, V.Yu. Shepitko, among others.

At the same time, modern research does not address the specificity of typical investigative situations at the initial stage of investigating crimes committed by IDPs, nor the algorithms of actions for resolving them.

The purpose of this article is to determine the typical investigative situations at the initial stage of investigating crimes committed by IDPs.

## 2. Foundations for Studying Typical Investigative Situations

Knowledge of typical investigative situations makes it possible not only to anticipate their emergence under corresponding conditions as regular occurrences, but also to select appropriate means, techniques, and methods for investigating crimes (Veselskyi, 2011).

In this regard, scholars emphasize the importance of studying the typical investigative situations of both the initial and subsequent stages of investigation. The existence of a typical investigative situation ensures a clear structuring of specific forensic methodologies in close connection with the concept of an investigative stage (Volobuiev, 2000).

At the same time, despite the fact that in Ukraine the doctrine of typical investigative situations began to develop at the level of theoretical concepts as early as the 1970s, there is still no unified position regarding the classification and content of typical investigative situations.

It should be noted that scholars interpret this category differently, and some even in two dimensions simultaneously.

Thus, S.V. Velikanov defines this category as a set of conditions formed at a particular stage—namely, the circumstances, state, and environment—of an investigation, perceived, evaluated, and used by the investigator to solve tactical tasks and achieve general (strategic) investigative objectives (Velikanov, 2002).

A.P. Sheremet defines the investigative situation as, on the one hand, an objective reality (material and ideal sources), and on the other hand, an objective reality that has been cognized by the subject of proof and exists at that specific moment (Sheremet, 2009).

M.M. Shulha, V.M. Plakhotina, and O.V. Balaniuk understand this category as the sum of information significant for the investigation that is available to the investigator at a certain stage of the investigation (Shulha, Plakhotina, Balaniuk, 2013).

A somewhat different viewpoint is held by M.V. Salteviskyi, who defines an investigative situation as a set of circumstances of a specific criminal event actualized by the investigator, inquiry officer, prosecutor, or court involved in its detection, investigation, and prevention, or as a set of potential information about the crime that has been actualized by the subject of the criminal process and is reflected and preserved in the material environment (Salteviskyi, 2001).

O.F. Kobzar, M.L. Komissarov, N.O. Komissarova, O.V. Tkachenko, and O.M. Voluiko understand a typical investigative situation as a set of data on the criminal event and the circumstances of its investigation at a specific stage, which influences the selection, sequence, and tactics of investigative (search) actions and operational-search measures (Kobzar, Komissarov, Komissarova, Tkachenko, Voluiko, 2023).

We support those scholars who define an investigative situation as an imagined dynamic model that reflects the informational-logical, tactical-psychological, tactical-managerial, and organizational states that have developed in a criminal case and that characterize a favorable (or unfavorable) course of the investigative process (Shepitko, 1998).

Moving on to the types of typical investigative situations, it should be emphasized that the groups of crimes identified by us—

1. acquisitive (thefts, fraud, unlawful seizure of vehicles);
2. ideological (high treason, collaboration, evasion of conscription for military service);
3. violent (intentional grievous or moderate bodily injuries);

4. situational (violations of traffic safety rules or operation of transport by persons driving vehicles) – have already been studied from the perspective of situational analysis.

At the same time, the issue of typical investigative situations in crimes committed by internally displaced persons, as well as the corresponding algorithms of investigators' actions when the offenders are IDPs, has not yet been addressed in scientific literature, which is undeniably a shortcoming from an academic standpoint.

Given the subject of our research, it is appropriate to present several variations of typical investigative situations at the initial stage of investigation that have been defined by scholars with regard to the examined groups of crimes.

1. Acquisitive crimes (thefts, fraud, unlawful seizure of vehicles)

For example, M.I. Skryhoniuk identifies the following typical investigative situations in theft cases:

1. The first situation arises when information about the theft and the identity of the perpetrator is available, and the offender has been apprehended at the crime scene or immediately after its commission.

2. The second situation arises when the identity of the offender has been established, but the person has disappeared and is hiding from the investigation.

3. The third situation arises when no information about the identity of the person who committed the theft is available (Skryhoniuk, 2005).

A.S. Kuzmenko identifies a system of typical investigative situations at the *subsequent* stage of investigating thefts committed by previously convicted persons, specifically:

a) the offender has been notified of suspicion, provides truthful testimony, and the material evidence is sufficient for drafting an indictment;

b) the offender has been notified of suspicion, provides false testimony, and the material evidence is sufficient for drafting an indictment;

c) the offender has been notified of suspicion, provides false testimony, but the material evidence is insufficient for drafting an indictment;

d) the offender has been notified of suspicion, refuses to testify, and the material evidence is sufficient for drafting an indictment;

e) the offender has been notified of suspicion, refuses to testify, and the material evidence is insufficient for drafting an indictment (Kuzmenko, 2018).

2. Ideological Crimes (high treason, collaboration, evasion of conscription for military service)

In examining the investigation of criminal offenses related to collaboration, A.V. Kovalenko identifies the following typical investigative situations:

1. **First situation:** the investigated act of collaboration was committed in territory controlled by the Ukrainian government;

2. **Second situation:** the acts were committed in temporarily occupied territories that, at the time of the pre-trial investigation, had already been de-occupied;

3. **Third situation:** the investigated acts were committed (1) in temporarily occupied territories that, at the time of investigation, remain beyond the control of the Government of Ukraine, or (2) outside the territory of Ukraine (Kovalenko, 2024).

According to the author, these situations should further be divided into **sub-situations** based on an internal informational criterion—specifically, depending on the available possibilities to obtain information about the offender and from the offender. In particular, he proposes distinguishing sub-situations in which the person who committed the collaborative activity, at the time of the pre-trial investigation, is located in territory controlled by the Government of Ukraine, and sub-situations in which such a person, at the same moment, is located in temporarily occupied territories or outside Ukraine (Pysmenskyi, Holovkin, Kovalenko, Kovalenko, 2024).

A more substantiated approach is proposed by O.L. Khrystov, who notes that the detection of such criminal offenses occurs both in occupied and in de-occupied territories. Simultaneously with identifying these facts, measures are undertaken to establish the whereabouts of offenders. Their location may be as follows:

– the individuals are located in the occupied territory where the criminal offense is being committed;

– the individuals are located in de-occupied territory;

– the individuals have left for the territory of the Russian Federation or the Republic of Belarus;

– the individuals have left for the territory of “third” states (Khrystov, 2024).

A similar approach is applied by A.V. Kovalenko, who distinguishes the following sub-situations:

– **Situation 1.1.** The person committed collaboration and is located in territory controlled by the Government of Ukraine (36%).

– **Situation 1.2.** The person committed collaboration in territory controlled by the Government of Ukraine but left it before the start of the pre-trial investigation (0%).

– **Situation 2.1.** The person committed collaboration and is located in de-occupied territory (46%).

– **Situation 2.2.** The person committed collaboration in temporarily occupied territory, left it before de-occupation, and at the time of the investigation is located outside the territory controlled by the Government of Ukraine (1.6%).

– **Situation 3.1.** The person committed collaboration in temporarily occupied territory or abroad and, at the time of the pre-trial investigation, returned to territory controlled by the Government of Ukraine (4%).

– **Situation 3.2.** The person committed collaboration in temporarily occupied territory or abroad and, at the time of the pre-trial investigation, remains outside the territory controlled by the Government of Ukraine (12.4%) (Kovalenko, 2024).

3. Violent Crimes (intentional grievous and moderate bodily injuries)

M.I. Panov, V.Yu. Shepitko, and V.O. Kononova note that, in the investigation of bodily injuries, the investigative situations at the initial stage are characterized by the conditions under which information about the crime is received:

– **Situation I:** Information is received regarding bodily injuries inflicted upon a victim who has been brought to a medical facility.

– **Situation II:** The fact of bodily injury is known; information is available regarding the nature of the incident and the alleged offender (Panov, Shepitko, Kononova, 2007).

3. Typical Investigative Situations at the Initial Stage of Crime Investigation

The analysis of criminal cases involving bodily injuries and existing investigation methodologies has enabled I.A. Strok to identify the following general situations at the initial stage:

1. **The investigator possesses sufficient information about the victim and the offender, and there are eyewitnesses.**

2. **Bodily injuries were inflicted in the presence of witnesses, but neither the victim nor the witnesses have information about the offender.**

3. **Serious bodily injuries were inflicted without witnesses.**

Each of these situations determines a specific direction for further investigation and requires the proper organization and planning of actions by investigators and operational officers (Panov, Shepitko, Kononova, 2007).

4. Situational Crimes (Violations of Road Traffic Safety Rules or Transport Operation by Drivers)

Every traffic accident is inherently individual. At the same time, certain regularities operate within the mechanism of their occurrence. The situational theory states that each traffic accident results from a set of accidental

circumstances that give rise to a particular incident and influence the degree of its social danger. Indeed, the analysis of any accident reveals a chain of accidental events that were previously unrelated but, due to a certain combination of circumstances, led to harm to life, health, or property of road users (Iunin, Shevchenko, Babanin, Toloshna, 2022).

Initial information about the facts of traffic accidents is received from the patrol police, medical institutions, drivers, or individual citizens. Depending on the clarity or obscurity of the traffic accident, the harmful consequences, the timeliness of detection, the nature of crime traces, and the actions aimed at concealing or destroying the consequences of the accident, as well as the characteristics of the offender, the following **typical investigative situations** at the initial stage are distinguished:

1. **The vehicle and the driver remain at the scene, and there are witnesses** (a favourable investigative situation);

2. **The material consequences of the accident have been established, but there are no witnesses, and the driver has:**

3. **a) fled the scene in the vehicle used to commit the accident;**

4. **b) fled the scene but left the vehicle behind;**

5. **c) taken measures to destroy traces at the scene (removed, concealed, or destroyed the victim's body) or subsequently filed a report alleging that the vehicle had been stolen prior to the accident** (an unfavourable investigative situation) (Lukianchykov, Lukianchykov, Petriaiev, 2017).

In the context of this study, particular attention should be paid to the conclusions drawn by V.M. Shevchuk, who notes that the classification of investigative situations should be carried out based on situational modelling, the essence of which lies in the consolidation of a large number of specific situations that are similar in some essential respect into one or several generalized situations. For these generalized situations, optimal programmes for decision-making and practical actions are developed (Shevchuk, 2014).

Given the above, it is hardly possible to compile an exhaustive list of all components constituting an investigative situation. Therefore, it is advisable to identify only certain groups of such components. This approach simplifies the analysis of the content of a situation while allowing practitioners to consider all significant elements of the investigative situation and determine possibilities for their optimal use in solving investigative tasks (Shevchuk, 2014).

At the initial stage of the investigation, it is also necessary to consider the complexity

and duration of conducting non-traditional types of forensic examinations (phototechnical, video-phonoscopy, examinations of materials, substances and products such as petroleum products, fuels and lubricants, paint and varnish materials, etc.). The need for these examinations may arise when traces of a criminal offence and physical evidence are detected and seized. Therefore, primary forensic examinations should be appointed, depending on the situation, as promptly as possible at the initial stage of the investigation (Klimov, 2024).

Consequently, the systematization of typical investigative situations at the initial stage of investigating crimes committed by IDPs should be based on situational modelling, which implies combining or generalising several situations that are repeatable in essential respects and arise as a result of pre-crime, crime, or post-crime actions of IDPs.

A generalization of various approaches to defining typical investigative situations of the groups of crimes identified by us, as well as the results of the analysis of criminal proceedings, makes it possible to **unify the typical investigative situations most characteristic of the initial stage of investigating crimes committed by IDPs**, including:

1. **The crime has been detected, but the IDP who committed it has not been identified (36%).**

2. **The crime has been detected, information about the IDP offender has been established, but the offender has not been apprehended (17%):**

2.1. The IDP offender remains within the territory of Ukraine (7%).

2.2. The IDP offender has left for another state (3%).

2.3. The IDP offender has left for a territory not controlled by the Ukrainian government and/or for the territory of the aggressor state (3%).

2.4. The IDP offender is a servicemember of the Armed Forces of Ukraine, the National Guard of Ukraine, or other Defence Forces (4%).

3. **The crime has been detected, the IDP offender has been apprehended, and sources of evidence are available (24%).**

4. **The crime has been detected, the IDP offender has been apprehended, but sources of evidence are insufficient or absent (23%).**

In the context of the detection and investigation of crimes committed by IDPs, **typical investigative situations and action algorithms at the initial stage** are of particular importance, since the prompt identification and apprehension of offenders based on collected evidence occurs in most cases precisely at this stage.

#### 4. Conclusions

In the context of detecting and investigating crimes committed by internally displaced persons (IDPs), particular importance is attached to the typical investigative situations and action algorithms characteristic of the initial stage of the investigation, since the prompt identification of offenders and their apprehension based on the collected evidence occurs, in most cases, precisely at this stage.

A generalization of different approaches to identifying typical investigative situations within the selected groups of crimes, as well as the results of examining criminal case materials, makes it possible to unify the typical investigative situations most characteristic of the initial stage of investigating crimes committed by IDPs, namely:

1. **A crime has been detected, but the IDP offender has not been identified.**

2. **A crime has been detected, information about the IDP offender has been established, but the offender has not been apprehended:**

3. 2.1. A crime has been detected and it has been established that the IDP offender remains within the territory of Ukraine.

4. 2.2. A crime has been detected and it has been established that the IDP offender has left for another state.

5. 2.3. A crime has been detected and it has been established that the IDP offender has left for a territory not controlled by the Ukrainian authorities and/or for the territory of the aggressor state.

6. 2.4. A crime has been detected and it has been established that the IDP offender is a servicemember of the Armed Forces of Ukraine, the National Guard of Ukraine, or other Defence Forces.

7. **A crime has been detected, the IDP offender has been apprehended, and sources of evidence are available.**

8. **A crime has been detected, the IDP offender has been apprehended, but sources of evidence are insufficient or absent.**

#### References

Iunin, O.S., Shevchenko, S.I., Babanin, S.V., Toloshna, N.V. (2022). *Porushennia pravyl bezpeky dorozhnogo rukhu abo ekspluatatsii transportu osobamy, yaki keruiut transportnymy zasobamy (determinanty ta kryminalno-pravovi zakhody zapobihannia): metodychni rekomendatsii* [Violation of road safety rules or transport operation by persons driving vehicles (determinants and criminal law prevention measures): methodological recommendations]. Dnipro: DDUVS (in Ukrainian).

Khrystov, O.L. (2024). *Osoblyvosti vykorystannia hromadskosti pidrozdilamy kryminalnoi politsii pid chas vyiaclennia ta dokumentuvannia kryminal-*

nykh pravoporushen, peredbachenykh st. 111–1 KK Ukrainy [Peculiarities of using the public by criminal police units during the detection and documentation of criminal offenses provided for in Art. 111–1 of the Criminal Code of Ukraine]. *Zakonodavchi aspekty protydii osoblyvo nebezpechnym zlochynam v Ukraini*, № 1, 279–282 (in Ukrainian).

Klimov, B.V. (2024). *Rozsliduvannya khulihanstva, vchynenoho futbolnymy vbolivalnykamy* [Investigation of hooliganism committed by football fans]. Candidate's thesis. Zaporizhzhia: Zaporizk. nats. un-t (in Ukrainian).

Kobzar, O.F., Komissarov, M.L., Komissarova, N.O., Tkachenko, O.V., Voluiko, O.M. (2023). *Kryminalistyka* [Forensic science]. Kyiv: IVTs NHU (in Ukrainian).

Kovalenko, A.V. (2024). *Typovi slidchi sytuatsii pochatkovoho etapu rozsliduvannya kolaboratsiinoi diialnosti (za materialamy sudovo-slidchoi praktyky)* [Typical investigative situations of the initial stage of investigation of collaboration activities (based on forensic and investigative practice)]. *Visnyk LNNI im. E.O. Didorenka*, № 1, 279–296 (in Ukrainian).

Kuzmenko, A.S. (2018). *Rozsliduvannya kvar-tyrnykh kradizhok, uchynenykh ranishe zasudzhenyymy* [Investigation of apartment thefts committed by previously convicted persons]. Candidate's thesis. Dnipro (in Ukrainian).

Luk'ianchykov, B.Ie., Luk'ianchykov, Ye.D., Petraiev, S.Iu. (2017). *Kryminalistyka* [Forensic science]. Kyiv (in Ukrainian).

Orlov, Yu.Iu. (2005). *Poniattia ta elementy orhanizatsii operatyvno-rozshukovoi diialnosti* [Concept and elements of the organization of operational and investigative activities]. *Naukovyi visnyk Kyivskoho natsionalnoho universytetu vnutrishnikh sprav*, № 5, 264–271 (in Ukrainian).

Panov, M.I., Shepitko, V.Iu., Konovalova, V.O. (2007). *Nastilna knyha slidchoho* [Investigator's desk book]. Kyiv: Vyd. Dim «In Yure» (in Ukrainian).

Pysmenskyi, Ye.O., Holovkin, S.V., Kovalenko, A.V., Kovalenko, V.V. (2024). *Rozsliduvannya kolab-*

*oratsiinoi diialnosti* [Investigation of collaboration activities]. Kyiv: VD Dakor (in Ukrainian).

Saltevs'kyi, M.V. (2001). *Kryminalistyka: pidruchnyk* [Forensic science: textbook]. Kharkiv: Konsum (in Ukrainian).

Shepitko, V.Iu. (1998). *Kryminalistyka. Kryminalistychna taktyka i metodyka rozsliduvannya zlochyniv: pidruchnyk* [Forensic science. Forensic tactics and methods of investigating crimes: textbook]. Kharkiv: Pravo (in Ukrainian).

Sheremet, A.P. (2009). *Kryminalistyka* [Forensic science]. Kyiv: Tsentr uchbovoi literatury (in Ukrainian).

Shevchuk, V.M. (2014). *Slidcha sytuatsiia: poniattia, struktura, vydy ta yikh znachennia dlia optyimizatsii rozsliduvannya zlochyniv* [Investigative situation: concept, structure, types and their significance for optimizing the investigation of crimes]. *Yurydychnyi naukovyi elektronnyi zhurnal*, № 1, 146–150 (in Ukrainian).

Shulha, M.M., Plakhotina, V.M., Balaniuk, O.V. (2013). *Kryminalistyka* [Forensic science]. Odesa: Feniks (in Ukrainian).

Skryhoniuk, M.I. (2005). *Kryminalistyka: pidruchnyk* [Forensic science: textbook]. Kyiv: Atika (in Ukrainian).

Velikanov, S.V. (2002). *Klasyfikatsiia slidchykh sytuatsii v kryminalistychnii metodytsi* [Classification of investigative situations in forensic methodology]. Abstract of Candidate's thesis (PhD in Law). Kharkiv: Natsionalna yurydychna akademiia Ukrainy im. Yaroslava Mudroho (in Ukrainian).

Veselskyi, V.K. (2011). *Slidcha sytuatsiia yak katehoriia kryminalistychnoi taktyky* [Investigative situation as a category of forensic tactics]. *Borotba z orhanizovanoi zlochyinnistiu i koruptsiieiu (teoriia i praktyka)*, № 25–26, 193–199 (in Ukrainian).

Volobuev, A.F. (2000). *Problemy metodyky rozsliduvannya rozkradannia maina u sferi pidpriemnytstva: monohrafiia* [Problems of the methodology of investigating property theft in the business sector: monograph]. Kharkiv: KhNUVS (in Ukrainian).

**Олег Григорьев,**

здобувач Науково-дослідного інституту публічного права  
вул. Г. Кіпчу, 2 а, Київ, Україна, 03055, olehgrigorov@ukr.net  
**ORCID:** orcid.org/0009-0008-4550-5858

## ТИПОВІ СЛІДЧІ СИТУАЦІЇ ПОЧАТКОВОГО ЕТАПУ РОЗСЛІДУВАННЯ ЗЛОЧИНІВ, ЩО ВЧИНЯЮТЬСЯ ВНУТРІШНЬО-ПЕРЕМІЩЕНИМИ ОСОБАМИ

**Анотація.** Метою статті є визначення типових слідчих ситуацій початкового етапу розслідування злочинів, що вчиняються внутрішньо переміщеними особами. **Результати.** У статті досліджено типові слідчі ситуації початкового етапу розслідування злочинів, що вчиняються внутрішньо переміщеними особами. Автор дійшов висновків, що у контексті розкриття та розслідування злочинів, вчинених внутрішньо переміщених осіб, особливого значення відіграють саме типові слідчі ситуації та алгоритми дій початкового етапу розслідування, оскільки швидке встановлення злочинців та їх затримання на підставі зібраних доказів у більшості випадків відбувається саме на цьому етапі. **Висновки.** Узагальнення різних підходів до визначення типових слідчих ситуацій впроваджених нами груп злочинів, а також результати вивчення матеріалів кримінальних проваджень

дозволяють уніфікувати типові слідчі ситуації, які є найбільш характерними на першочерговому етапі розслідування злочинів внутрішньо переміщених осіб, зокрема: 1. Виявлено злочин, а особу (внутрішньо переміщену особу), що його вчинила не встановлено. 2. Виявлено злочин, встановлено відомості про внутрішньо переміщену особу, яка його вчинила (-ли), але останнього не затримано: виявлено злочин, встановлено, що внутрішньо переміщена особа, яка його вчинила (-ли), перебуває на території України; виявлено злочин, встановлено, що внутрішньо переміщена особа, яка його вчинила (-ли), виїхав (-ли) до іншої держави; виявлено злочин, встановлено, що внутрішньо переміщена особа, яка його вчинила (-ли), виїхав (-ли) на непідконтрольну органам державної влади України територію та/або на територію держави-агресора; виявлено злочин, встановлено, що внутрішньо переміщена особа, яка його вчинила (-ли), є військовослужбовцем Збройних сил України, Національної гвардії України або інших сил оборони. 3. Виявлено злочин, затримано внутрішньо переміщену особу, яка його вчинила (-ли), наявні джерела доказової інформації. 4. Виявлено злочин, затримано внутрішньо переміщену особу, яка його вчинила (-ли), джерел доказової інформації недостатньо та/або вони відсутні.

**Ключові слова:** алгоритм, варіативність, затримання, невстановлена особа, підозра.