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Jurisdictional issues

(1)(a) How does your country locate the place of the commission of a crime in cyberspace?

According to Criminal Law Article 6.

This law is applicable to all who commit crimes within the territory of the PRC except as specially stipulated by law.

This law is also applicable to all who commit crimes aboard a ship or aircraft of the PRC.

When either the act or consequence of a crime takes place within PRC territory, a crime is deemed to have been committed within PRC territory.

According to “Opinions of the Supreme People’s Court, the Supreme People’s Procuratorate and the Ministry of Public Security on Several Issues concerning the Application of Law in the Handling of Criminal Cases of Internet Gambling”, Section IV. Jurisdiction over the criminal cases of internet gambling

The “place of a crime” shall include the place where the server of the gambling website is located, the place of network access, the place where the establisher or manager of the gambling website is located, the place where the agent of the gambling website and the gamblers commit internet gambling, etc.

In other words, the place of commission includes where the server of the website in question is located, the place of network access, the place where the establisher or manager of the website in question is located, the place where the agent of the website in question and the user commit illegal internet act, etc.

(b) Does your national law consider it necessary and possible to locate the place where information and evidence is held? Where is the information that one can find on the web? Is it where the computer of the user is physically present? Is it there where the provider of the network has its (legal or factual) seat? Which provider? Or is it the place where the individual who made the data available? If these questions are not considered to be legally relevant, please state why.

According to “Opinions of the Supreme People’s Court, the Supreme People’s Procuratorate and the Ministry of Public Security on Several Issues concerning the Application of Law in the Handling of Criminal Cases of Internet Gambling”, Section IV. Jurisdiction over the criminal cases of internet gambling

For the territorial jurisdiction over criminal cases of internet gambling, the principle of taking the place of a crime as the first choice and the place of abode of the defendant as the second choice shall be adhered to.

* Important notice: this text is the last original version of the national report sent by the author. The Review has not assured any editorial revision of it.

* Guo Jing is a lecturer at the College for Criminal Law Science at the Beijing Normal University. She received her Ph.D. at the Faculty of Law of the University of Macau.
legal proceeding, resolve the disputes through serious negotiation. If they cannot reach an agreement after negotiation, they shall report the case to their common public security organ at the higher level for designated jurisdiction. Where the investigation of a major internet gambling case which involves two or more provinces (autonomous regions, or municipalities directly under the Central Government) is about to conclude, the Ministry of Public Security may, when necessary, designate the jurisdiction over the case after consulting with the Supreme People’s Court and the Supreme People’s Procuratorate.

Examinining current cases in practice, most of them were investigated and the trial was conducted in the place where the natural victim or the victim company was physically present.

(2) Can cyber crime do without a determination of the locus delicti in your criminal justice system? Why (not)?

There is no specific legal document that clearly stipulates this issue. However, the general principles of jurisdiction also apply to cyber crime. In other words, there is no particular rule for cyber crime. Cyber crime can only do with a determination of the locus delicti.

(3) Which jurisdictional rules apply to cyber crime like hate speech via internet, hacking, attacks on computer systems etc? If your state does not have jurisdiction over such offences, is that considered to be problematic?

The general principles of jurisdiction also apply to cyber crime. In other words, there is no particular rule for cyber crime. According to article 6-9 of Criminal Law,

Article 6. This law is applicable to all who commit crimes within the territory of the PRC except as specially stipulated by law. This law is also applicable to all who commit crimes aboard a ship or aircraft of the PRC.

When either the act or consequence of a crime takes place within PRC territory, a crime is deemed to have been committed within PRC territory;

Article 7. This law is applicable to PRC citizens who commit the crimes specified in this law outside the territory of the PRC; but those who commit the crimes, provided that this law stipulates a minimum sentence of less than a three-year fixed-term imprisonment for such crimes, may not be dealt with.

This law is applicable to PRC state personnel and military personnel who commit the crimes specified in this law outside PRC territory.

Article 8. This law may be applicable to foreigners who, outside PRC territory, commit crimes against the PRC state or against its citizens, provided that this law stipulates a minimum sentence of not less than a three-year fixed term of imprisonment for such crimes; but an exception is to be made if a crime is not punishable according to the law of the place where it was committed.

Article 9. This law is applicable to the crimes specified in international treaties to which the PRC is a signatory state or with which it is a member and the PRC exercises criminal jurisdiction over such crimes within its treaty obligations.

(4) Does your national law provide rules on the prevention or settlement of conflicts of jurisdiction? Is there any practice on it?

There is national law, to be more specific a judicial interpretation, “Opinions of the Supreme People’s Court, the Supreme People’s Procuratorate and the Ministry of Public Security on Several Issues concerning the Application of Law in the Handling of Criminal Cases of Internet Gambling”, settling the domestic disputes about jurisdiction

Section IV. Jurisdiction over the criminal cases of internet gambling

Where the public security organs have disputes about the jurisdiction over a criminal case of internet gambling which involves two or more regions, they shall, on the basis of the principle of being conducive to ascertaining criminal facts and conducive to legal proceeding, resolve the disputes through serious negotiation. If they cannot reach an agreement after negotiation, they shall report the case to their common public security organ at the higher level for designated jurisdiction. Where the investigation of a major internet gambling case which involves two or more provinces (autonomous regions, or municipalities directly under the Central Government) is about to conclude, the Ministry of Public Security may, when necessary, designate the jurisdiction over the case after consulting with the Supreme People’s Court and the Supreme People’s Procuratorate.

There is no national law dealing with cyber crime jurisdiction dispute with foreign countries.

(5) Can cyber crime do without jurisdictional principles in your criminal justice system, which would in essence mean that national criminal law is applicable universally? Should this be limited to certain crimes, or be conditional on the basis of a treaty?

Cyber crime should follow the jurisdictional principles in Chinese criminal law, which are written in article 6-9 in particular. Hence, no exceptional jurisdictional rules apply to cyber crime.
(C) Substantive criminal law and sanctions

Which cyber crime offences under your national criminal justice system do you consider to have a transnational dimension?

It is controversial to say which cyber crime is transnational. Some believe all cyber crimes are transnational in nature. Some believe the crimes against internet information are transnational due to the fact that the internet does not have any boundaries. In comparison, traditional crimes with cyber as a tool are not transnational in nature.

To what extent do definitions of cyber crime offences contain jurisdictional elements?

As we can see from articles 285-287 of criminal law, the definitions do not contain jurisdictional elements.

To what extent do general part rules on commission, conspiracy or any other form of participation contain jurisdictional elements?

General part rules on commission, conspiracy or any other form of participation do not contain jurisdictional elements. However, due to the specialty of cyber crime, some participation acts, for instance providing programs or tools for others to commit illegal intrusion or controlling computer information system, constitute an independent crime.

There are additional requirements for participation acts to constitute cyber crime. For instance, according to “Interpretation of the Supreme People’s Court and the Supreme People’s Procuratorate of Several Issues on the Application of Law in the Handling of Criminal Cases about Endangering the Security of Computer Information Systems”:

Article 9 Whoever, knowing that any other person is committing an act as mentioned in Articles 285 and 286 of the Criminal Law, falls under any of the following circumstances shall be deemed an accomplice in a crime, and be punished in accordance with the provisions of Article 285 or 286 of the Criminal Law:

(1) Providing any other person with any program or tool used for sabotaging the functions of, data in or application programs of a computer information system and obtaining illegal income of 5,000 yuan or more, or providing the program or tool to 10 or more other persons;

(2) Providing any other person with assistance in a field such as internet access, server hosting, network storage space, communication transmission passage, settlement of expenses, transaction services, advertising service, technical training or technical support, and obtaining illegal income of 5,000 yuan or more; or

(3) Providing any other person with funds of 5,000 yuan or more through promotion of software, publication of advertisement, etc.

Article 8 Where a crime of endangering the security of a computer information system is committed in the name of or in the form of an entity, and the standards for conviction and sentencing as prescribed in this Interpretation are met, the directly liable person in charge and other directly liable persons shall be subject to criminal liability in accordance with Articles 285 and 286 of the Criminal Law.

Do you consider cyber crime offences a matter that a state can regulate on its own? If so, please state how a state may do that. If not, please state why it cannot do that.

The answer to this question should be really careful. Due to the non-boundary nature of cyber crime and the application of double criminality, it is very difficult to regulate cyber crime on its own. However, traditional crimes committed through cyber are more suitable for states to regulate on their own.

Does your national criminal provide for criminal responsibility for (international) corporations/ providers? Does the attribution of responsibility have any jurisdictional implications?

According to China criminal law,

Article 30. A company, enterprise, institution, organization, or group which commits an act endangering society that is considered a crime under the law shall bear criminal responsibility.

Companies, enterprises, institutions, organizations or groups take responsibility only when the law clearly says the crime can be committed by a corporation. However, the four kinds of cyber crime do not fall within this group, and therefore, there is no corporation liability for cyber crime in China.

Nevertheless, according to “Interpretation of the Supreme People’s Court and the Supreme People’s Procuratorate of Several Issues on the Application of Law in the Handling of Criminal Cases about Endangering the Security of Computer Information Systems”,

Article 8 Where a crime of endangering the security of a computer information system is committed in the name of or in the form of an entity, and the standards for conviction and sentencing as prescribed in this Interpretation are met, the directly liable person in charge and other directly liable persons shall be subject to criminal liability in accordance with Articles 285 and 286 of the Criminal Law.
Criminal Law.

(D) Cooperation in criminal matters
As is the case with jurisdictional issues, there are no special rules for cooperation in criminal matters regarding cyber crime. The existing mutual legal assistance instruments between China and other sovereign states also apply to cyber crime. Besides, the cooperation regime that is offered by International conventions such as the UN Convention on Transnational Organized Crime can also be utilized for combating cyber crime, if the cyber crime can be identified as a transnational crime.

Detailed answers to questions in this part are being prepared by other specialists in preparation for the Section 3 Preparatory Colloquium, planned to be held in Turkey.

(E) Human rights concerns
Which human rights or constitutional norms are applicable in the context of criminal investigations using information technology? Is it for the determination of the applicable human rights rules relevant where the investigations are considered to have been conducted? How is the responsibility or accountability of your state involved in international cooperation regulated? Is your state for instance accountable for the use of information collected by another state in violation of international human rights standards?

The two SCNPC decisions require the protection of the privacy rights of the individual online. The human rights provisions on the international level, and of the states where actual harm is caused, as well as of the states where the conduct occurs, all need to be taken into consideration. WHATSOEVER, these are interesting questions that involve human right standards, state sovereignty, state immunity, and so on.

(F) Future developments
Modern telecommunication creates the possibility of contacting accused, victims and witnesses directly over the border. Should this be allowed, and if so, under which conditions? If not, should the classical rules on mutual assistance be applied (request and answer) and why? Is there any legal impediment under the law of your country to court hearings via the screen (skype or other means) in transnational cases? If so which? If not, is there any practice? Is there any other issue related to information society and international criminal law which currently plays a role in your country and has not been brought up in all the questions before?

We believe that the development of information society would bring an innovation to rules on mutual assistance. New techniques and skills which may facilitate court hearings and the presentation of evidence will be used in legal proceedings in the near future. Right now, there is no practice of this kind; however, the future is very promising.
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Whoever violates state regulations and deletes, alters, or adds data or application programs installed in or processed and transmitted by the computer systems, and thus causes grave consequences, is to be punished according to the preceding paragraph.

Whoever deliberately creates and propagates a computer virus or other programs that sabotage the normal operation of the computer system, and cause grave consequences, is to be punished according to the first paragraph.
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“Interpretation (II) of the Supreme People's Court and the Supreme People's Procuratorate of Several Issues on the Specific Application of Law in the Handling of Criminal Cases about Producing, Reproducing, Publishing, Selling and Disseminating Pornographic Electronic Information via the Internet, Mobile Communication Terminals and Sound Message Stations”, issued by the Supreme People’s Court and the Supreme People’s Procuratorate, on 2 October 2010.
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