



Article

The Practice of Ensuring Public Safety at Metropolitan Facilities in Different Countries and Their Legal Regulation

Behzodbek Islombekov*¹

1. Independent Researcher, University of Public Security of the Republic of Uzbekistan, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

*Correspondance: islambekov1802@gmail.com

Abstract: This article examines issues related to improving public safety in metropolitan systems in major cities and megacities around the world. It analyzes the extensive measures implemented by different countries to combat crime and terrorism, taking into account their internal capabilities and specific socio-political and economic conditions. The article also discusses administrative and criminal liability measures, the amounts of fines, and procedures for imposing and collecting fines for violations of safety rules governing the use of and movement within metropolitan systems under the legislation of foreign countries. In addition, the modern scientific and technological measures implemented by individual countries to ensure public safety in metropolitan systems are examined, compared, and subjected to scientific analysis with regard to their specific characteristics. The article puts forward several proposals and recommendations concerning the application in Uzbekistan of foreign experience in improving public safety in metropolitan systems.

Keywords: Metropolitan System, Megacity, Public Safety, Terrorism, Metro Police, Administrative and Criminal Liability Measures, Fine

Citation: Islombekov, B. The Practice of Ensuring Public Safety at Metropolitan Facilities in Different Countries and Their Legal Regulation. American Journal of Social and Humanitarian Research 2026, 7(9), 14-23.

Received: 10th Jul 2026

Revised: 30th Jul 2026

Accepted: 20th Aug 2026

Published: 04th Sept 2026



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

1. Introduction

Research has shown that, under current conditions, more than sixty developed countries around the world make extensive use of metropolitan transportation systems. These include China, the United States, England, Russia, France, Italy, Germany, Japan, Canada, Belgium, the Czech Republic, Copenhagen, South Korea, the United Arab Emirates, Turkey, Iran, as well as CIS countries such as Belarus, Georgia, Azerbaijan, and several dozen other countries [1]. Considerable experience has been accumulated in ensuring public safety in the metropolitan systems of their capitals and other major cities. One of the most urgent and important tasks of our time is to introduce the most significant aspects of this experience at the facilities of the Tashkent Metro, which is continuously expanding. In this regard, let us examine the experience of several countries [2].

Despite the considerable international experience in ensuring public safety in metropolitan transport systems, differences in national legal frameworks, institutional responsibilities, preventive mechanisms, and technological security measures make their direct application to Uzbekistan difficult. Therefore, a comparative analysis is required to identify those elements of foreign practice that can be appropriately adapted to the conditions of the Tashkent Metro. The aim of this study is to comparatively examine the legal, organizational, preventive, and technological mechanisms used to ensure public safety in metropolitan systems in selected foreign countries and to develop practical recommendations for improving the public safety system of the Tashkent Metro.

2. Materials and Method

The study was conducted using comparative legal, comparative analytical, and descriptive research methods. The research materials consisted of national legislation, regulatory legal acts, official documents, and scientific and analytical sources concerning public safety and security in metropolitan transport systems in foreign countries.

The study examined the experience of the United Kingdom, France, the Czech Republic, the United States, Japan, the Russian Federation, and the People's Republic of China. The analysis focused on the legal regulation of public safety at metropolitan facilities, administrative and criminal liability for violations, institutional responsibility for transport security, counter-terrorism measures, and the application of modern security technologies.

The comparative legal method was used to identify similarities and differences between the approaches adopted in the selected countries. Particular attention was paid to the distribution of responsibilities among law-enforcement agencies, transport operators, specialized security services, and other institutions, as well as to preventive measures, surveillance systems, passenger screening, and legal sanctions for violations of transport safety requirements.

The results of the comparative analysis were considered in relation to the existing system of public safety at metropolitan facilities in Uzbekistan in order to identify foreign practices that may be applicable to the Tashkent Metro. On this basis, relevant organizational, legal, preventive, and technological approaches were identified for further analysis and the development of practical recommendations.

3. Results

England. Following the terrorist bombings carried out on public transport in London on July 7, 2005, the British Government adopted comprehensive measures to prevent terrorism. Full-body metal detectors were installed at metro entrances and exits. Metro platforms and train carriages were equipped with video-surveillance systems capable of promptly detecting and signaling when passengers leave their hand luggage unattended [3]. All stations and infrastructure facilities were brought under comprehensive surveillance through an increase in the number of video cameras. In addition, the number of police officers accompanied by trained dogs was increased in order to detect ammunition, explosives, and narcotic substances through the dogs' ability to identify and distinguish various odors [4].

Communication between train drivers and the London Fire Brigade, the London Ambulance Service, and the Metropolitan Police Service was improved. Beginning in 2006, the London Metropolitan Police began implementing a comprehensive security system project [5]. As part of this initiative, a new counter-terrorism unit was established, consisting of integrated operational forces, including investigators and operational officers responsible for analyzing intelligence information and responding rapidly to terrorist threats [6].

However, the police authorities were forced to acknowledge that no single counter-terrorism method could ensure public safety at the required level. Consequently, the British security services increased their focus on identifying and neutralizing terrorists before they could bring explosives onto the metro or an aircraft [7]. Following the 2005 terrorist attacks, the London transport authorities decided to temporarily suspend, in accordance with established procedures, the operation of mobile communication network transmitters in underground metro stations that had previously been installed and operational. For this reason, even today, mobile phones operate only on above-ground metro lines and at certain stations [8].

The security of the London Underground and certain other railway transport systems in the country is provided by the specialized police service known as the British

Transport Police. The principal duties of its officers include combating major and minor offenses, public disorder, and similar incidents that may occur on the railway systems of England, Wales, and Scotland, including the London, Docklands, Glasgow, and Midland metro systems, as well as the Croydon tram network. A total of 2,914 police officers, additional forces consisting of 322 officers, 190 constables, and 1,316 support personnel are involved in carrying out these duties. Their recruitment and training are conducted in the same manner as those of other local police officers, and they exercise all the powers granted to those police officers [9].

The principal purpose of the United Kingdom's 2015 Counter-Terrorism and Security Act, consisting of 7 parts, 8 schedules, and 53 sections, is to identify and prevent individuals traveling abroad to participate in terrorist activities; monitor the conduct of persons suspected of terrorism; prevent the radicalization of the population and recruitment into terrorist ideologies; expand the capacity to detect terrorist activities conducted via the Internet; and strengthen the security of air, maritime, and railway transportation. Sections 22–31 of the Act are aimed at ensuring the security of aviation, maritime, and railway transport. In particular, Section 26 of the Act establishes the powers of the relevant authority concerning railway transport security [10].

The Transport Act of the United Kingdom, adopted on November 30, 2000, consists of five chapters and contains 280 sections. Section 219(2)(d) addresses matters related to public order and regulates procedures for preventing undesirable incidents. Section 219 sets out railway regulations, including provisions governing public order in metro systems and railway stations, vandalism, fare evasion, and restrictions on dangerous behavior [11]. The Act itself does not establish liability; rather, it primarily provides for compliance with railway regulations. Liability for violations of these rules is established under other legal instruments. Under these instruments, liability may arise for traveling without a ticket at stations, being intoxicated, smoking in public places, bringing dangerous objects into the transport system, obstructing railway operations, and disturbing public order. Persons violating these rules may be subject to fines amounting to hundreds of pounds sterling and, in certain cases, depending on the severity of the offense, criminal liability imposed by a court [12].

France. In 1978, the concept of the Vigipirate Plan was developed in France. The Vigipirate Plan includes 40 measures that can be implemented by the French Government in various crisis situations. Its main purpose, apart from responding to nuclear and aerial threats, is to prevent terrorist acts, for which special plans known as “Pirat” and “Piratom” were developed. Vigipirate is a multi-level system of measures implemented depending on the level of threat posed by a potential terrorist attack. The plan provides for two levels of response: ordinary and reinforced (*Vigipirate simple* and *Vigipirate renforcé*). The armed forces participate only at the second level. In such circumstances, police and gendarmerie forces are mobilized, and the air force, navy, and ground forces may also be involved in cooperation with them [13].

The plan was first implemented following terrorist attacks at the “Musée d’Orsay” and “Port-Royal” stations of the Paris Metro in 1996. In particular, it provided for reinforced patrols by police officers and military units at locations where large numbers of people gather, including railway stations, airports, and metro stations. In France, responsibility for ensuring public safety is primarily assigned to the police, while metropolitan transport personnel perform functions directly related to the operation and use of the transport system [14].

The results of the study demonstrate that the French experience of ensuring public safety in metropolitan systems is characterized primarily by comprehensive coordination, as well as extensive use of public oversight and public assistance.

The French Criminal Code, adopted in 1992 and entering into force in 1994, consists of five books. Book IV addresses crimes against the nation, the state, and public peace. It includes provisions concerning combating terrorism, threats to public safety, armed

groups, explosions and dangerous acts, as well as offenses against state security. Under the French Criminal Code, terrorist or subversive acts directed against public transport and metro facilities are not treated merely as ordinary crimes against property but as threats to public and state security. Persons committing such acts may, under Article 421-1 and subsequent provisions of the Code, be sentenced to imprisonment for a period of 20 to 30 years [15].

The French Internal Security Code, adopted in 2012, consists of seven books, with Book II devoted to public order and public safety. This book contains eight principal titles, with Title VI addressing public transport security. It regulates such matters as security on metro systems, trains, and other means of transport; security services operated by transport operators; passenger screening; detection of dangerous objects; the use of video surveillance; and protection of transport infrastructure.

A key feature of the French model of transport infrastructure protection is its decentralized and preventive approach. Pursuant to Article L261-1 of the Code, transport authorities and operators are directly involved in preventing crime and ensuring passenger safety. In other words, security is not solely the responsibility of the police but also constitutes a legal obligation of transport organizations.

In Uzbekistan, the system for protecting transport infrastructure has been formed primarily on the basis of centralized management. This function is carried out by the Department for Ensuring Security at Transport and Tourism Facilities of the Ministry of Internal Affairs. It can therefore be concluded that, whereas the French approach to protecting transport infrastructure is based on cooperation among transport operators, local government bodies, and law-enforcement agencies, in Uzbekistan this activity is carried out primarily by specialized state law-enforcement structures. The French model places greater emphasis on prevention, whereas the Uzbek model is more focused on centralized security management and control. Therefore, in order to improve public safety in the Tashkent Metro, it would be appropriate to introduce mechanisms from the French experience that expand the responsibility of transport personnel in the field of security.

Czech Republic. Additional security measures were introduced in the Czech metro system beginning in 2009 and were implemented in accordance with the requirements of modern innovative approaches. Special containers capable of withstanding the explosive force of explosives of a certain capacity were installed at metro stations. Following the terrorist attack in Moscow in 2010, patrol services in the Prague Metro were strengthened, and additional security systems were tested. Video surveillance cameras were installed throughout the metro system, and the continuous operation of specialized chemical protection systems was ensured.

The Czech Railways Act No. 266/1994 Sb., adopted on December 14, 1994, contains important provisions concerning public safety. The Act restricts unauthorized access to metro and railway areas, establishes requirements for passengers to comply with safety rules, and grants metro personnel the right to issue safety-related orders and instructions to passengers, with passengers being legally required to comply with such instructions. The use of transport by persons whose actions may pose a threat to metro operations is also prohibited.

Czech legislation clearly establishes fines for such violations. For example, pursuant to Section 50 of the Act, unauthorized entry into areas of the metro closed to the public, damage to metro infrastructure or transport vehicles, failure to comply with an operator's safety instructions, or obstructing or endangering railway or metro operations may result in a fine of up to CZK 2,000. Depending on the seriousness of the offense, the fine may reach up to CZK 1 million.

Within the metro system itself, violations of safety rules may also result in fines. In particular, traveling without a valid ticket may result in a fine of CZK 2,000, or CZK 1,200 if paid on the spot. Failure to pay the required fare for baggage may result in a fine of CZK

600, or CZK 200 when paid on the spot. Interference with the activities of transport personnel may result in a fine of CZK 2,000, reduced to CZK 1,000 if paid on the spot.

Under Czech legislation, the authority to impose fines is not limited to police officers. A transport inspector authorized by the carrier also has the legal authority to impose fines for relevant violations.

United States. The metropolitan systems of major U.S. cities have traditionally been protected through conventional security measures. Underground metro stations in New York, Chicago, Washington, and other major cities are equipped with video surveillance cameras, and several emergency telephones are installed on each platform. These telephones enable passengers to quickly contact emergency services in serious or critical situations.

The security services of the Washington and New York metropolitan systems have the authority to conduct selective inspections of bags and suitcases belonging to passengers who arouse suspicion. Bags are scanned using special equipment, and in some cases passengers are asked to open their bags and show their contents. Canine units with trained handlers are on duty at the stations. Passengers who refuse to undergo inspection are not detained; however, they are not permitted to enter the station. According to the transport police, these measures are not intended to prevent a specific threat but rather to enhance the overall level of security. Preparations are also underway to introduce similar inspection practices in other major cities across the country.

The study revealed that the United States faces a number of problems in ensuring public safety in railway transport, particularly in metropolitan systems. For example, it was found that nearly half of the video surveillance equipment installed in the New York City subway, which serves a very large population, was not functioning. In Washington, metro trains were not equipped with video surveillance systems at the beginning of the century. According to officials of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, 748 railcars equipped with video recording systems were scheduled for purchase in 2013, with the first of these railcars entering service that same year.

As is well known, the United States occupies one of the leading positions in the world in terms of population and socio-economic development and is also among the global leaders in the length and extensive network coverage of its metropolitan systems. Therefore, according to research, particular attention should be paid to the fact that many issues related to public safety in the country are addressed through *traditional* approaches, namely, through the extensive involvement of the public in security measures and the systematic use of information and reports provided by citizens.

In the United States, the Revised Code of Washington serves as the official compilation of state laws. It regulates criminal law, administrative law, transportation, public safety, and other areas. Chapter 9A of this Code constitutes the Washington Criminal Code. Section 84 of Chapter 9A provides for offenses against public order and peace. Chapter 81 contains provisions concerning the safety of railways and other transportation systems. In the United States, many acts posing a threat to public safety are regulated not only by state legislation but also by federal law. Consequently, serious offenses related to metro and transportation security may be considered at the federal level. For example, under Section 81.48.020 of the Code, damaging railway facilities is punishable as a serious felony. Section 9A.52.020 of the Washington Code classifies unlawful entry into a building with a weapon or through the use of violence as a serious felony.

Japan. Following the tragedy that occurred in the Tokyo Metro in March 1995, when members of the religious extremist group Aum Shinrikyo released toxic gas, a wide range of equipment and security systems began to be installed immediately and comprehensively to ensure passenger safety. Particular attention was paid to ensuring that these devices and systems would not interfere with passengers' free movement within metro stations and other infrastructure facilities. The metropolitan system was

comprehensively equipped with a video surveillance system and a centralized situational control center. This center receives information from video surveillance systems as well as reports transmitted by police officers stationed at the metro stations. Older surveillance cameras were replaced with modern, compact cameras capable of transmitting significantly clearer, sharper, and more detailed images.

Among the latest technological developments in the field of security, particular attention should be given to the clean-air reserve system installed in the Tokyo Metro. In the event of a dangerous situation involving toxic gases, the system can use electronic controls to direct a flow of clean air toward the area affected by the contamination.

Research indicates that in this densely populated country, which currently occupies a leading position in the global economy, highly optimized and modernized systems for ensuring public safety in metropolitan transportation have been developed. There are numerous aspects of Japan's experience that can serve as valuable examples for study and potential implementation in Uzbekistan. Another notable aspect of Japan's experience that deserves particular attention is its policy of training highly qualified and comprehensively prepared personnel for the field of public safety.

Japan's Criminal Code, enacted in 1907 as Law No. 45, consists of a General Part and a Special Part and contains 50 chapters and 264 articles. Chapter VI directly addresses crimes against transportation safety and includes Articles 125–129. Article 125 covers acts that endanger the safety of trains, ships, or aircraft and provides for imprisonment of up to two years or a fine of up to 300,000 yen. Article 126 concerns obstructing train operations, disrupting railway traffic, and creating a danger to railway safety, and provides for imprisonment of up to five years. Article 108 of the Code provides for punishment for setting fire to a vehicle or facility containing passengers, including imprisonment for a minimum of five years, life imprisonment, or the death penalty.

Russia. Following a number of terrorist attacks in the Moscow and St. Petersburg metropolitan systems, as well as in response to the growing threat of terrorist attacks worldwide, Russia has increasingly focused on equipping its metropolitan systems with engineering and technical security measures and comprehensive transport security systems. In this regard, during the implementation of the Comprehensive Public Safety Plan, the following engineering and technical equipment and transport security systems were purchased and installed in metropolitan systems using subsidies allocated from the federal budget:

- Metal-detection frames;
- Handheld metal detectors;
- Radiation monitoring equipment;
- Stationary x-ray scanning devices for personal passenger screening;
- Stationary x-ray inspection systems for conveyor-based screening of hand luggage;
- Portable x-ray television inspection devices;
- Explosion-protection containers;
- Portable detectors for identifying explosive vapors;
- Portable integrated systems for detecting explosives based on rapid-response neural-network technologies;
- Systems designed to suppress the remote control of explosive devices through radio waves.

The Criminal Code of the Russian Federation also consists of General and Special Parts and contains 12 sections and 361 articles. Section IX of the Special Part is entitled "Crimes against Public Safety and Public Order." Articles 205–227 of Chapter 24 of the Code establish provisions concerning crimes against public safety, while Articles 228–245 of Chapter 25 concern crimes against public health and public morality. Article 214 of the Code, consisting of two parts, is entitled "Vandalism." Part 1 provides for a fine of up to

40,000 rubles or a fine equivalent to the convicted person's income for a period of up to three months for defacing buildings and structures with offensive or destructive inscriptions or damaging property in public transport or other public places; alternatively, up to 360 hours of compulsory labor, correctional labor for up to one year, or arrest for up to three months may be imposed. Under Part 2 of this provision, vandalism committed by a group of persons acting by prior conspiracy or motivated by hatred or hostility is punishable by compulsory labor for up to three years or imprisonment for up to three years. This provision establishes liability for acts such as painting metro carriages with graffiti, unauthorized entry into metro facilities, and damaging escalators, alarm systems, video surveillance equipment, and similar infrastructure.

It is noteworthy that Uzbek legislation does not currently provide for criminal liability for such acts.

It should be emphasized that, in the experience of foreign countries, considerable attention is generally devoted to the security of underground transport facilities. Many of the examples presented above demonstrate that responsibility for ensuring public safety is assigned to the state, represented by law-enforcement agencies, or to specially established police units. In the case of Russia, however, under Federal Law No. 16-FZ "On Transport Security," responsibility for ensuring transport security is assigned to entities operating transport infrastructure and to carriers. In other words, transport companies and carriers that own facilities classified as objects requiring protection against unlawful acts and terrorist attacks, as well as persons leasing transport vehicles or facilities, are responsible for implementing the relevant security measures. These measures may be carried out independently or with the involvement of accredited transport security units. Such units are legal entities and provide commercial security services.

It is important to note that the level of transport security in the Russian metro system is exceptionally high. At present, terrorist attacks that have occurred in the Moscow and St. Petersburg metro systems are subjected to comprehensive and detailed analysis, while measures aimed at ensuring public safety are continuously improved and further developed.

Another distinctive feature of the system of measures adopted to ensure public safety in the Russian metro system is the significant expenditure of energy and capital resources, as well as the particular balance between rights and obligations in the security process. Under this model, the principal function of transport entities is the transportation of passengers and cargo, while the responsibility for ensuring security is assigned by the state specifically to these passenger and cargo carriers. Failure to comply with security requirements and violation of relevant laws and regulations may result in administrative or criminal penalties under Russian legislation.

The multifaceted nature of public safety arrangements in the Russian Federation, together with the operation of metropolitan systems in seven major cities Moscow, St. Petersburg, Novosibirsk, Nizhny Novgorod, Yekaterinburg, Kazan, and Samara demonstrates that Russia has developed a comprehensive combination of distinctive traditional and modern systems for ensuring public safety.

The results of the study of Russian experience in ensuring public safety revealed the following. First, the system of ensuring public safety in Russian metropolitan systems has distinctive characteristics, with the use of modern technological achievements having expanded and improved considerably in recent years. Second, based on experience in combating crime and offenses, public safety issues are addressed throughout the country directly by the state, within the territories of the Federation, or through authorized private companies entrusted with relevant responsibilities. Furthermore, unlike some other foreign countries, such as France and Japan, Russia relies directly on police structures as well as personnel employed on a contractual basis to ensure public safety.

Third, the issue of ensuring public safety within the Russian metropolitan system is implemented at a high level.

The People's Republic of China, one of the world's most developed countries, adopted the Law of the People's Republic of China on Penalties for Administration of Public Security on June 27, 2025, which entered into force on January 1, 2026. The Law consists of six chapters and 144 articles. Chapter III is entitled "Violations of Public Security Administration and Their Penalties." The principal penalties provided for by the Law include warnings, administrative fines, administrative detention ranging from one to fifteen days, and, in certain cases, restrictions on activities or confiscation of property. Under the new version of the Law, interference with public transportation operations, unlawful seizure of a train, metro or bus, and acts that obstruct transport operations through dangerous conduct are expressly established as separate administrative offenses. The Law strengthens administrative liability mechanisms in the field of public safety and provides for the legal regulation of new forms of violations.

Article 144 of the Law, which establishes acts threatening the security of transport infrastructure and metropolitan systems as independent offenses, represents important experience that may also be relevant to Uzbek legislation. In this regard, expanding the provisions of the Code of Administrative Responsibility of the Republic of Uzbekistan concerning offenses committed at transport and metropolitan facilities is becoming an increasingly important requirement of the present time.

One of the most important features of the Chinese Law is its treatment of transport infrastructure as an object of national security. Under the Law, acts that pose a threat to metro systems, railways, railway stations, and other public transport facilities are regarded as acts threatening state security. In this context, the object of legal protection is not limited to transport property; it also includes the life and health of passengers, the continuity of transport operations, public order, and the stability and resilience of the state's transport system.

The Chinese Law recognizes the security of transport infrastructure and metropolitan systems as a distinct component of public safety and establishes mechanisms for early prevention of more serious threats by strengthening administrative measures against violations in this sphere. This experience is particularly relevant to improving the system of public safety at Tashkent Metro facilities, especially from the perspective of expanding preventive and legal measures of influence.

4. Discussion

The prohibition on entering transport systems, particularly metropolitan facilities, with one's face covered, as reflected in the experience of various countries, provides a basis for drawing *appropriate and well-founded* conclusions regarding measures to ensure public safety.

The comparative findings demonstrate that there is no single universal model for ensuring public safety in metropolitan systems. Instead, the countries examined in this study employ different combinations of legal regulation, institutional responsibility, preventive measures, technological solutions, and public participation. The effectiveness of these approaches is largely determined by the characteristics of national legislation, the organization of law-enforcement institutions, the structure of metropolitan transport systems, and the level of technological development.

The experience of the United Kingdom and France demonstrates the importance of combining law-enforcement activities with preventive and coordinated security mechanisms. In particular, the French approach illustrates a decentralized model in which responsibility for transport security is shared among law-enforcement agencies, transport operators, and other relevant institutions. This differs from the predominantly centralized approach currently used in Uzbekistan and indicates that greater involvement of metropolitan transport organizations in preventive security activities may contribute to improving the protection of the Tashkent Metro.

The experiences of Japan and Russia further demonstrate the growing importance of technological measures in metropolitan security. Video-surveillance systems, centralized situational control, passenger and baggage screening technologies, detection equipment, and other engineering solutions can strengthen the capacity to identify and respond to potential threats. However, technological measures alone cannot provide comprehensive public safety. Their effectiveness depends on their integration with appropriate legislation, qualified personnel, clearly defined institutional responsibilities, and effective emergency-response mechanisms.

The comparative analysis also reveals differences in the distribution of responsibility for transport security. While some countries rely primarily on specialized police and law-enforcement structures, other systems assign substantial responsibilities to transport operators and specialized security organizations. The Russian experience is particularly relevant in this respect because transport infrastructure entities and carriers are directly involved in implementing security requirements. This approach suggests that strengthening the legal responsibility and preventive role of transport organizations could complement the activities of specialized state security structures in Uzbekistan.

Another important finding concerns the role of administrative and criminal liability. The legal systems examined in this study establish different forms of liability for conduct that threatens public order, passenger safety, and transport infrastructure. The experience of China is particularly significant because transport infrastructure security is approached as a distinct component of public safety and preventive administrative measures are used to address violations before they develop into more serious threats. Such an approach may provide a useful basis for further improving the legal regulation of offenses committed at metropolitan facilities in Uzbekistan.

Therefore, the foreign practices examined in this study should not be transferred mechanically into the national system. Their implementation requires adaptation to the legal framework, institutional structure, operational characteristics, and security needs of Uzbekistan. For the Tashkent Metro, the most applicable approach may involve the combined development of preventive legal mechanisms, institutional cooperation, technological security systems, professional training, and clearly defined responsibilities among the organizations involved in metropolitan safety.

5. Conclusion

Thus, studying and analyzing the practices of ensuring public safety in metropolitan systems around the world, as well as modern legislative approaches in this field, and introducing relevant best practices in Uzbekistan, can make a significant contribution to improving the effectiveness of public safety measures. Thus, studying and analyzing the practices of ensuring public safety in metropolitan systems around the world, as well as modern legislative approaches in this field, and introducing relevant best practices in Uzbekistan, can make a significant contribution to improving the effectiveness of public safety measures. The comparative analysis conducted in this study demonstrates that effective public safety in metropolitan systems is based on the integration of legal, organizational, technological, and preventive mechanisms. The experience of the countries examined shows that sustainable metropolitan security requires not only the activities of law-enforcement agencies but also clearly defined responsibilities of transport operators, specialized security services, and other institutions involved in the operation and protection of transport infrastructure. The findings indicate that international experience relevant to Uzbekistan includes strengthening preventive security measures, expanding the use of modern surveillance and threat-detection technologies, improving coordination among responsible institutions, and developing effective mechanisms of administrative and criminal liability for violations affecting metropolitan safety. Particular attention should also be given to improving the professional training of personnel responsible for preventing and responding to security threats. For the Tashkent Metro, foreign practices should be introduced selectively and adapted to national legislation and existing

institutional arrangements. In particular, it is advisable to strengthen cooperation between law-enforcement agencies and metropolitan transport organizations, clearly define their respective responsibilities for preventive security, further develop technological monitoring and passenger-protection systems, and improve legal mechanisms for responding to offenses committed at metropolitan facilities. The implementation of these measures can contribute to the development of a more comprehensive, preventive, and technologically advanced system of public safety in the Tashkent Metro. At the same time, further research should focus on evaluating the practical applicability and effectiveness of specific foreign security mechanisms within the legal and organizational conditions of Uzbekistan.

REFERENCES

- [1] "Rapid transit," *Wikipedia*, Dec. 2024. [Online]. Available: Wikipedia — Rapid transit
- [2] R. Krivobok, "International experience in ensuring security in metro systems," *RIA Novosti*, Mar. 30, 2012. [Online]. Available: RIA Novosti
- [3] Parliament of the United Kingdom, *Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015*, 2015, c. 6. [Online]. Available: UK Legislation — Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015
- [4] Parliament of the United Kingdom, *Transport Act 2000*, 2000, c. 38. [Online]. Available: UK Legislation — Transport Act 2000
- [5] I. Tushko, "International experience in ensuring metro system security," *Security & Safety*, Sep. 16, 2024. [Online]. Available: Secuteck
- [6] French Republic, *French Penal Code (Code pénal)*, WIPO Lex. [Online]. Available: WIPO Lex — French Penal Code
- [7] French Republic, *Internal Security Code (Code de la sécurité intérieure)*, 2012. [Online]. Available: Légifrance — Internal Security Code
- [8] Washington State Legislature, *Revised Code of Washington (RCW)*. Olympia, WA, USA. [Online]. Available: Washington State Legislature — RCW
- [9] Government of Japan, *Penal Code of Japan (刑法, Keihō)*. Japanese Law Translation. [Online]. Available: Japanese Law Translation — Penal Code
- [10] Russian Federation, *Criminal Code of the Russian Federation*, as amended by Federal Law No. 164-FZ of Jun. 10, 2026. [Online]. Available: Criminal Code of the Russian Federation
- [11] People's Republic of China, *Public Security Administration Punishments Law of the People's Republic of China (中华人民共和国治安管理处罚法)*, 2025. [Online]. Available: China Law Translate — Public Security Administration Punishments Law
- [12] Czech Republic, *Act No. 266/1994 Coll. on Railways (Zákon o dráhách)*, 1994. [Online]. Available: Zákony pro lidi — Act No. 266/1994
- [13] European Parliament and Council of the European Union, "Directive (EU) 2022/2557 of the European Parliament and of the Council on the resilience of critical entities," *Official Journal of the European Union*, vol. 65, L 333, pp. 164–198, Dec. 27, 2022.
- [14] U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Transportation Security Administration, *Security and Emergency Management Action Items for Transit Agencies*. Washington, DC, USA: TSA, 2017.
- [15] International Association of Public Transport (UITP), *Security in Public Transport: Protecting Passengers, Staff and Infrastructure*. Brussels, Belgium: UITP, 2022.