

## Abstract

There are two main thesis to the work "*A Company as the injured party in criminal procedure*": (i) civil law recodification, in the context of company actions or actions made on behalf of a company, represents a positive change for the injured party when submitting a proposition for the court to impose a duty to compensate the damage in its sentencing judgment and as well determinates a limitation period, (ii) the process of assigning or withdrawing a status of the injured party is not described accordingly in the contemporary procedure act, especially regarding the exact form needed for this decision. These issues are closely tied to the types of damage applicable in a criminal procedure, injured party categories and to the details of submitting the compensation duty motion.

A comparison of different company actions before and after recodification implies that there is a possibility of approbating the juridicial act of legal proceedings of a company that are invalid due to the company's procedure errors. Determining a limitation period by the day of the original motion stays unimpaired. Repeating the legal procedure and putting the limitation period to the day after its valid execution was necessary with the latest legal version.

The second thesis was verified as well by exploiting contemporary legislation and examining possible impacts on the rights of the injured party. It is obvious, that determining or withdrawing injured party status through an informal note is ever so problematic, because there is no possibility motioning a reparatory claim, which per se strictly limits rights of the injured party.

In addition to aforementioned reasoning *de lege ferenda*, a particular paragraph version suggestion was made, which should eliminate the imperfections in question.