







11. – .118-122. // . – 1998. -

7. . . .

( , ). , , . - ., 1992. – 135 .

8. „ „

// . - 2003.-

12. – .97-101.

9. . . . -

[8, .67]. . - ., 1972.- 75 .

10. . - ? //

. - 1994. – 11 – .17-22.

11. „ . . . -

1. . - . - . -

. - 2001. - 416 . //

2. - . - 1994. - 4. - .2-6.

12. . . . -

. 3- „ - . - .: ., 2001. – 248 .

13. . . . -

.. . / . . . .

3. . - .: ., 2003. – 1056 . . - 6- .

14. : ., 2002.- 270 .

2004. – 296 .

4. . . . // . - 2005. -

. - ., 1991. – 2. – .52-55.

360 . 15. . . . -

5. „ . . . - : . - ., 2000. – 704 .

16. . . . -

. - ., 1979. – 80 .

6. . , 1970. – 104 .

21 2007 .  
« » . . . .

*L.V. Husar*

**REALIZATION OF RIGHT IS ON A NECESSARY DEFENSIVE**

**Summary**

In this article the author attempts to analyze the social and legal nature the institute of necessary defense. The place of law on necessary defense in the structure of common legal statute of person was also investigated in this article.