

# Examination of the Procedures of the General Inspection Organization in Addressing Administrative Offenses and Violations

1. Reza Shamseddin Vandi<sup>ID</sup>: PhD Student, Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology, Aras International, Islamic Azad University, Tabr, Iran

2. Baharak Shahed

<sup>ID</sup>\*: Assistant Professor, Department of Law, Urmia Branch, Islamic Azad University, Urmia, Iran

3. Fatemeh Ahadi<sup>ID</sup>: Associate Professor, Department of Criminal Law and Criminology, Maragheh Branch, Islamic Azad University, Maragheh, Iran

\*Correspondence: e-mail: baharak.shahed@gmail.com

## Abstract

The General Inspection Organization, as one of the principal supervisory bodies of the Islamic Republic of Iran, is responsible for overseeing the proper implementation of laws and addressing administrative offenses and violations. This organization operates based on the principles of the Constitution and statutory laws, including the Islamic Penal Code and the Law on Administrative Violations. Article 576 of the Islamic Penal Code (Book Five: Ta'zirat) and the Law on the Promotion of Administrative System Health are among the key legal foundations influencing the performance of this organization. This article examines the role of the General Inspection Organization in identifying and addressing administrative violations and the effectiveness of the laws applied in preventing administrative corruption. Furthermore, the operational procedures, challenges, and legal instruments utilized by the General Inspection Organization in handling administrative violations are analyzed. The significance of this organization's cooperation with other supervisory and judicial bodies to ensure the effective implementation of laws and reduce administrative offenses is also emphasized. The findings of this study indicate that proper coordination and the effective utilization of legal capacities can significantly contribute to reducing violations and enhancing administrative integrity.

**Keywords:** General Inspection Organization, administrative offenses, administrative violations, Islamic Penal Code, administrative system health, administrative corruption

Received: 03 October 2024

Revised: 16 October 2024

Accepted: 05 November 2024

Published: 21 November 2024



**Copyright:** © 2024 by the authors. Published under the terms and conditions of Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) License.

**Citation:** Shamseddin Vandi, R., Shahed, B., & Ahadi, F. (2024). Examination of the Procedures of the General Inspection Organization in Addressing Administrative Offenses and Violations. *Legal Studies in Digital Age*, 3(4), 88-104.

## 1. Introduction

The administrative system of any country, as one of the main pillars of governance, plays a vital role in implementing national policies, laws, and macro-level programs. In this regard, transparency, integrity, and efficiency in the administrative

system not only contribute to the realization of social justice and sustainable development but also enhance public trust in governmental institutions. However, the occurrence of administrative violations and offenses, as serious challenges to the administrative system, can lead to reduced efficiency, the spread of corruption, and the weakening of public confidence. In such circumstances, effective oversight of administrative performance and the prevention of violations become particularly significant.

The General Inspection Organization, as one of the key supervisory bodies of the Islamic Republic of Iran, plays a crucial role in maintaining the integrity of the administrative system. This organization, relying on statutory laws such as the Islamic Penal Code, the Law on Administrative Violations, and the Law on the Promotion of Administrative System Health, is responsible for ensuring the proper implementation of laws and preventing the spread of corruption through the identification and prosecution of violations. Article 576 of the Islamic Penal Code (Book Five: Ta'zirat), which pertains to the abuse of administrative positions, is one of the important legal instruments in this field that defines the responsibilities of institutions and personnel under the law.

This article aims to examine the performance of the General Inspection Organization in addressing administrative violations and offenses. Additionally, the challenges and opportunities facing this organization in identifying and prosecuting violations, the role of legal instruments, and the necessity of cooperation with other supervisory bodies are analyzed. The objective of this study is to provide a comprehensive perspective on the role and function of this organization in maintaining the integrity of the administrative system and reducing corruption, which can contribute to enhancing the quality of public administration and strengthening good governance.

## 2. Concepts

This section explains key concepts, followed by an examination of related topics.

### 2.1. *The Concept of Crime*

The term "crime" in Persian and Arabic languages is used to denote "sin," "fault," "wrongful act," and "violation of legal or religious limits." In reputable Persian dictionaries, crime is defined as any act or omission that is contrary to the laws or moral principles of society. In Arabic, the word "crime" (jurm) originates from the root "jarama," meaning to sever or separate, and is interpreted as deviating from the correct and legitimate path (Nekouei, 2021).

In legal terminology, crime is an act prohibited by the legislator for which a punishment or preventive and corrective measures have been prescribed. Essentially, crime is a behavior or omission that the law considers a threat to public order or the rights of others and provides sanctions for it (Mahdavi & Fallah Hosseini, 2019).

Article 2 of the Islamic Penal Code (2013) defines crime as follows: "Any conduct, whether an act or an omission, for which punishment has been determined by law." This definition explicitly highlights the three fundamental elements of crime: legal, material, and mental elements (Alizadeh, 2022).

Moreover, the definition of crime is entirely relative and dependent on the legal system and social conditions of each society. The legislator may criminalize certain acts based on temporal and spatial conditions or remove them from the category of crimes. The Law on the Reduction of Ta'zir Imprisonment Sentences (2020) has decriminalized certain behaviors and replaced them with alternative measures such as fines or mandatory public services. Additionally, the Law on the Protection of Children and Adolescents (2020) has adopted a protective approach in defining certain crimes, such as child abuse (Afrasiabi & Khoyeni, 2022; Alizadeh, 2022).

### 2.2. *The Concept of Violation*

The term "violation" in its lexical sense means "breach of law," "disobedience to regulations," and "deviation from the prescribed path." The root of this term comes from the Arabic verb "takhallafa," meaning to lag behind, violate, or depart from a rule or obligation.

In legal terminology, violation refers to an act or omission that contradicts administrative regulations, bylaws, or directives. Unlike crime, a violation typically disrupts the internal order of an organization or a specific administrative domain and rarely entails criminal punishment (Mousavi, 2016).

Violations and crimes differ in terms of nature, scope, and enforcement measures:

- **Scope:** Crime involves the violation of criminal laws that disrupt security and public order, whereas a violation pertains to breaching administrative, disciplinary, or professional regulations.
- **Enforcement Measures:** The consequences of crime include criminal punishments such as imprisonment and fines, whereas violations generally lead to disciplinary actions like reprimands, salary deductions, or suspensions.
- **Nature:** Crime directly harms society, whereas a violation primarily disrupts internal organizational discipline (Akbari, 2018).

In Iran's legal system, violations are mainly defined in administrative and disciplinary laws. The Law on Administrative Violations (1993) specifically outlines instances of violations within government agencies and the mechanisms for addressing them. In Islamic jurisprudence, violation refers to the breach of obligations or failure to comply with religious commands. This concept extends to ethics and law as an infringement upon principles related to justice and order (Haji Agha Bozorgi, 2015).

Violations represent breaches of administrative regulations and bylaws that, directly or indirectly, undermine the efficiency of organizations and public trust. Transparent and effective handling of violations, in addition to improving organizational integrity, enhances the performance of both public and private institutions.

### 2.3. *The Concept of the General Inspection Organization*

The General Inspection Organization is an independent supervisory and inspection institution in the Islamic Republic of Iran, responsible for overseeing the proper implementation of laws, regulations, and public policies within governmental agencies and non-governmental public institutions. This organization was established to preserve and promote administrative integrity, prevent corruption and violations, and enhance the efficiency of the administrative system. It is one of the key supervisory bodies in the country, operating under the direct authority of the Supreme Leader and playing a crucial role in maintaining order and transparency in the executive system (Ranjbar, 2020).

The establishment of the General Inspection Organization is formally recognized in Article 174 of the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran. According to this article, the General Inspection Organization is responsible for supervising the proper flow of affairs and the correct implementation of laws in executive bodies. As an independent institution, it has the authority to directly or through its inspectors identify and address violations and legal breaches. Moreover, this body is authorized to submit reports to high-ranking officials and propose corrective measures.

The primary duty of the General Inspection Organization is to oversee the correct implementation of laws within executive bodies. This oversight includes examining the processes and activities of various governmental entities and public non-governmental institutions that utilize public resources. Through continuous and rigorous supervision, the organization prevents potential violations and abuses and ensures that governmental agencies operate within the framework of laws and regulations (Moqareb, 2019).

One of the significant objectives of the General Inspection Organization is the prevention of corruption within government agencies. By identifying weaknesses and vulnerabilities in administrative and executive processes, the organization contributes to preventing the emergence of corruption. For example, through regular inspections, the organization can detect potential violations and report them to judicial authorities. In this regard, it can implement preventive measures to avert future instances of corruption and misconduct (Nourali Dokht, 2017).

The General Inspection Organization also plays a crucial role in enhancing transparency and accountability in governmental agencies. One of the mechanisms it employs to promote transparency is the publication of detailed and documented reports on the activities of executive bodies.

## 3. **Causes and Factors Contributing to Administrative Corruption and Violations and Their Comparison with Criminal Offenses**

One of the primary causes of administrative corruption is the weakness of the supervisory system. When supervisory mechanisms fail to effectively monitor the performance of government officials and employees, opportunities for corruption arise. Under such circumstances, employees may exploit their positions for embezzlement, bribery, and other forms of corruption. This issue also leads to a decline in public trust in governmental institutions.

A lack of transparency in administrative processes and decision-making is another factor contributing to corruption and administrative violations. When decisions are made behind closed doors and the public is unaware of the details, the likelihood of corruption increases. Government employees may, in such situations, make decisions that serve their personal interests while disregarding public interests. Inefficiency in laws and regulations can also facilitate the occurrence of corruption and administrative violations (Ranjbar, 2020).

Economic pressures are also among the significant factors leading to administrative corruption. When government employees face financial difficulties and are dissatisfied with their earnings, they may engage in illegal activities to secure additional income.

The nature of criminal offenses is, in most cases, directly related to the individual and their unlawful actions, whereas administrative corruption generally occurs within organizational contexts and is linked to the functioning of government and public institutions. Consequently, administrative corruption often has broader social and economic effects and, in the long term, can lead to a decline in public trust in the governance system (Ansari, 2011; Tabatabai Motameni, 2010).

The approach to addressing administrative corruption and violations differs from the handling of criminal offenses. Administrative violations are typically investigated and pursued by internal supervisory bodies such as the General Inspection Organization or the Court of Audit, whereas criminal offenses are adjudicated by general or specialized courts. This distinction in oversight and judicial institutions results in different legal and executive processes for each type of offense.

Compared to criminal offenses, administrative corruption requires a more effective and responsive supervisory system due to its widespread social, economic, and political implications to prevent its occurrence.

#### **4. Procedures for Addressing Crimes Committed by Government Officials**

The prosecution of crimes committed by government officials in the Iranian legal system is a complex process that necessitates adherence to legal principles, procedural safeguards, and appropriate supervisory structures. This process not only contributes to maintaining justice and transparency in government institutions but also strengthens public trust in governance structures and helps prevent corruption.

One of the fundamental pillars in addressing crimes committed by government officials is the authority of the General Inspection Organization. As the primary supervisory body, this organization is responsible for investigating and pursuing violations and crimes committed by government officials. If evidence and documentation of an offense are collected by this body, the General Inspection Organization submits a report on the alleged violation or crime to judicial authorities or other competent institutions. These reports can serve as the basis for legal actions and prosecution of the implicated officials (Shakrzadeh Garoui, 2016).

Initially, preliminary investigations into crimes committed by government officials are typically conducted by the General Inspection Organization or other oversight bodies such as the Administrative Justice Tribunal. Once the initial investigations are completed, the next step involves referring the case to the judiciary. If the committed violation or crime necessitates judicial proceedings, the case is transferred to specialized courts or general courts. Accused government officials may be interrogated, and if the crime is proven, they may face trial. At this stage, judicial independence and the legal safeguards of the accused for a fair trial are of particular importance. The protection of the rights of the accused during the prosecution of government officials' crimes is crucial (Delavari, 2016).

Another important aspect of addressing crimes committed by government officials is cooperation and coordination between various supervisory and judicial institutions. The General Inspection Organization, the Administrative Justice Tribunal, the judiciary, and other supervisory bodies must have full coordination to ensure that the prosecution of government officials' violations is conducted effectively and without unnecessary delays. Such coordination can expedite judicial proceedings and facilitate the prosecution of violations.

In some cases, investigating the financial corruption of government officials is one of the most prominent aspects of crime prosecution. Financial corruption can manifest in various forms, including bribery, embezzlement, misappropriation of public funds, and abuse of governmental positions. These types of crimes often require extensive investigations, financial audits, and forensic accounting to fully uncover the extent of corruption. Possible penalties for government officials, if convicted, may include financial fines, imprisonment, removal from office, and even deprivation of civil rights.

Overall, addressing crimes committed by government officials is not only legally and judicially significant but also plays a crucial role in enhancing transparency and accountability in governmental institutions and in protecting citizens' rights. In this process, adherence to fair trial principles, coordination between supervisory and judicial institutions, and the enforcement of appropriate penalties contribute to the realization of justice and the fight against corruption.

#### *4.1. Jurisdiction Over Crimes Committed by Political and Government Officials*

In Iran, the prosecution of crimes committed by political and government officials is conducted through special jurisdictions, particularly in cases involving national security, administrative corruption, or specific violations. According to the Constitution, these cases are referred to specialized courts such as Revolutionary Courts or special tribunals. Special courts are established to adjudicate certain offenses committed by government and political officials due to the sensitivity of such crimes and the necessity of maintaining national security. The judicial process in these courts operates independently of general courts, and they primarily handle cases with political or security-related dimensions (Akbari, 2018; Delavari, 2016).

The General Inspection Organization, as one of the primary supervisory bodies in Iran, plays a crucial role in identifying and reporting violations committed by government officials. This organization documents and investigates such offenses and, after collecting sufficient evidence, submits reports to judicial authorities or other competent institutions. If these violations acquire legal and judicial significance, they are forwarded to the judiciary. In cases where the violations involve financial or economic corruption, the matter may be referred to the Administrative Justice Tribunal. As the primary body for adjudicating administrative violations and unlawful decisions within the executive branch, the Administrative Justice Tribunal is responsible for determining whether the decisions made by government officials comply with the law. If these decisions infringe upon public rights or threaten public interests, the tribunal can annul them and initiate proceedings against the offenders (Ahmadi, 2020; Najafzadeh, 2019).

In certain cases, crimes committed by government officials may be referred to Revolutionary Courts, particularly when they involve security-related issues or threats against national security. Revolutionary Courts were established to handle political and security-related offenses, and in some instances, they specifically adjudicate cases involving government officials directly linked to national security matters. If the crime committed by a government official involves abuse of office or embezzlement, the case is referred to general courts or specialized courts designated for such offenses.

The penalties imposed on government officials for crimes depend on the nature and severity of the offense. If the crime involves financial corruption, penalties such as imprisonment, fines, and dismissal from public office may be imposed. For political crimes that threaten national security, harsher punishments, including long-term imprisonment or, in extreme cases, the death penalty, may be considered. These penalties must be proportional to the crime and its impact on society and the country. High-ranking officials, including the President and certain ministers, may enjoy judicial immunity in some circumstances, requiring special authorization from the Supreme Leader or Parliament to pursue charges against them. Due to their unique status within the governance structure, these officials may be subject to specific procedures for addressing their violations. This system is generally designed to prevent the abuse of power and to maintain the stability of the Islamic Republic.

Additionally, reviewing and reforming policies and oversight mechanisms regarding the prosecution of government officials can help prevent corruption and strengthen the governance system. Enhanced oversight and greater transparency in addressing violations can restore public trust and reduce the occurrence of corruption and misconduct in the future. This process should be continuously revised and strengthened to align with the long-term objectives of social justice and human rights.

Overall, the prosecution of crimes committed by government and political officials is a complex process requiring coordination among various judicial and supervisory bodies. This issue is particularly significant in countries with specific governance structures, such as Iran, where specialized laws and jurisdictions exist for handling such offenses.

#### 4.2. *The Process of Prosecuting and Adjudicating Crimes Committed by Government Officials*

The process of prosecuting and adjudicating crimes committed by government officials in Iran is a complex, multi-stage legal procedure designed to uphold principles of justice and transparency within the executive branch. This process involves several stages, including identification, preliminary investigations, referral to judicial authorities, and ultimately, legal proceedings, all of which are conducted under the strict supervision of judicial institutions and oversight bodies.

The first step in this process is the identification and reporting of violations. If a detected violation constitutes a criminal offense, the case is referred to the competent judicial authorities. During the adjudication process, preliminary investigations are conducted by judicial authorities. These investigations involve interviewing relevant individuals, examining documents and financial records, evaluating bank accounts, and reviewing other pertinent evidence related to the crime. One of the critical phases in these investigations is the arrest and interrogation of the accused officials. After a thorough review of the case, the court convenes a hearing to examine the charges against the government officials. At this stage, the documentary evidence provided by the General Inspection Organization, the Administrative Justice Tribunal, and other supervisory bodies is considered as legally admissible evidence (Yasayi Meybodi, 2016).

Judicial proceedings generally include public hearings, with the participation of the accused officials' legal counsel and representatives of the prosecution. During these proceedings, accused government officials have the right to defend themselves and to present evidence to refute the allegations. If the court determines that a violation has been committed, it may issue an appropriate sentence in proportion to the crime. These penalties may include fines, imprisonment, removal from office, and, in certain cases, more severe punishments (Tabatabai Motameni, 2010).

In some cases, preventive sanctions are also implemented to deter future misconduct and corruption. These measures may include legal restrictions on the ability of convicted officials to hold public office, revocation of their right to participate in governmental positions, and even social disqualification (Gharamani, 2011).

The adjudication of crimes committed by government officials has a significant impact on the level of transparency and accountability within governmental institutions. Prosecuting these crimes reinforces public trust in governance structures and demonstrates that no individual, including high-ranking officials, is above the law. This process also serves as a deterrent, compelling government officials and administrators to exercise greater caution in fulfilling their duties and to refrain from engaging in misconduct (Najafzadeh, 2019).

Coordination among supervisory and judicial institutions is of paramount importance in the process of addressing crimes committed by government officials. The General Inspection Organization, the Administrative Justice Tribunal, the judiciary, and other competent bodies must work in coordination to ensure that investigations and prosecutions are conducted efficiently and without delay. Such cooperation can play a crucial role in enhancing judicial transparency and mitigating the negative effects of corruption within governmental institutions (Nekouei, 2021).

Ultimately, reviewing and reforming judicial and supervisory procedures related to the prosecution of government officials can contribute to the prevention of future violations and corruption. Strengthening oversight institutions, providing necessary training for government officials on professional ethics and legal compliance, and implementing legislative reforms to facilitate the judicial process are among the preventive measures that can be effective in reducing misconduct among government officials (Rezaei Tabar, 2021).

Overall, the process of prosecuting and adjudicating crimes committed by government officials in Iran represents a significant legal, social, and political challenge. This process requires stringent oversight, coordination among various institutions, and adherence to fair trial principles to achieve desirable outcomes in combating corruption and promoting transparency within governmental institutions.

#### 4.3. *Jurisdiction Criteria in Crimes Committed by Government Employees*

The jurisdiction criteria in crimes committed by government employees constitute one of the fundamental principles of the judicial and legal system of any country, particularly in the prosecution of crimes committed by government officials and employees. Jurisdiction refers to the authority and competence of a judicial or administrative body to adjudicate a specific case. In cases involving crimes committed by government employees, jurisdiction may vary based on the type of offense, the rank



of the accused official, the supervisory body involved, and the applicable legal framework. This matter is specifically defined and regulated within the Iranian judicial system.

The first criterion for determining jurisdiction over crimes committed by government employees is the nature of the offense. If the offense is a general crime that bears no connection to governmental responsibilities or administrative duties, the general courts have jurisdiction over the case. However, if the offense directly relates to economic corruption or abuse of public office, the case may be adjudicated by specialized courts or the Administrative Justice Tribunal (Moqareb, 2019).

In some cases, if a crime is committed by a government employee in the course of duty, the jurisdiction over such offenses is determined by specific conditions. For example, if an employee commits corruption or a violation while performing official duties, the case falls under the jurisdiction of the Administrative Justice Tribunal. This oversight body, which deals with administrative violations and unlawful government decisions, intervenes particularly when citizens' rights are infringed. The jurisdiction of special courts is also significant in handling crimes committed by government employees, particularly in cases involving security-related or political offenses (Moqareb, 2019).

The jurisdiction of the Administrative Justice Tribunal in addressing administrative crimes committed by government employees is another key legal pillar. This tribunal, responsible for reviewing administrative and legal violations, assumes jurisdiction when a government employee or official commits an offense that specifically contradicts administrative laws or unlawful government decisions. This body can independently investigate violations and, if necessary, issue the required decisions (Yazdani, 2014).

The jurisdiction of general courts in adjudicating crimes committed by government employees that are classified as ordinary offenses unrelated to their official position is widely recognized. Generally, if a crime committed by a government employee is not directly linked to their official duties and is classified as an individual offense, the general courts have the jurisdiction to hear the case. These courts adjudicate cases based on the general laws of the country, without considering the accused's official position (Yazdani, 2014).

The specific jurisdiction of disciplinary bodies is also significant in addressing certain violations committed by government employees. These bodies may handle administrative violations specifically related to disciplinary matters. For instance, offenses concerning workplace discipline in governmental environments that affect public order may be referred to disciplinary authorities. These bodies typically play an indirect role in the adjudication of administrative and governmental violations.

The jurisdiction of the Guardian Council and certain specialized oversight bodies may be invoked when violations committed by high-ranking officials or political figures result in breaches of fundamental constitutional principles. If an offense involves a violation of the country's constitutional principles, these bodies possess the legal authority to assess the qualifications of government officials and advance judicial proceedings.

Ultimately, the process of determining jurisdiction in cases involving crimes committed by government employees must be conducted with the goal of accountability and transparency. This process must be designed in a manner that ensures all government officials and employees are subject to the law without discrimination, and justice is administered equitably for all individuals, regardless of their rank or position.

#### *4.4. Mechanisms for Adjudicating Administrative Violations and Ensuring Fair Trial*

The mechanism for adjudicating administrative violations and ensuring a fair trial is a fundamental component of any legal and governance system, particularly within governmental and administrative institutions. This mechanism is directly linked to safeguarding the rights of government employees, preventing corruption and administrative violations, and maintaining public trust in governmental and judicial institutions. Fair trial principles and administrative adjudication procedures must be designed to ensure that the rights of both the accused and complainants are equitably upheld.

The first step in this process is identifying and reporting administrative violations to the relevant authorities. The second phase involves preliminary investigations, which are conducted by supervisory or judicial bodies. If the violation involves financial corruption or abuse of public office, more detailed and extensive investigations are carried out.

The right to defense is one of the fundamental principles of a fair trial. In the adjudication process for administrative violations, the accused is granted the right to defend themselves and present evidence and documents in their favor. Additionally, the accused has the right to legal representation. This safeguard is essential to prevent injustice and wrongful

accusations against government employees, as administrative violations may sometimes be mistakenly attributed to individuals. Once preliminary investigations are completed, the case proceeds to adjudication before judicial or administrative bodies. At this stage, the judicial or administrative authority determines whether the case should be referred to a court or directly reviewed and decided by supervisory bodies. In cases involving severe and irreparable violations, the matter may be referred to general courts or specialized courts such as the Administrative Justice Tribunal. These bodies are responsible for issuing judicial rulings in accordance with existing laws and documented evidence (Ranjbar, 2020; Yasayi Meybodi, 2016).

A fair trial, on the one hand, entails adherence to all legal and constitutional principles in the adjudication process, and on the other hand, requires that all judicial and administrative bodies review cases without regard to the accused's official status. If a crime or violation is proven, the corresponding punishment must be fairly imposed, in proportion to the nature of the offense. Sanctions may include dismissal from office, financial penalties, demotion, suspension, or, in severe cases, imprisonment. In cases involving financial corruption and economic offenses, additional measures such as asset investigations and examination of the accused's bank accounts may also be undertaken. In such instances, the goal of the punishment is not only to penalize the offender but also to deter similar future violations (Yasayi Meybodi, 2016).

Supervisory institutions such as the General Inspection Organization and the Administrative Justice Tribunal are frequently responsible for handling administrative violations. These bodies play a crucial role in the adjudication process by reviewing violations and submitting relevant reports to judicial or executive authorities. In cases where administrative violations result in severe penalties such as imprisonment or dismissal from office, it is essential to ensure that all judicial proceedings comply with international human rights standards. Fundamental rights, such as the right to legal representation, the right to a fair trial, and the right to appeal decisions, are among the most critical principles in this regard (Sedaghaty, 2011).

Ultimately, transparency in reporting and informing the public about administrative violations and judicial proceedings can enhance public trust and improve accountability within government institutions. When citizens are assured that violations are meticulously investigated and adjudicated in accordance with fair trial principles, this can reinforce democracy and improve the overall performance of governmental bodies.

## 5. Procedural Law Governing the Administrative Violations Review Boards for Government Employees

The procedural law governing the administrative violations review boards for government employees is a fundamental component of the country's administrative and judicial system. Its purpose is to ensure compliance with legal principles, justice, and transparency in handling administrative violations committed by government employees. This procedural law encompasses a set of regulations, principles, and procedures under which the administrative violations review boards investigate and issue decisions regarding offenses committed by government employees. Since such violations may significantly impact administrative performance and the reputation of governmental institutions, the adjudication process must be conducted with precision and fairness (Ahmadi, 2020).

In the initial phase, administrative violations review boards must establish their jurisdiction over cases in accordance with relevant laws and regulations. Jurisdiction, in this context, means determining whether the alleged violation committed by a government employee falls within their official duties. Once jurisdiction is established, the next step involves notifying the accused. According to governing procedural laws, the accused must be informed that a complaint has been filed against them and be made aware of the specific violations attributed to them. This stage is crucial in ensuring the right to defense and requires clear communication to the accused regarding the nature of the alleged violations and the evidence and documentation against them. This step allows the accused an opportunity to present their defense and supporting evidence (Delavari, 2016).

During the proceedings, the collection of documentation and evidence by the review board is of critical importance. The administrative violations review board must meticulously gather all relevant evidence and examine it thoroughly. This evidence may include reports, internal documents, witness testimonies, and official records from executive bodies. This stage plays a crucial role in accurately identifying and proving the violation while preventing judicial errors (Niazpour, 2015).

The convening of hearings is another essential phase in the procedural process and must be conducted within the framework of established laws. During these hearings, both the accused and the complainant have the opportunity to present their arguments and defenses. The members of the review board, after hearing the defense statements and examining the evidence,



reach a decision. In some cases, the review board may determine that additional investigation or further inquiry is necessary. Whether hearings are conducted publicly or privately depends on the nature of the violation and must align with legal provisions (Tabatabai Motameni, 2010).

Issuing and enforcing rulings is one of the final stages of the procedural process. After reviewing the evidence and defense statements, the review board renders its decision. The ruling must be officially communicated to the accused, and where applicable, prescribed penalties must be enforced. At this stage, it is essential to ensure that the ruling is issued fairly and that all procedural steps have been correctly followed in accordance with legal requirements.

The right to appeal is another fundamental feature of procedural law governing administrative violations review boards. If either the accused or the complainant is dissatisfied with the issued ruling, they may file an appeal. Appeals must be based on legal grounds and supported by new evidence. The right to appeal is particularly important in cases where the initial ruling was issued based on legal or judicial errors. This safeguard is designed to protect the rights of both the accused and the complainant.

High-level oversight of the process of handling administrative violations is another essential principle of procedural law. Supervisory institutions such as the Administrative Justice Tribunal and the General Inspection Organization are responsible for overseeing the validity and integrity of the proceedings conducted by the administrative violations review boards. These institutions review administrative violation procedures and, in cases where legal violations are detected, recommend corrective measures to ensure justice is upheld (Ahmadpour Rostami, 2015).

Alongside oversight, continuous training for members of the administrative violations review boards is essential. Members of these boards must be well-versed in administrative law, government employees' rights, and procedural principles to adjudicate cases effectively and accurately. Legal and specialized training on handling administrative violations enhances decision-making quality and improves accuracy in the adjudication process.

One of the existing challenges in addressing administrative violations is the lack of transparency, which can lead to decreased public trust in supervisory and judicial institutions. Therefore, transparency in the adjudication process and public reporting to relevant legal authorities are essential. Increased transparency enhances public trust in government and supervisory institutions and helps prevent further corruption and violations.

Ultimately, the mechanism for handling administrative violations must be designed to not only protect the rights of government employees but also support the efficiency and transparency of the administrative system. The ultimate goal of addressing administrative violations is not only to penalize misconduct but also to prevent future violations. By doing so, similar issues can be mitigated, and public trust in government institutions can be strengthened.

### *5.1. Accountability of Administrative Violations Review Boards*

The accountability of administrative violations review boards is one of the fundamental principles ensuring transparency, justice, and efficiency within the administrative and judicial system of the country. This oversight directly influences the functioning of these boards and helps identify and rectify potential misconduct and abuses in the adjudication process. Accountability is particularly crucial in matters related to government employees' rights and the decisions affecting them, as in some cases, the boards' rulings may have significant consequences on an individual's employment status and social standing. This process is especially important in strengthening public trust in the government's administrative and supervisory systems.

Supervisory bodies such as the Administrative Justice Tribunal and the General Inspection Organization play a significant role in overseeing administrative violations review boards. These institutions monitor the boards' performance, ensure compliance with laws and regulations, and investigate complaints regarding the boards' decisions and actions. If the administrative violations review boards act improperly or if procedural misconduct occurs during adjudication, supervisory bodies have the authority to intervene and implement corrective measures (Delavari, 2016).

Another critical aspect of accountability is documentation and transparency in the adjudication process. Administrative violations review boards must systematically document all procedural steps, including hearings, decisions, and the reasoning behind those decisions, and make this information available to supervisory bodies and, where appropriate, the public. Such transparency enhances public trust in the adjudication process and prevents misconduct and corruption within this system. Additionally, thorough documentation of all adjudication stages serves as a reliable reference in appeal proceedings or legal follow-ups (Ranjbar, 2020).

Judicial oversight is another essential dimension of accountability for administrative violations review boards. Board members must adhere strictly to the relevant legal framework, and any procedural violations must be subject to judicial review and potential legal action. Additionally, the boards' decisions must be subject to appeal, ensuring that any judicial errors made during initial adjudication can be rectified. Judicial oversight is particularly vital in safeguarding the accused's right to defense and ensuring fairness in the adjudication process.

Incentive policies and feedback mechanisms within the supervisory system can enhance the accountability of administrative violations review boards. For instance, if these boards conduct fair and precise case reviews while maintaining transparency, they should be acknowledged and incentivized. Such policies encourage board members to adhere strictly to oversight principles and fair trial standards, ultimately leading to improved decision-making quality (Mousavi, 2016).

Accountability also extends to the appellate stages. If an accused or complainant is dissatisfied with the initial decisions of the boards and the case is subject to appeal, oversight must also apply to the appellate process. At this stage, review mechanisms must ensure meticulous case reassessment while strictly adhering to legal principles to prevent errors or potential abuses.

Overall, ensuring the accountability of administrative violations review boards through various oversight mechanisms and collaboration among judicial, supervisory, and societal institutions can improve adjudication processes, prevent corruption, and enhance transparency in the administrative system. This process not only protects the rights of government employees but also strengthens public trust in governmental institutions and their decisions.

## 5.2. *Adjudication of Administrative Violations Committed by Political and Government Officials*

The adjudication of administrative violations committed by political and government officials is a critical issue within the administrative and judicial system of any country. This process holds particular significance due to the influential and sensitive positions these officials occupy within the government and society. Political and governmental officials are typically recognized as individuals with high executive and decision-making authority; therefore, their potential violations can have far-reaching effects on society and governance structures. As a result, adjudicating such violations must be conducted with precision, transparency, and strict adherence to legal and procedural principles (Afsa, 2019).

One of the major challenges in addressing violations committed by political and government officials is the distinction between judicial and administrative responsibilities. These officials often hold positions that combine executive and judicial functions. Therefore, the judicial system must effectively and independently separate these responsibilities and determine appropriate penalties based on the nature of the offense. For instance, violations constituting criminal offenses should be prosecuted by general and criminal courts, whereas administrative violations should be reviewed by administrative violations review boards (Alizadeh, 2022; Mehrvarz et al., 2022).

The process of adjudicating violations committed by political and government officials typically consists of two main stages: investigation and adjudication. During the first stage, evidence and documentation are collected, and if a violation is identified, the case proceeds to adjudication. At this stage, administrative violations review boards or various judicial bodies, such as the Administrative Justice Tribunal or general courts, conduct a thorough and transparent review of the case. If necessary, these bodies may impose penalties such as removal from office, financial fines, or suspension (Alizadeh, 2022; Mehrvarz et al., 2022).

A major challenge in adjudicating violations committed by political officials is the presence of conflicts of interest and political pressures. High-ranking officials often operate in environments where their personal and political interests intersect. Under such conditions, legal and supervisory safeguards must be effectively enforced to ensure that no external influence or political pressure compromises the adjudication process. Both internal and external oversight mechanisms must rigorously monitor the proceedings to maintain transparency and justice.

The penalties imposed for violations committed by political and government officials must be proportionate to the severity of the offense and its impact on society and governance. These penalties may include removal from office, suspension, financial penalties, or even judicial prosecution and criminal sanctions. The primary objective of imposing penalties is not solely to punish the offending officials but also to prevent the recurrence of similar violations while enhancing transparency and administrative efficiency.

### 5.3. *Appellate Boards for the Review of Administrative Violations*

Appellate boards for the review of administrative violations are one of the essential components of administrative adjudication systems in various countries. These boards serve as independent and superior bodies above the primary administrative violations review boards, playing a crucial role in ensuring justice and accuracy in the adjudication of administrative offenses. The primary purpose of appellate boards is to reassess the decisions issued by initial review boards and to correct or modify rulings in cases where legal errors or procedural deficiencies exist. These boards must carefully review cases and issue final decisions while adhering to fair trial principles.

Appellate boards are typically composed of experienced members with expertise in administrative and judicial law who can analyze and meticulously review case files and existing evidence. Members of these boards often include judges, legal experts, and representatives of governmental organizations. By reassessing initial decisions, appellate boards have the authority to rectify errors or procedural irregularities in the initial review process. Consequently, these boards act as supervisory bodies to protect the rights of government employees and maintain transparency in handling administrative violations (Ranjbar, 2020).

One of the key features of appellate boards is their ability to review and revise initial rulings. These boards have the authority to reassess cases and modify decisions if necessary. Such modifications may involve adjusting penalties, overturning decisions, or issuing new rulings. Appellate boards must operate in accordance with fair trial and legal principles, ensuring that all procedural steps are transparent and impartial while safeguarding the due process rights of the accused. The accused must be informed of all evidence and reasons cited against them and must be granted full and unrestricted opportunities to present their defense. Furthermore, it must be ensured that appellate board decisions are based on credible evidence and legal documentation rather than political or social pressures (Ranjbar, 2020).

Oversight of appellate boards' performance is another critical aspect of their operation. Both internal and external oversight mechanisms must be in place to prevent corruption, bias, or abuse in the adjudication process. To this end, supervisory institutions such as the Administrative Justice Tribunal and the General Inspection Organization may monitor the proceedings of administrative violations review boards and intervene in cases of procedural misconduct. Effective oversight enhances public trust in the judicial and administrative systems. In certain instances, appellate boards may not have the authority to initiate new cases and may only review cases that have not been conclusively resolved at the initial stage. Under such circumstances, these boards are limited to reviewing and reconsidering initial decisions without the power to introduce new cases, thereby ensuring greater procedural transparency and preventing potential misuse of the adjudication process.

Another critical responsibility of appellate boards is the establishment of mechanisms to expedite case proceedings. Given the high volume of administrative violations cases and the lengthy adjudication process, appellate boards must implement measures to reduce processing time and prevent judicial delays. This is particularly important in high-profile cases involving senior government officials. To accelerate adjudication, appellate boards may utilize modern technologies for case tracking and documentation. The issuance of appellate rulings must be conducted with precision and in full compliance with all applicable legal and regulatory provisions.

Finally, a significant challenge in handling administrative violations is preserving the independence of appellate boards. Administrative violations review boards must remain free from any political or social influence throughout the adjudication process. To achieve this goal, legal and supervisory mechanisms must be in place to ensure the impartiality and independence of these boards. This issue is particularly critical in sensitive cases and situations involving high-ranking government officials.

### 5.4. *Scope of Jurisdiction and Authority of Appellate Boards*

As superior adjudicatory bodies above initial review boards, appellate boards play a vital role in ensuring justice and accuracy in administrative violations proceedings. These boards are authorized to review cases that have been initially adjudicated and are responsible for reassessing the decisions issued by lower review bodies to ensure their compliance with legal and regulatory provisions (Ranjbar, 2020).

Appellate boards are mandated to base their rulings on the available evidence and legal documentation. Their jurisdiction includes reassessing evidence, hearing the defense arguments of the accused, and analyzing case records. As higher adjudicatory bodies, these boards may amend initial rulings, and if sufficient evidence does not support the finding of a

violation, they may issue an acquittal. Additionally, appellate boards may alter the type of sanction imposed or prescribe alternative penalties (Ranjbar, 2020).

Regarding jurisdiction, appellate boards have specific authority, particularly in cases involving government officials. These boards must exercise heightened scrutiny when adjudicating offenses committed by senior government officials and executive authorities. Special legal provisions regulate the review and adjudication of violations committed by high-ranking officials. For example, if a government official is found guilty of an administrative violation, their case may be reviewed by an appellate board comprising representatives from both judicial and supervisory institutions.

A critical aspect of the jurisdiction of appellate boards is the requirement for them to function independently and impartially. This means that appellate board decisions must not be influenced by political or social pressures. Accordingly, the scope of jurisdiction and authority of appellate boards must be carefully delineated to prevent conflicts of interest. Members of these boards must remain free from any personal or professional conflicts of interest during adjudication. For this reason, rigorous oversight and the establishment of legal safeguards against misuse of office are essential in maintaining the integrity of appellate proceedings.

#### 5.5. *Composition of the Administrative Violations Review Board Under the Law on the Establishment of the General Inspection Organization*

According to the Law on the Establishment of the General Inspection Organization, administrative violations review boards are composed of various members, each with specific responsibilities. Typically, these boards include a chairperson and other members such as deputies, representatives of governmental agencies, and judges or legal experts. This diverse composition allows for the integration of specialized perspectives from different fields in the adjudication of administrative violations. The chairperson of the administrative violations review board is usually selected from among experienced judges or senior judicial officials. This selection is intended to ensure the impartiality and independence of the board's decisions. The chairperson is responsible for overseeing all adjudication stages, issuing rulings, and ensuring adherence to fair trial principles. In certain cases, the chairperson may play a guiding role in the adjudication process and make final decisions after reviewing evidence and documentation (Hosseini & Nozari Fardousieh, 2014; Najafzadeh, 2019).

Other members of the administrative violations review boards are generally selected from among legal experts or professionals specializing in administrative and executive affairs. These members may include individuals with experience in government management, legal advisors, or representatives of supervisory bodies such as the General Inspection Organization (Alizadeh, 2022).

In addition to expert members, administrative violations review boards may include representatives from institutions such as the Administrative Justice Tribunal or other judicial authorities. These representatives may play an advisory and supervisory role in decision-making and help ensure legal transparency and fairness in the adjudication process. This multi-faceted composition is particularly crucial when handling complex or sensitive cases involving senior government officials.

Structurally, administrative violations review boards may consist of an initial review board and an appellate review board. Initial review boards are responsible for adjudicating cases and issuing initial rulings, whereas appellate review boards handle the review and revision of decisions issued by the initial boards. The composition of these boards may vary depending on the nature of the violation and the officials involved. Appellate review boards generally comprise more experienced members to ensure the accuracy and validity of decisions.

In some cases, the composition of administrative violations review boards may change based on the nature of the violation and the rank of the involved government officials. For instance, in cases involving high-ranking government officials, the review boards may include judges, senior government officials, and representatives of supervisory bodies such as the General Inspection Organization. This specific composition is designed to ensure impartiality and transparency in handling high-profile and critical cases.

Ultimately, the composition of administrative violations review boards must be structured in a way that fosters public confidence in the boards' decisions and the administrative adjudication process. To achieve this, board members must possess qualifications such as expertise, experience, and impartiality, enabling them to effectively adjudicate administrative violations.

The composition must ensure that the adjudication process remains transparent, fair, and in accordance with human rights principles.

## **6. Methods of Inspection by the General Inspection Organization Through the Preparation and Compilation of Reports**

The inspection methods of the General Inspection Organization, particularly concerning the preparation and compilation of inspection reports, constitute a fundamental aspect of the organization's activities. Inspection reports serve as the primary tool for documenting violations, deficiencies, and irregularities within governmental agencies and organizations. These reports are not only crucial for informing relevant authorities and decision-makers but also play a significant role in promoting transparency and improving administrative processes (Alizadeh, 2022).

The first step in the inspection process is identifying the subject of inspection. The General Inspection Organization periodically or in response to public reports, complaints, and referrals from responsible authorities identifies institutions that may potentially be involved in violations. This identification process may be based on continuous analyses and managerial assessments. At this stage, inspection teams, following specific guidelines and objectives, initiate in-depth examinations of the documentation and activities of the targeted institutions (Alizadeh, 2022).

After determining the subject of inspection, the inspection teams proceed with data collection. This stage is critical in the preparation of inspection reports and involves analyzing documents and records, interviewing employees, reviewing financial and administrative records, and monitoring the daily activities of the organizations under review. During this phase, the inspection team meticulously evaluates the collected information to ensure its accuracy and prevent errors in the reporting process (Mehrvarz et al., 2022).

Following the data collection and analysis phase, the next step is identifying the type of violation or regulatory deviation. The inspection team must precisely determine the nature of the violation or misconduct and assess whether it constitutes a breach of domestic or international regulations. This stage requires a high level of expertise and accuracy, as the final report must be comprehensive and supported by valid legal references (Mehrvarz et al., 2022).

Once the violation is identified and analyzed, the inspection report must be compiled in a structured and transparent manner. Typically, an inspection report includes various sections such as an introduction to the institution under review, the objectives of the inspection, inspection methods, analyses, documented evidence, inspection findings, and, finally, recommendations for corrective actions (Mehrvarz et al., 2022).

Upon completion, the final inspection report is submitted to the relevant authorities. These authorities may include senior government officials, judges, or other supervisory bodies that will take the necessary actions based on the report. In some instances, these reports serve as the foundation for judicial or managerial proceedings within different organizations. During this process, the report must be presented comprehensively and accurately to ensure that all aspects of the issue have been thoroughly examined and analyzed.

## **7. Jurisdiction of the General Inspection Organization in Cases Under the Competence of the Administrative Justice Tribunal**

The jurisdiction of the General Inspection Organization in cases falling under the competence of the Administrative Justice Tribunal is a complex and significant issue within the legal system of the Islamic Republic of Iran. These jurisdictions are designed to oversee governmental activities and prevent administrative corruption. As an independent supervisory body, the General Inspection Organization is responsible for identifying and investigating administrative violations and breaches of laws and regulations. However, defining the scope and limits of the organization's jurisdiction in relation to cases that fall within the purview of the Administrative Justice Tribunal requires careful legal analysis (Ahmadi, 2020; Mehrvarz et al., 2022; Najafzadeh, 2019).

The General Inspection Organization primarily functions as an executive and supervisory body, intervening in cases where violations occur within the framework of governmental laws and regulations. In situations where the Administrative Justice Tribunal adjudicates public or private complaints, the General Inspection Organization can contribute by clarifying and



documenting violations. In other words, the organization may compile reports identifying and thoroughly examining violations and legal breaches, which may later serve as the basis for complaints filed before the Administrative Justice Tribunal. However, it is important to note that the General Inspection Organization does not possess independent jurisdiction to adjudicate claims and complaints. This means that the organization cannot issue rulings directly or undertake actions that fall exclusively within judicial proceedings. Therefore, although the General Inspection Organization can identify violations and document them in its reports, the Administrative Justice Tribunal remains the competent authority for adjudicating claims and issuing final rulings. In this sense, these two institutions function in a complementary manner, each fulfilling a distinct yet interconnected role (Karimnejad Rostami, 2007; Khorami, 1997; Parvin & Delbar, 2014).

Under the existing legal framework, the General Inspection Organization can, through its supervisory functions, identify administrative violations and breaches of laws committed by executive bodies and submit its reports to competent authorities, including the Administrative Justice Tribunal. In such cases, the tribunal may rely on the documented evidence and reports provided by the General Inspection Organization to adjudicate complaints and relevant claims. In this regard, the General Inspection Organization plays a preventive and supervisory role, encouraging governmental institutions to adhere to legal and regulatory standards and to avoid violations (Delavari, 2016; Haji Agha Bozorgi, 2015).

A key aspect of this issue is the distinction between the responsibilities and authority of the General Inspection Organization and the Administrative Justice Tribunal. The tribunal specifically adjudicates claims and complaints against unlawful actions and administrative decisions made by government agencies. Accordingly, the tribunal has the authority to issue orders such as annulling governmental resolutions or actions that contradict legal provisions. On the other hand, the General Inspection Organization primarily focuses on executive and supervisory matters, gathering evidence, documenting violations, and evaluating the performance of governmental institutions.

The level of cooperation and interaction between the General Inspection Organization and the Administrative Justice Tribunal is particularly important when violations and claims involve both institutions. In some cases, the General Inspection Organization may compile reports that serve as the basis for individual or collective complaints before the Administrative Justice Tribunal.

When these violations lead to formal complaints before the Administrative Justice Tribunal, the reports and documentation prepared by the General Inspection Organization may serve as credible evidence in the tribunal's adjudicatory process. This is particularly relevant when the evidence and findings contained in inspection reports directly influence the tribunal's proceedings and final rulings. Overall, it can be concluded that the General Inspection Organization does not directly intervene in adjudicating claims that fall under the jurisdiction of the Administrative Justice Tribunal. Instead, its role is limited to oversight and documentation. Nevertheless, the organization's reports may serve as the foundation for complaints brought before the tribunal, which then utilizes these reports as part of its decision-making process regarding various claims.

As a result, the interaction between the General Inspection Organization and the Administrative Justice Tribunal establishes a comprehensive oversight system that enhances transparency, accuracy, and justice in addressing violations and claims. This cooperation can contribute to preventing corruption, improving transparency, and enhancing the efficiency of governmental institutions in Iran.

## **8. Analysis of Deficiencies and Proposed Reforms for the Law on the Establishment of the General Inspection Organization**

Analyzing deficiencies and proposing reforms for the Law on the Establishment of the General Inspection Organization is a crucial step toward enhancing the effectiveness of this supervisory body in combating corruption and administrative violations. The current law faces several challenges and limitations that require fundamental revisions and reforms. One of the primary weaknesses of the law is the restriction on the organization's authority to take decisive actions against violations. Specifically, in certain cases, the organization is only permitted to report violations and propose corrective measures, lacking executive authority to directly pursue or take concrete action against offending officials. To address this issue, the executive and legal powers of the General Inspection Organization should be strengthened to enable it to effectively oversee the implementation of its corrective recommendations and, if necessary, take more decisive actions (Ranjbar, 2020).



Another deficiency in the current law is the lack of legal mechanisms for effective coordination between the General Inspection Organization and other supervisory and judicial bodies. Despite the existence of multiple oversight institutions in the country, these bodies often conduct simultaneous supervision over the same matters without adequate cooperation, information exchange, or synergy in performing their supervisory functions. To remedy this issue, the law governing the General Inspection Organization could be amended to include provisions mandating collaboration and coordination among these institutions. Such collaboration could involve information exchange, the formation of joint committees, and coordinated investigations (Ranjbar, 2020).

A further problem lies in the complexity of the organization's oversight processes, which can lead to delays in addressing violations and administrative challenges. At times, these procedures are so intricate that they lack the necessary transparency and efficiency to effectively combat misconduct. Another existing challenge is the shortage of financial resources and specialized personnel within the General Inspection Organization. Despite its broad mandate to oversee governmental institutions, the organization often operates under resource constraints. To enhance its effectiveness, the law should be revised to allocate increased financial and human resources. Additionally, conditions should be established to ensure that organizational members possess greater expertise and specialized skills in various fields, enabling more precise and comprehensive oversight.

Another notable deficiency in the law is the lack of transparency in handling violations committed by high-ranking officials. Specifically, when senior government officials or high-level employees engage in misconduct, the adjudication process and its outcomes are not publicly accessible. This issue can lead to diminished public trust in supervisory institutions. To improve this situation, it is recommended that the General Inspection Organization be required to publicly disclose its reports regarding violations and the actions taken in response, while adhering to legal and security considerations. Such transparency would enhance public trust in the organization.

Additionally, another weakness in the law is the absence of an effective evaluation system for assessing the performance of the General Inspection Organization. To measure the organization's effectiveness in combating corruption and supervising government agencies, performance evaluation criteria should be established to monitor its internal operations.

A key issue in analyzing the deficiencies of the law is the need to enhance training and capacity-building for the organization's staff. As the primary overseers of government activities and official conduct, the personnel of the General Inspection Organization must possess diverse expertise and high levels of competence. Therefore, it is recommended that the law include provisions for continuous and specialized training programs to equip staff with up-to-date knowledge and modern supervisory methods, enabling them to conduct more precise and effective oversight.

Another problem that must be addressed in the legal reform process is the limitations imposed on the General Inspection Organization in investigating violations committed by senior government officials. While the organization is empowered to identify and pursue violations by lower-ranking officials, legal restrictions and higher authorities often obstruct swift and decisive action against senior officials. To resolve this issue, legal amendments should be introduced to enable the General Inspection Organization to operate more effectively across all levels of government.

In conclusion, the reform of the Law on the Establishment of the General Inspection Organization should be designed to grant the institution greater flexibility and stronger authority in conducting oversight and combating corruption. By improving its structural framework and strengthening its resources, the organization can more effectively address issues of injustice, mismanagement, and corruption, ultimately creating a more robust institution that safeguards public rights and promotes transparency within governmental institutions.

## 9. Conclusion

Addressing administrative crimes and violations is a fundamental issue with a direct impact on the integrity of the administrative system and public trust in government institutions. As a key supervisory body, the General Inspection Organization plays a crucial role in preventing and addressing violations through its legal capacities, including the Islamic Penal Code and the Administrative Violations Investigation Law. An analysis of the organization's performance demonstrates that reliance on legal provisions, such as Article 576 of the Islamic Penal Code and the Law on the Promotion of Administrative Integrity, provides a legal framework for combating administrative offenses.

One of the organization's strengths is its use of legal instruments and supervisory mechanisms to identify violations and refer offenders to judicial authorities. However, studies indicate that challenges such as weak inter-institutional coordination and resource limitations—both human and financial—can affect the organization's ability to fulfill its mandate. Strengthening inter-organizational communication and allocating adequate resources can enhance the institution's effectiveness and facilitate more rigorous enforcement against violations.

Moreover, effective cooperation between the General Inspection Organization and other supervisory and judicial bodies is of particular importance. Coordinated enforcement of laws, information-sharing, and the use of modern technologies for monitoring violations can improve oversight quality and reduce corruption within the administrative system. Additionally, training and raising awareness among administrative personnel about legal regulations and the consequences of violations should be prioritized as a preventive strategy.

Ultimately, the role of the General Inspection Organization extends beyond addressing violations; it can serve as a deterrent and educational institution in reducing administrative offenses. By leveraging its legal capacities and enhancing its oversight structures, the organization can contribute to the development of a transparent, accountable, and efficient administrative system. In doing so, the integrity of the administrative system will be preserved, and public trust in governance will be strengthened.

### Ethical Considerations

All procedures performed in this study were under the ethical standards.

### Acknowledgments

Authors thank all participants who participate in this study.

### Conflict of Interest

The authors report no conflict of interest.

### Funding/Financial Support

According to the authors, this article has no financial support.

### References

- Afrasiabi, S., & Khoyeni, G. (2022). Foundations of criminalization in Iran regarding administrative occupations. *Monthly Scientific Journal of Political Administrative Sociology*, 5(12), 2174-2184.
- Afsa, A. (2019). *The jurisdiction of judicial courts and administrative violation investigation committees in handling the punishments of crimes and violations by employees and high-ranking officials of the three branches* Islamic Azad University, Bandar Abbas Unit].
- Ahmadi, M. (2020). *The role of the General Inspection Organization in protecting citizens' rights* Bu Ali Sina University].
- Ahmadpour Rostami, A. (2015). The role of the organization in preventing crime and corruption in executive bodies. *Journal of Evaluation Knowledge*, 7(26), 252-268.
- Akbari, N. (2018). *Iran's criminal policy regarding illegal appropriation of public funds and property* Islamic Azad University, Taft Unit].
- Alizadeh, S. (2022). *The duties of the General Inspection Organization regarding the administrative violations of managers* Alborz University].
- Ansari, H. (2011). *The role of private organizations in achieving the objectives of the General Inspection Organization according to clause (a) of Article 11 of the General Inspection Organization Law* Shiraz University].
- Delavari, M. R. (2016). The jurisdiction of the General Inspection Organization in handling cases within the jurisdiction of the Administrative Justice Court. *Journal of Evaluation Knowledge*, 3(27), 1-21.
- Gharamani, A. K. (2011). Community-oriented policing: The role of public participation in crime prevention. *Journal of Crime Prevention Studies*, 6(18), 1-22.
- Haji Agha Bozorgi, R. (2015). *The legal nature of the supervision of the General Inspection Organization of the country* Islamic Azad University, Central Tehran Unit].
- Hosseini, S. M., & Nozari Fardousieh, M. (2014). Islamic criminal policy regarding administrative corruption and a comparative study with international standards. *Criminal law and Criminology Studies*, 1(1), 83-101.
- Karimnejad Rostami, S. (2007). *The supervisory role of the General Inspection Organization in Iran* Islamic Azad University, Central Tehran Unit].

- Khorami, M. (1997). The legal structure of supervision and inspection in the country. In Proceedings of the First Conference on Supervision and Inspection in the Country,
- Mahdavi, M., & Fallah Hosseini, B. F. (2019). The role of the General Inspection Organization in crime prevention. *Prevention Approach Journal*, 8, 37-56.
- Mehrvarz, M. R., Heydari, H., Hosseini Sadrabadi, I., & Mohammadi Malghorani, A. (2022). The role of the General Inspection Organization in preventing administrative violations with a focus on combating managerial oversight evasion. *Interdisciplinary Studies Journal of Strategic Knowledge*, 48, 119-144.
- Moqareb, S. (2019). *Civil liability of government employees arising from administrative violations towards the government and private individuals* Islamic Azad University, Damavand Unit].
- Mousavi, S. M. (2016). Strategies of the General Inspection Organization to combat corruption. In Third Conference on Financial and Administrative Corruption in the Legal System of Iran: Reform and Development of the Legal System,
- Najafzadeh, M. (2019). *The supervisory role of the General Inspection Organization in preventing economic crimes* Payame Noor University, Khorasan Razavi Province].
- Nekouei, M. (2021). Pathology of the opinions of administrative violation investigation committees from the perspective of fair trial principles with emphasis on the rulings of the Administrative Justice Court. *Scientific Journal of New Administrative Law Research*, 3(9), 189-213.
- Niazpour, A. H. (2015). Prevention of administrative-financial corruption in light of the "Regulation for Systematic and Sustainable Prevention and Combat of Economic Corruption in the Executive Branch 2013". *Strategic Journal*, 24(76), 1-22.
- Nourali Dokht, H. (2017). Identification and pathology of managerial factors affecting administrative-financial corruption. *Journal of Supervision and Inspection*, 40, 49-72.
- Parvin, K., & Delbar, H. (2014). Evaluation and reform of administrative processes in the light of the General Inspection Organization. *Journal of Public Law Research*, 15(42), 153-172.
- Ranjbar, E. (2020). *Critique and review of the performance of the General Inspection Organization in preventing economic crimes* University of Isfahan].
- Rezaei Tabar, S. M. R. (2021). *The role of the General Inspection Organization in safeguarding citizens' rights* Tolou Mehr Higher Education Institute, Qom].
- Sedaghaty, K. (2011). *The role of the General Inspection Organization in realizing and advancing the rule of law* Allameh Tabatabai University].
- Shakrzadeh Garoui, M. (2016). *The scope of the oversight of the Court of Audit and the General Inspection Organization* Judicial Sciences and Administrative Services University].
- Tabatabai Motameni, M. (2010). *Administrative law*. Tehran: Samt Publishing.
- Yasayi Meybodi, F. (2016). Enhancing the integrity of the administrative system and combating corruption. In Third Conference on Financial and Administrative Corruption in the Legal System of Iran: Reform and Development of the Legal System,
- Yazdani, Z. (2014). *An examination of the supervisory role of the General Inspection Organization over the performance of state-owned companies* Islamic Azad University, Central Tehran Unit].