

# TSUL LEGAL REPORT

INTERNATIONAL ELECTRONIC  
SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL

VOLUME 5  
ISSUE 4  
DECEMBER 2024



JOURNAL DOI: 10.51788/tsul.ir.  
ISSUE DOI: 10.51788/tsul.ir.5.4.  
E-ISSN: 2181-1024



Founder: Tashkent State University of Law



TSUL LEGAL REPORT  
T L R

INTERNATIONAL  
ELECTRONIC SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL

VOLUME 5  
ISSUE 4  
DECEMBER 2024

JOURNAL DOI: 10.51788/tsul.lr.  
ISSUE DOI: 10.51788/tsul.lr.5.4.

«TSUL Legal Report» international electronic scientific journal was registered by the Press and Information Agency of Uzbekistan on April 21, 2020, with certificate number 1342. The journal is included in the list of journals of the Higher Attestation Commission under the Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Innovations of the Republic of Uzbekistan.

Copyright belongs to Tashkent State University of Law. All rights reserved. Use, distribution and reproduction of materials of the journal are carried out with the permission of the founder.

**Publication Officer:**

Orifjon Choriev

**Editor:**

Elyor Mustafaev

**Graphic designer:**

Umid Sapaev

**Editorial office address:**

Tashkent, st. Sayilgoh, 35. Index 100047.  
Principal Contact

**Tel.:** (+998 71) 233-66-36

**Fax:** (+99871) 233-37-48

**Website:** legalreport.tsul.uz

**E-mail:** info@legalreport.tsul.uz

**Publishing license**

№ 174625, 29.11.2023.

**E-ISSN: 2181-1024**

© 2024. TSUL – Tashkent State University of Law.

**EDITOR-IN-CHIEF**

*I. Rustambekov* – Acting Rector of Tashkent State University of Law, Doctor of Law, Professor

**DEPUTY EDITOR**

*B. Xodjaev* – Deputy Rector for Scientific Affairs and Innovations of Tashkent State University of Law, Doctor of Law, Professor

**EXECUTIVE EDITOR**

*Sh. Yusupova* – Acting Associate Professor of the Department of Foreign Languages, TSUL, PhD in Philology

**MEMBERS OF THE EDITORIAL BOARD**

*Rolf Knieper* – Professor of Civil, Economic and Comparative Law, University of Bremen, Doctor of Law (Germany)

*Nikos Koutras* – Curtin Law School, PhD (Australia)

*Thomas Johann Hoeren* – Professor of Information, Media and Business Law of the University of Münster (Germany)

*Karim Zaouaq* – Professor of Sidi Mohamed Ben Abdellah University (Morocco)

*Zachary R. Calo* – Hamad bin Khalifa University School of Law, PhD (Qatar)

*Roman Tashian* – Associate Professor of Yaroslav Mudryi National Law University, PhD (Ukraine)

*Anisimov Aleksey Pavlovich* – Volgograd Institute of Management – Professor of the branch of the Russian Academy of National Economy and Public Administration, Doctor of Law (Russian Federation)

*Horace Yeung* – Associate Professor of Leicester Law School, University of Leicester, (UK)

*Christopher Kelley* – Associate Professor of Law School of Arkansas University (USA)

*Walid Ben Hamida* – Professor of Law at Evry-Val d'Essonne University (France)

*Natalia G. Prisekina* – Deputy Dean of the Faculty of Law of the Far East Federal University, Candidate of Legal Sciences (Russia)

*Levan Jakeli* – Dean of the Faculty of Law at Batumi Shota Rustaveli State University, Professor

*Yamamoto Kazushi* – Professor of Faculty of Law of Kathmandu University

*D. Umarov* – Associate Professor, Candidate of Legal Sciences

*B. Qosimov* – Acting Associate Professor of the Department of Constitutional Law of TSUL, PhD in Law

*X. Radjapov* – Associate Professor of the Department of Business Law of TSUL, PhD in Law

*A. Davronov* – Teacher of the Department of Criminal-procedural Law, PhD in Law

*D. Egamberdiyeva* – Employee of the Institute of Fundamental and Applied Research TIAME National Research University

**CONTENTS**

**12.00.02 – CONSTITUTIONAL LAW. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW. FINANCIAL AND  
CUSTOMS LAW**

**JURAYEV SHERZOD YULDASHEVICH**

Applications of the principle of protecting trust: theory and practice .....4

**12.00.12 – CORRUPTION PROBLEMS**

**AHMADJONOV MURODULLO NURALI UGLI**

Preventing corruption risks in public administration: factors, strategies,  
and systematic approaches ..... 11

**OKYULOV OMANBAY**

Scientifically competent scientist (about professor Shukhrat Ruzinazarov) ..... 17



# TSUL LEGAL REPORT

Journal home page: [www.legalreport.tsul.uz](http://www.legalreport.tsul.uz)



Received: 25.11.2024

Accepted: 12.12.2024

Published: 27.12.2024

DOI: 10.51788/tsul.lr.5.4./KDBY2853

## PREVENTING CORRUPTION RISKS IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION: FACTORS, STRATEGIES, AND SYSTEMATIC APPROACHES

**Ahmadjonov Murodullo Nurali ugli,**

Assistant to the prosecutor of Kosonsoy district,  
Namangan region

ORCID: 0009-0006-4286-6752

e-mail: [murodulloahmadjonov123@gmail.com](mailto:murodulloahmadjonov123@gmail.com)

**Abstract.** The prevention of corruption risks in public administration has become a pressing issue with dire consequences at both the national and global levels, necessitating legislative and practical measures in the fast-paced world. This paper highlights various risk factors, including individual, operational, external, internal, and systemic elements, which contribute to corruption within public institutions. More importantly, the article emphasizes the need to distinguish and clearly identify these risk factors for more effective governance while also exploring the theoretical and practical implications of corruption risk assessment. The study recommends a systematic approach for evaluating and managing corruption risks, involving stages such as risk identification, analysis, and mitigation. Additionally, the paper presents a range of strategies, such as enhancing the code of conduct for state officials, improving transparency in public procurement, and reinforcing budgetary accountability. By effectively managing these risks with sufficient resolve, public trust in government institutions can be strengthened, ensuring better governance and the targeted use of public resources.

**Keywords:** transparency, public procurement, public administration, criminal liability, corruption risks, cooperation, public oversight

### Introduction

Today, not only in our country but also globally, the issue of preventing corruption risks in public administration has become increasingly pressing, and relevant measures are being implemented within both national and international legislative frameworks. Before addressing the issues related to mitigating corruption risks in public

administration, it would be appropriate to first consider the factors contributing to such risks. In the context of scientific inquiry, a risk factor refers to behaviors inclined towards corruption, actions of a public official that do not conform to laws or their official duties, or the influence exerted by individuals, organizations, or events that could impact public administration. Moreover, risks

and risk factors are akin to two sides of the same coin, and they cannot be clearly distinguished, as any risk may originate from one or more risk factors, which can vary significantly in their nature and essence [1].

### **Material and methods**

This article makes use of qualitative research methods, especially grounded theory analysis, to identify and assess corruption risks in public government all over the world. The methodology of this article makes up an in-depth examination of current legal literature of foreign countries associated with the identification and evaluation of corruption risks, the components of the approaches to corruption risks, and the rigid strategies for bolstering hands-on approaches to foster transparency along with public trust in state governance worldwide [2].

Throughout an all-around review and analysis of current legal literature, this study aims to enhance a comprehensive understanding of corruption risks, their significance, and the methods that can be employed to modify legislation within the legal domain. In a scene, this approach allows for a thorough exploration of the subject matter, providing valuable insights into the understanding of drastic ramifications of illicit corruption actions and contributing to a deeper comprehension of assessing, identifying, and eradicating corruption risks in public administration [3].

### **Research results**

In the realm of combating corruption on a large scale, it should be noted that the identification and elimination of corruption risks in public administration do not follow strictly defined rules, and certain stages and structures of these approaches may vary.

Currently, various measures aimed at preventing corruption risks in public administration are being implemented both locally and globally. However, these practical measures demonstrate that shortcomings and deficiencies still exist in the system. In particular, to prevent and eliminate the factors creating conditions

for corruption risks in public administration and to develop effective measures against them, I propose the following recommendations that are vitally crucial to implement:

- to prevent corruption risks in public administration, promote the integrity, honesty, and responsibility of officials in line with the fundamental principles of the national legal system.

- enhance and improve the code of conduct for officials operating within public administration to ensure they perform their duties correctly, conscientiously, and adequately.

- develop measures and systems that require public officials to report any corruption activities they become aware of during the performance of their duties, and introduce disciplinary, administrative, and criminal liabilities into the legislation for failing to report such crimes in the case of conflicts of interest.

- from the perspective of preventing corruption risks and corruption in general, establish and improve appropriate procurement systems based on transparency, competition, and impartial criteria for decision-making.

- regularly publish and ensure public access to information related to tenders, public procurement procedures, and contracts, including calls for participation in bids and details of concluded contracts.

- regulate the responsibilities of officials in charge of public procurement in public administration, set professional qualification requirements, and consistently monitor their activities [4].

These highlighted issues should be thoroughly studied and implemented in practice, and a monitoring system should be developed to oversee their execution.

In addition to the aforementioned suggestions, enhancing accountability in the management of the state budget will also be necessary to prevent corruption risks in public administration and increase effective measures against them. The actions to

be taken in this regard are outlined in the following proposals:

- approval procedures for the national budget;
- timely submission of income and expenditure reports;
- strengthening the system of accounting and audit standards and ensuring transparency;
- improving the system of effective internal control and risk management related to the state budget;
- establishing civil and administrative liabilities in accordance with the basic principles of national law to ensure the preservation of accounting books, records, electronic databases, financial documents, and other documents related to state expenditures and revenues [5].

It is important to emphasize that the prevention and eradication of corruption and corruption risks are among the primary duties of the state. To ensure the effectiveness of efforts in this area, cooperation with individual stakeholders and groups beyond the public sector, such as civil society, non-governmental organizations, and community-based organizations, should be considered.

**Analysis of research results**

Corruption risks and the factors that give rise to them often seem to be identical, yet they are distinct. We will endeavor to explain this distinction as follows: a corruption risk is the likelihood of engaging in corrupt activities. If we consider corruption in public administration as a whole, we can observe that the presence of corruption risks serves as the foundation for the manifestation of this phenomenon. Additionally, corruption risks emerge from several underlying factors [6].

The efforts currently undertaken to identify and eliminate corruption risks in public administration affirm the practical necessity of combating the root causes of corruption, rather than merely addressing the consequences of corruption-related offenses [7].

It is worth noting that a number of foreign scholars have put forward various perspectives on the identification of corruption risks in public administration. Specifically, corruption risks are positioned at the initial stages of corruption’s emergence, and these risk factors are diverse conditions that facilitate and foster corruption, as outlined in Klitgaard’s corruption formula [8] ( $C = M + D - A - T$ , corruption equals monopoly plus discretion minus accountability minus transparency). In this case, Klitgaard has a point here, as the five-letter description plays a vital role in conveying the whole understanding of corruption and the linkage that is associated with illicit corruption-based actions on the whole [9].

Although these formulas may be the subject of certain debates, it remains imperative to limit monopoly and discretion within public sector processes while ensuring extensive accountability and transparency. Monopoly and discretion should be partially or entirely unavoidable; particular attention must be given to the laws and regulations designed to prevent their misuse. This formula sheds light on the factors contributing to corruption risks. Absolute authority in a particular domain, discretionary power in that domain, lack of accountability to anyone, exemption from responsibility, and the unclear nature of activities are all factors that contribute to the risk of corruption [10]. This remains evident even today. Structurally, the factors underlying corruption risks can be observed from various perspectives.

First, these are factors that may lead to legal violations. In this regard, we can identify two primary factors:

- factors that enable the emergence of corruption;
- factors that facilitate the prolonged persistence of corruption.

Second, based on the factors that create conditions for the emergence of corruption risks in public administration, as noted above, we can classify them into the following categories:

- external and systemic risk factors
- these are factors of which organizations and sectors are aware but are beyond their control;
- internal structural and organizational corruption factors - these are factors that arise from the actions or inactions of organizations and institutions, which are within their control.

These include the established rules and regulations for management, decision-making, operational leadership, and other internal policies that enable an organization to achieve its objectives and fulfill its responsibilities [11].

**Individual Risk Factors:** These pertain to the factors that drive public officials in public administration to commit corruption-related offenses [12].

**Operational Risk Factors:** These include risk factors arising from the operational processes within organizations [13]. Specifically, the aforementioned corruption risk factors are presented based on general conditions. In certain circumstances, it becomes necessary to identify specific corruption risk factors to effectively assess corruption risks. That is my firm conviction that it is essentially appropriate to implement a system that clearly identifies the factors contributing to corruption risks in public administration. By following this approach, it will be possible to determine which laws in public administration are ineffective or insufficiently developed, leading to inefficiencies in the whole legislation as a whole [14].

With the advancement of the theory of corruption risk factors in public administration, practical attention to this matter has also increased. Notably, in the Russian Federation's law "On combating corruption," adopted on December 25, 2006, it is stated that "Factors contributing to the emergence of corruption are the set of conditions, events, or circumstances that create or facilitate corruption offenses or lead to their widespread occurrence." These include objective and subjective preconditions, the

establishment of excessively broad norms in regulatory legal documents, discretion for law enforcement officers, and the unwarranted application of exceptions from general rules, encompassing vague, onerous, and difficult-to-implement demands imposed on citizens and organizations, which thereby create an environment conducive to corruption and corruption-related risks. Additionally, the protocol of the Russian Federation's Project Committee meeting, approved in 2017, highlights a list of factors contributing to corruption [15]. According to this protocol, the following corruption risk factors may be encountered during the implementation of tasks and functions by supervisory and executive authorities:

- the absence or ambiguity of timelines, conditions, or grounds for decision-making, as well as the presence of overlapping competencies and the possibility of unjustifiably establishing exceptions for citizens and organizations from general procedures (lack or insufficiency of clear grounds and criteria for decision-making);
- the ability to execute a potentially corrupt scheme with minimal effort;
- a narrow circle of personnel required to implement the corrupt scheme;
- numerous instances of implementing corrupt schemes;
- insufficient, incomplete, or ineffective internal controls [16].

It is crucial to emphasize that the establishment of an effective corruption risk assessment system in public administration can lead to improvements in the correct fulfillment of duties and functions, enhanced public trust in government institutions, and the targeted utilization of the state budget [17].

This, in turn, serves the interests of society, as the assessment of corruption risks will help officials to take control over the internal rules of the body they manage, maintain order, and ultimately avoid liability for the consequences of corruption-related offenses [18]. If corruption risks in public administration are not managed, sooner or later, such risks will lead organizations, projects, and processes

into corrupt situations. If corruption occurs, it will have a negative impact on the reputation, finances, and other positive aspects of that organization. Moreover, successfully managing risks is a key tool in the anti-corruption policy and provides an opportunity for better understanding a specific situation or context [19].

### Conclusion

To conclude, the effective prevention of corruption risks in public administration is critical for ensuring transparency, accountability, and efficient governance in public government. Identifying and managing corruption risks requires a thorough understanding of both internal and external factors contributing to corrupt behaviors of state officials who hold special or entrusted power in public government. This makes up implementing an effective corruption risk assessment system, which addresses the root causes rather than merely mitigating the consequences.

Promoting integrity among officials, making strenuous and collaborative effort with sufficient will, establishing clear decision-making guidelines, enhancing transparency in procurement, and fostering collaboration with non-governmental entities are essential steps and these imperative approaches act as a catalyst for the growth of integrity, transparency along with the trust of the people in laws and regulations that were stipulated in the legislation to root out corruption-related offenses and eliminate corruption risks and catastrophic results which have been putting unprecedented strain on democracy and resulting in drastic ramifications in every region of the globe in state governance. Ultimately, a sweeping approach, consisting of rigorous internal controls and international best practices, is needed to lessen corruption risks and bolster public trust in government institutions as a whole.

## REFERENCES

1. Transparency International, Holding Power to Account - A Global Strategy Against Corruption. Available at: <https://www.transparency.org/en/the-organisation/our-strategy>
2. The Council of Europe. Available at: <https://www.coe.int/en/web/corruption>
3. State of Integrity, UNODC. Available at: <https://www.unodc.org/>
4. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, Legislative Guide for the implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption. Available at: <https://www.unodc.org/pdf/corruption/>
5. Van Genugten, Loopholes, Risks and Ambivalences in international lawmaking. Available at: <https://pure.uvt.nl/ws/files/928961/loopholes>
6. Parliamentary Assembly, Promoting Integrity to Tackle Political Corruption. Available at: <https://assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/Xref-XML2HTML-EN.asp?fileid=23930>
7. United Nations office on drugs and corruption. Available at: <https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/ngos/CN0-anti-corruption-activities.html>
8. Transparency International, Holding Power to Account - A Global Strategy Against Corruption. Available at: <https://www.transparency.org/en/the-organisation/our-strategy>
9. United Nations, UNODC. Available at: <https://www.unodc.org/e4j/zh/>
10. OECD. Collusion and corruption in public procurement. Available at: <https://www.oecd.org/daf/competition/46235884>
11. Allah Rakha. Legal Procedure for Investigation under the Criminal Code of Uzbekistan. International Journal of Law and Policy, 2024, no.2. (In English). Available at: <https://doi.org/>

org/10.59022/ijlp.160

12. Ahmadjonov M. Anti-Corruption and Compliance Control: Legal Literacy among Lawyers and Law Students. *International Journal of Law and Policy*, 2023 no. 8. (In English) Available at: <https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.145>

13. Allah Rakha. Cybercrime and the law: Addressing the challenges of digital forensics in criminal investigations. *Mexican Law Review*, 2023, no. 16. (In English) Available at: <https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.37>

14. Allah Rakha. Legal Challenges for International Fintech Startups. *International Journal of Law and Policy*, 2023, no. 1. (In English). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.148>

15. Sharopov R. Behavioral Law and Antitrust Legislation in the Agro-Industrial Complex: Interconnection, Challenges, and Solutions, 2023, no. 1. (In English). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.98>

16. Babaev Isa. Integrating System Analysis, Information Management, and Decision Making: Legal Perspectives and Challenges, 2023, no. 1. (In English). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.85>

17. Munro, C., & Kirya, M. Values education for public integrity. U4 Anti-Corruption Resource Centre, Chr. Michelsen Institute, 2020, no. 1. (In English). Available at: <https://www.u4.no/publications/values-education-forpublic-integrity>

18. Hussmann, K., Dix, S., & Walton, G. Risks of corruption to state legitimacy and stability in fragile situations, 2019, no. 8. (In English). Available at: <https://www.u4.no/publications/risks-of-corruption-to-state-legitimacy-and-stability-infragile-situations>

19. Allah Rakha. Exploring the Role of Block-chain Technology in Strengthening International Legal Guarantees for Investment Activity, 2023, no. 3. (In English). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.37>