Scrutiny of legitimacy of delinquencies and retributions considered in Islamic power

Fereshteh khaleseh Ranjbar (M.D)[1], Elham Elhamizadeh (M.D)[2]

1. Department of Religious Jurisprudence and Islamic law, Karaj branch, Islamic Azad University, Karaj, Iran. E-mail: Fkh.ra66@yahoo.com
2. Department of Religious Jurisprudence and Islamic law, Karaj branch, Islamic Azad University, Karaj, Iran.

Abstract: The main aim of the governance of statute is nothing but hampering of despotism and tyranny and caitiff in encountering of magistrates with nationals and superiors with subalterns respectively. According to the aforesaid principle all life-and-death decisions arrived by authorities must be by law. Pillars of delinquencies e.g. statutory pillar are considered very overriding matters of the penal code as well and there exist an underscore for felon excuse which has been written-in as legitimacy of the crime which says: No operation is considered culpability per se and no penalty can be inflicted unless by a binding law which has been promulgated by the ratification of legislator. The above-said maxim is avowed by Islam which originates by inalienable law. [Fereshteh khaleseh Ranjbar , Elham Elhamizadeh . **Scrutiny of legitimacy of delinquencies and retributions considered in Islamic power.** *N Y Sci J* 2013;6(12):181-185]. (ISSN: 1554-0200). http://www.sciencepub.net/newyork. 29

Keywords: Good intention, Imam Khomeini, realm of thought, Ordinances governing

1. Introduction

The main objective of the legitimacy of delinquencies and retributions is that the definition of felon excuse is promised by legislature which must be accomplished pre committing a crime, henceforth, nobody according to the latter stipulations, is considered guilty and no punishment will be mete out as well. So, the legislator carries the burden of the definition right of the segregation of licit and illegitimate action and the arbiter, without any binding legislation, is not in the right of treating a deed as crime, punishing the doer of the action queue.

Even the lawgiver is not in the right of deserve punishment of an individual cited to his/her back deeds.

Accomplishment of any conduct is permissible and it is not considered a crime though considered foul or tortuous for the public good or intrudes upon discipline, except it has been considered delinquency by law.

Judge of the criminal court is obliged to hand down the exculpation sentence providing that there are no statutory texts or when an individual defies the law.

The aforesaid principle is propagated more by the change of societies and their fellows' intellectual rise which encompasses the whole topics considered in penal code e.g. points of hearing and it has persuaded the legislator of the civilized world to prognosticate it explicitly in the constitution which acquire the vindication of rights of fellows against arbitrary authorization of regimens and restriction of the authorization of regnant in the specified frameworks of law to secure their freedom and to avert to call to account by personal manners.

People qualify their deeds and public order will be secured besides the scrutiny of performing the above-mentioned principle and public intimidation achieved respectively.

1- Principle of the legitimacy of delinquencies and retributions considered in Islamic law

There is no raison d'etre to implicate the validity of the aforesaid principle in Islamic jurisprudence, but inference to some verses and principles shows that the main implication of it has been regarded by lawgivers.

Juridical concepts say that the origin of objects is applicable. The execution or omission of an act until no verdict has been given is permissible but upon the indictment, it is required. Imamiye jurisconsults believe that reason and sharia are based on uniqueness permissibility until no exact reason indicating the act taken e.g. unawareness of the verdict including incumbency or reverence, no obligation will be completed. In this case, abandonment or taking of an action require no answerability as well and as Ali Shirvani says as long as an obligation discharges by a bound, it is considered very fie-fie for the master to excruciate the doer and the principle considered is an abandonment of verdict.

The principle of permissiveness which is executed in prohibitive doubts says that when there is no testimony for inviolability, taking of an action is licit, in other words, penal accountability of fellows is based on the interpretation of warrant. In case of inaccessibility to edicts, the person is not responsible for his misdeed.

Furthermore, the reason is the most overriding testimony in abandonment of an action and the legitimacy of delinquencies in common law.

Argumentative principle of nastiness retribution says that the lawgiver must not impose an action as an incriminate pre exclaiming his/her observation and admonish the convict.

As Islamic legal principle of necessity of osculation says if a pagan converts to a Saracen, he/she would not be punished for doing actions when being an atheistic, so-called it is not retroactive.

Argumentative principle of nastiness retribution corroborates that adopt a decree ere-remonstrance is indispensable for legislators and the retribution of fellows without any warrant is unlawful and the "principle of intolerableness" applies here.

Obliging individuals to whatever being not proved is considered erroneous and performing that misdeed is below the dignity of Islamic regime and legislators.

Promiscuousness and allowableness of Islamic laws and their difficulty and fault is required to not having attained the irreproachable puberty.

The principle of "fringes generate doubts" says that if a delinquent is not aware of his/her deeds, the retribution is considered illegal.

Therefore it is believed that many juridical principles which are reciprocal by the inherence principle corroborate that when a guilty is not aware of his/her blighted deed, whether or not for the lack of texts or violation of law or remittance, the verdict of being not guilty will be charged except that the unwise will be aware and there is no doubt that by referring to bibles by conservatives, the principle of legitimacy of delinquencies in Islamic law is very manifest.

To exemplify more precisely, here we refer to the statements of Sheikh considered in Rasaeel:

The third reason for the confirmation of verdict of acquittal for assuming the non-permissibility of retribution without a bound is that the lawgiver assumes it amiss and the hypothesis of indispensability of surmounting the losses to whom avers his/her guilt will be legal if the principle of nastiness would be confirmed as well, since the above- said principle is considered the transposition of loss contingency, scilicet, "excruciation".

While pro handing down the verdict of amiss of punishment, thence, there is no expectancy of loss. So, regarding the principle of eliminating plausible loss, it is very determined that it will be handed down when the obligation is signified but the required is wavered.

The late Akhuond-e-khorasani says an equivalent:

Intellect is segregated from the amiss of retribution, the repugnance of unbeknown imposition pre verification and dejection to gain a proof testifies an obligation, owing to they are considered unreasonable chide in which the Shari deprecate it respectively. Assuming the principle of reason absoluteness, the result is that the probability of loss has no relevancy with the objection of the bound, since there is no presumption to eliminate it against the principle of amiss of retribution and if the deed will be considered illegal on the objection itself, then punishment is applied although it is not distinguished by the obligation of presumable loss.

As seen the consensus of the opinion of Islamic scholars is that the retribution is amiss and perhaps it is derived from intellectual independencies with the consensus of opinions of many jurisconsults for many years. Jurists have revised the principle of the legitimacy of delinquencies and retributions by referring to the above-mentioned principle on the spur of the moment. Mankind needs to explain law is considered the right of signification of interdictions which is natural and on the spur of sword.

With the existence of law bounded in fellows subjective relations, the infringement upon others rights is prohibited, similar to the subject-matters of crime and retribution, as to infringe upon their rights by monarchs as well. Islamic lawgivers confirm the necessity of law to ascertain criminal excuses and the infliction of them are distinguished.

Particularly, regarding the occultation of immaculate Imam, the possibility of misrepresentation and egoism is manifest by magistrates, and the hazard of being tyrannized is vast due to interdictions and the deterioration of respects, so the Lord has appointed Prophets to notify His behests to people and has obliged Saracen wardens to codify laws for establishing the justice in the society. The two above-mentioned principles are not assigned to a moment and they are enforceable when Islamic administration is established. It is indispensable for Islamic governments' administrators to warn people of prohibited acts and the sequence of their retribution. So, non-observing the principle of the legitimacy of delinquencies and retributions is considered a contradictory act and against the considerations of Imams. They were so precise in citation the precepts to avoid any arduousness but in some cases they prohibit the scrutiny of religious regulations let there not be any austere bound disclosed.

It is quoted by Imam Ali when He ordered that God has necessitated various indispensible religious duties, so neither connive at them nor exceed, so He has tolerated at other matters which depicts His extenuate, henceforth, do not put thyself to pester. It is very clear that the lawgiver not only will not call to account the unknown sentences, but also has precluded of intemperate and exorbitant minute research as well which shows that he has pondered the

serenity of sentences which requires avoiding hardship imposed to fellows in exacting the laws.

2- The principle of legitimacy of delinquencies and retributions considered in our country`s enactments

Chronological orders shows that the record of the aforesaid principle considered in our country`s sanctioned laws dates back to the year 1325 when the amendment of constitutional statute were exacted. Acts 9th to 14th of the sanctioned constitutional law show their results and principles as well.

Act 12 says that "no retribution will be inflicted unless put into force by law" and the lawgiver assented to it in 1304 by passing acts 2 &6 and in 1352 AH, the principle of non-retroactive of penal laws put into force in our country. After the Islamic Revolution, by the change of legislation system, the necessity of complying with Islamic laws, act 4, the principle of legitimacy of delinquencies and retributions were discussed and various conclusions were predicted by the system respectively.

Act 4 says that all civil codes and procedures must be due to Islamic standards. In constitution, separation of forces is enacted by the burden of legislator and as Act 71 says, Islamic Consultative Assembly has the power to enact laws which should not be contradictory with Country's regulations and ceremonies which has been sanctioned in Act 96 respectively.

Thereupon, it is conclude that the whole field of statutes e.g. general laws does not cover statuary laws or unwritten ones as well. Notwithstanding the existence of Islamic principles considered in juridical sources, the constitution defines that the sources are not adequate for the strata of society and article 4 of the Act 56, has underscored the duties of the judiciary in defiance of inflicting the penance by the lash. In civil procedures what has been denominated as law is considered the enactments of legislature which has the ability to interpose and inflict punishments based on written statutes and it should invoke to legal principles as well.

The following examples demonstrate the legitimacy of delinquencies stipulated in the constitution:

Articles 22&25 concerning disallowance of infringement upon the rights of others, article 32 concerning the legitimacy of holding detection, article 33 concerning the legitimacy of expatriation or de rigueur residence on a defined locality, article 36 concerning the legitimacy of trial and abandonment of verdicts, article 166 concerning the legitimacy of adopted sentences and article 169 concerning the non-retroactive of penal procedures as well.

The lawgiver is obliged to consider the whole legitimacy of delinquencies and he/she is not allowed to back out the principles which are accepted by Islamic laws.

3- Testimonies of the necessities of observing the legitimacy of delinquencies and retributions

Crimes are divided into the following categories based on retributions:

Retaliation, wergild, penance by the lash and penalties with no measures in which the lawgiver determines their severity but the determination of penalties with no measures is charged by the Guardian by considering the following two principles:

a) An introduced principle which says "anyone who disobeys God and His Prophet with transgression, for him there is no locality but the Hell"

b) An introduced principle which says "penalties with no measures are prohibited by and large"

The guardian is responsible for the total authorization and appointments that acts by ternate forces and administer justice besides the supervision of the legitimacy of delinquencies and retributions since the first and foremost bases of justice is that crimes must be cleared erstwhile and enjoining besides prohibition from repudiating should be notified e.g. Imam Baqer(peace be upon Him) orders that "the truthful witness of a mendacious will be whiplashed but the measure is not clear which is specified by Imam".

In reply to a vexed question He says that "the sine qua non of the rate of penalties with no measures depends on the seriousness of the offense and the stamina of the doer as well. Execution of verdicts e.g. penances by the lash or penalties with no measure are charged by Imam and Muslims warden and there is no difference among them.

Clause 4 of article 156 stipulates that "execution of penances by the lash and penalties with no measure is charged by judicial branch and Islamic jurisconsults have mentioned to magistrates or wardens in cases of penalties with no measures and penances by the lash.

Sheikh Tusi orders that "penalties with no measures are executed by Imam, whether deem it advisability or vice versa".

Abu Salah Halabi orders that "Muslims guardian should scourge the felon by instruments to proscribe him/her to derange obligations.

Sheikh Ameli has titled a self-determining topic on similar exemplum which says "Imam has the power to execute the penalties with no measure" and Sheikh Moufid says "Muslims Imams are immaculate fellows which have been appointed by God and they have turned over the matter to Shiite jurisconsults if possible".

The above-mentioned expression is seen in other bibles and if occasionally the expression "magistrate" is substituted by "Imam", the purpose is

a “despot” which includes guardianship and subrogation.

In our country the delinquencies and the rate of retributions are determined by the legislator but the arbiters can just verify the charges on the strength of written statutes and they cannot supersede the “legislator “in case of violation of law, c'est-a-dire, the aforesaid obligation is taken on by the guardian in Islam Republic Of Iran in which he is considered the tip-top rank and as you know Imam Ali and Prophet Mohammad (peace be upon Him) were charged with that duty.

All judges will be appointed by the Guardian, yet the duty is considered the manifest characteristic of legislation and codify of obligations, and they are bound to act on the scope of His authorization which impede helter-skelter, making social safety.

The principle of legitimacy of delinquencies and retributions are confirmed in terms of defending general interest, prevention of violation of others right and the permission of lawgivers, administer justice and etc.

Execution of distinct verdicts and sliding the determination of the excuses of delinquencies into chaos causes insecurity of the judicial system and Islamic isocracy, so determination of codified prototypes and the commitment to consider them is indispensable.

It is very overriding to determine the rate of delinquencies in appropriate intervals till the judges execute the verdict properly. The determination of such intervals is charged by the Guardian of Islamic government but not those authoritative arbiters whose cognizance are bounded to peculiar cases. Penalties with no measures as Divine crackdown against committing a minor offence should make awe to drop-outs respectively, par excellence an infrastructure ought to determine the variety of depravities regarding the moments and localities, and in any case Islamic government should determine the prototype of delinquencies and retributions to warrant personal freedoms and social welfare. Restraints of the aforesaid duty have been certified in some cases but in proportion to other transgressions, Islamic government is charged to execute exaequo.

Karmas which have been banned by the lawgiver are titled “taboo” which requires either otherworldly retribution or mundane one e.g. penances by the lash.

Some other crimes prompt rights for victims to retaliate in kind or demand compensation. There is no measure for some retribution, either cardinal or venial sins and the execution of verdict is charged by Imams.

The raisons d’etre of some actions have been banned by the lawgiver which may cause adverse consequences, jeopardizing social welfare. Theymay require retribution or with no penalty in which the whole countries have executed them by preference. The observation of the first martyr in regarding the discrepancy of penance by the lash and penalties with no measures, a subordinate of immorality, confirms the matter. By considering verses, traditions and procedures of immaculate Pontiffs and Imamiyeh jurisconsults, we conclude categorically that Islamic government enjoys the potency to ban any act delivering harassment, perplex and jade, executing retributions for it as well.

Traditions reveal that the execution of retributions is charged by the lawgiver and they are bound to act based on the regulations enacted by the judiciary and in circumstances in which the written law is considered lack or violation of the law, the lawgiver is bound to execute the abandonment of verdict.

4- Principles considering the legitimacy of delinquencies and retributions

Dignitaries of delinquencies e.g. legality are considered consequential questions of penal code. In arguing about the legitimacy of delinquencies, the assertion goes beyond the existence of law which has titled “the principle of legitimacy of delinquencies” or “unbiased trial”. It means that no act is considered a delinquency, except that it has been predicted by the lawgiver; even though the aforesaid matter disorganizes the public and social welfare and the arbiter is not allowed consider it as a crime without keeping the law in propriety persona.

Conclusions

a) Abandonment of verdict:

Regarding the principle of elbowroom in penal codes and as hermeneutics entitles it “authenticity of permissibility”, the abandonment of verdict enjoys a specific realm which has been expressed in the legislation period on the framework of legitimacy of delinquencies.

The selected peculiar charm of the word “abandonment of verdict”, when propounded in judicial period, and as magistrates address prosecution and trial and they give the thumbs-up sign, it means that anyone committing a crime but the guilt of who has not been confirmed by a competent court, he/she is sinless. The abandonment of verdict or the supposition of being sinless is considered the origin of all his/her vindication rights.

The word “exculpation” means absolution from obligation, illness, atonements, faults or separation from a gink or objects. The exact meaning of the word is that everyone has the puissance to act freely with no obligation except there is a proof withholding him/her respectively.

The aforesaid declaration stated in law and religious jurisprudence symbolizes the clearance from

obligation and impeccability of the fellow which means humans are irreproachable and do not commit a crime unless there might be a testimony adducted for their culpability. The most overriding juridical testimony of the matter is the exigency of argumentation of claim by the plaintiff, hence the abandonment of verdict means any matter delivering fret, pester, stint, gripe or surrendering freedom, stuttering and stammering, would exonerate the fellow in which the asseveration must be demonstrated, otherwise the abandonment of verdict will be executed by the oath of the defendant.

b) Non-retroactivity of laws

The aforesaid principle is considered a trivial principle especially in criminal laws and enjoys a deep relation with judicial security and civil law the aim of which is to prefigure fellows' rights and obligations. In this era the principle of predictability of laws has altered as an indispensable element inside legal systems and its ground valence is expressed in penal precepts and expounding misdemeanors and mulcts e.g. retroactivity of laws which guarantee the judicial landmark and grave decisions by the principle of segregation of branches will be restricted. In other words, the retroactivity of financial rules tramples the rights of burghers, so we conclude that the above-mentioned principle is executed when the delinquencies are confirmed conclusive. Whence, in regarding the principle of legitimacy of delinquencies, we must consider the consequence of laws forthcoming respectively.

c) Principle of the construction of law circumstantially

Notwithstanding the codification of laws punctiliously and explicitly, in many instances the construction of law is obligatory circumstantially but not expendably, which means that it is not permitted to simplify the construction of law to its analogous resources. The authorization of the construction has been specified but in many circumstances, it is charged by arbiters as well who ought to construct the law circumstantially regarding the matter and their cognizance.

The principle of the construction of law circumstantially origins from the principle of legitimacy of delinquencies and retributions in which the significance of law is restricted per se and it is not allowed to simplify it to unsaid or unwritten contingencies, and exemplars show that in the following cases, the aforesaid principle is applied: evidences documented for the attestation of lawsuits, circumstantial evidences and civil liability as well.

12/23/2013

Corresponding Author:
Fereshteh khaleseh Ranjbar (M.D)
Department of Religious Jurisprudence and Islamic law, Karaj branch, Islamic Azad University, Karaj, Iran.

References

1. The holy Koran
2. Abazari, Mansour, details of the penal terminology, Andisheh publications, first edition, 1387.
3. Akhound Khorasani, Mohammad Kazim, adequacy of principles, first edition, Al-E-Beyt publication, 1409.
4. Ashouri, Darioush, political license, third edition, Tehran, Morvarid, 1376.
5. Jafari Langroudi, Mohammad Jafar, law terminology, Tehran, Ganj-e-Danesh library, 23th edition, 1390.
6. Ibn-e-Andolesi, an introduction to law sciences.
7. Habibzadeh, Mohamad Jafar, legal contemplations (collection of penal law articles), Tehran, Negah Bineh, 1391.
8. Ameli, Mohammad Hasan, Shiite directory in religious law, 1412.
9. Shirvani, Ali, scrutiny of jurisprudence principles, Dar-Al-Elm publications, second edition, 1385.
10. Fazl, Ibn-e-Hasan, Majma-Al-Bayan, Tehran interpreters, Farahani publication, first edition, 1360.
11. Mohseni, Morteza, whole works of penal law, National University publication, 1355.
12. Mohagheh, Mostafa, principles of penal jurisprudence, Tehran, center of Islam Sciences, first edition, 1379.
13. Principles of civil proceedings, Tehran, center of Islamic Sciences, 1383.
14. Mashayikhi, Ghodrat-Allah, judicial principles, survey of human science organization, Alzahra University, 1383.
15. Meshkini, Ali, new epistles, Islamic doctrine, 1297.
16. Naser, Makarem Shirazi, judicial principles, Qom, Amir-Al-Momenin school, Bita.
17. Hussein, Mehrpour, human rights international system, Etteallat publication, 1383.
18. Abd-Allah, Nasri, mankind's prospects from religion, Danesh and Andishe Moaser cultural association, 7th edition, 1376.
19. Nouri, Mirzahasan, documentation, first edition, Qom, magazine of Bar Association, No.147.
20. Marefat, Seyyed Hadi, a discussion about penalties with no measure, Bar Association.
21. Vizheh, Mohammad Reza, legal security as judicial security substantiation, Rahbord journal, year 20, No.58.