

The Relationship Between Civil and Criminal Liability in Iranian and English Law

Morteza. Khalifeh¹, Seyed Mohammad Taghi. Karimpour Alehashem^{1*}, Asghar. Abbasi¹

¹ Department of Law, Cha.C., Islamic Azad University, Chalus, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: mtkal351@iau.ac.ir

Received: 2025-06-05 Revised: 2025-10-13 Accepted: 2025-10-20 Initial Publish: 2025-10-21 Final Publish: 2026-04-01

EDITOR:

Eman Shenouda¹

Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Isfahan (Khorasgan) Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran. Email: ens01@fayoum.edu.eg

REVIEWER 1:

Pinar Reisoglu¹

Faculty of Social Sciences, Recep Tayyip Erdogan University, Rize, Turkey. Email: pinarreisoglu@erdogan.edu.tr

REVIEWER 2:

Shehzad Raj¹

School of Law, Universiti Geomatika Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. Email: shehzadraj@geomatika.edu.my

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

This paragraph could integrate a clear thesis statement. Currently, it reads as a general exposition. End the paragraph with a sentence stating precisely what the article argues about the relationship between civil and criminal liability.

While the doctrinal sources are well cited, the author should differentiate Iran's mixed system (Civil Code + Sharia) from England's case-based system through a short transitional sentence clarifying methodological implications for comparison.

Add reference to procedural safeguards (e.g., presumption of innocence) to illustrate how criminal liability operationalizes moral blameworthiness differently from civil liability.

The discussion of procedural priority is accurate but would benefit from a flow diagram or brief tabular summary comparing procedural steps in Iran vs. England. This would enhance clarity for readers unfamiliar with procedural hierarchies.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

This section effectively identifies theoretical necessity, but it should also note policy consequences, e.g., how confusion between the two affects judicial efficiency and citizens' rights. Suggest inserting a sentence linking theoretical distinctions to institutional practice.

The discussion of diyeh is strong but lacks citation to specific statutory articles (for instance, Articles 15–17 of the Islamic Penal Code). Adding exact article numbers would enhance legal precision.

The explanation of the English system omits reference to statutory codification (e.g., Criminal Justice Act 2003). Incorporate an example to update the legal framework and demonstrate awareness of modern reforms.

Include the exact Civil Code article numbers (e.g., Arts. 328–331) to ground the analysis in positive law rather than secondary scholarship alone.

The integration of actus reus and mens rea is accurate, but the author should acknowledge strict liability offenses in English law, which complicate the neat dual-element model.

Clarify whether “preponderance of evidence” is an exact translation of ghalabeh al-dalil in Iranian procedure. A brief terminological note would prevent conceptual ambiguity.

Expand this section by referencing Article 14 of the Iranian Criminal Procedure Code (2014), which explicitly allows civil compensation within criminal judgments—an important doctrinal anchor.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.