

# Critical Analysis and New Solutions to the Jurisdictional Boundaries of the Administrative Justice Court Considering the Evolution of Administrative Justice Principles in Judicial Procedure

1. Khairollah Ansari<sup>✉</sup>: Department of Public Law, May.C., Islamic Azad University, Maybod, Iran

2. Abdolreza Barzegar<sup>✉\*</sup>: Department of Law, May.C., Islamic Azad University, Maybod, Iran

3. Iraj Hosseini Sadrabad<sup>✉</sup>: Assistant Professor and Faculty Member, Department of Law, University of Judicial Sciences and Administrative Services, Tehran, Iran

\*Correspondence: Reza.barzegar52@gmail.com

## Abstract

In recent years, the principles of administrative justice have undergone fundamental transformations in the judicial practice of the Administrative Justice Court—developments that have directly influenced the determination of the Court's jurisdictional boundaries and the procedures for handling administrative disputes. The purpose of this study is to critically examine the process of formation and evolution of these boundaries, with particular emphasis on emerging principles of administrative justice, in order to identify existing deficiencies and propose solutions aimed at enhancing the Court's performance and procedural efficiency. The research employs a descriptive-analytical method, and data were primarily gathered through document analysis, review of significant judicial decisions, comparative examination of procedural trends, and consultation of authoritative legal sources. The findings indicate that, despite the relative expansion of the Court's jurisdiction in accordance with new standards of administrative justice, ambiguities and weaknesses remain in defining the limits of jurisdiction, recognizing individuals' vested rights, and establishing effective compensation mechanisms. Drawing on the experience of advanced legal systems and implementing legislative reforms, the Court's role in ensuring administrative justice can be strengthened and its efficiency improved.

**Keywords:** Insurance; Professional liability; Nurses

Received: 01 June 2025

Revised: 08 October 2025

Accepted: 16 October 2025

Initial Publish: 19 October 2025

Final Publish: 01 January 2026



**Copyright:** © 2026 by the authors. Published under the terms and conditions of Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) License.

**Citation:** Ansari, K., Barzegar, A., & Hosseini Sadrabad, I. (2026). Critical Analysis and New Solutions to the Jurisdictional Boundaries of the Administrative Justice Court Considering the Evolution of Administrative Justice Principles in Judicial Procedure. *Legal Studies in Digital Age*, 5(1), 1-9.

## 1. Introduction

In the Iranian legal system, the Administrative Court of Justice, as the supreme body for handling administrative claims and grievances, occupies a central position in ensuring the realization of administrative justice. Accurate delineation of the limits and jurisdiction of this Court constitutes one of the key factors in upholding justice and protecting the fundamental rights of individuals against executive authorities (Basri, 2019; Molabigi, 2014).

However, clarifying and revising the jurisdictional boundaries of the Court has always been among the most challenging issues in administrative law. Rapid social, economic, and political developments in recent decades have significantly altered citizens' expectations of the administrative and judicial systems (Motlabi-Fasharkii & Atrian, 2018).

As a consequence of these transformations, the principles of administrative justice in judicial practice have also evolved, generating a new perspective on the necessity of redefining the scope of authority and duties of the Administrative Court of Justice (Abrishmi-Rad & Aine-Negini, 2022; Hemmati, 2017).

Meanwhile, existing ambiguities and doctrinal disagreements regarding the determination of the Court's jurisdictional limits have not only created grounds for procedural conflict but, in some cases, have fostered a sense of judicial insecurity and mistrust among stakeholders regarding the administrative adjudication process (Shah-Beig, 2012).

Hemmati (2017) argued that administrative proceedings represent a significant and modern branch of judicial procedure. He divided the standards of a fair administrative trial into two categories: general standards applicable to all judicial processes and specific standards governing the three phases of administrative claims—filing, hearing, and decision-making (Hemmati, 2017).

Similarly, Shah-Beig (2012) emphasized that administrative institutions, owing to their broad powers and discretion, can easily violate citizens' rights and freedoms if not subject to strict oversight. To prevent such violations, the principle of the rule of law confines the authority of administrative bodies to predetermined legal frameworks. Realization of this principle within administrative institutions necessitates a judicial authority empowered to supervise the legality of administrative actions (Shah-Beig, 2012).

In this regard, Article 173 of the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran established the Administrative Court of Justice to ensure compliance with the rule of law within administrative institutions (Molabigi, 2014).

Despite the relative clarity of the governing laws, the jurisdictional boundaries of the Administrative Court of Justice—particularly concerning its competence over specific individuals, institutions, or subject matters—remain contentious. Furthermore, the rapid development of new administrative domains and the emergence of complex interactions between citizens and the state have confronted the Court with challenges exceeding classical administrative law models (Mohaj & Ketabiroudi, 2014; Motlabi-Fasharkii & Atrian, 2018).

The Court therefore needs to continuously redefine its jurisdictional scope in light of modern principles of administrative justice. One of the most pressing challenges involves ensuring the Court's effective role in safeguarding individual rights and providing adequate compensation for harm caused by unlawful administrative actions or decisions (Abrishmi-Rad & Aine-Negini, 2022).

Procedural limitations and barriers related to jurisdictional determination sometimes prevent individuals from obtaining full access to justice, underscoring the necessity of reexamining the foundational principles and criteria of jurisdiction (Basri, 2019).

Moreover, contemporary transformations in the foundations of administrative justice—particularly the growing emphasis on fairness, the protection of acquired rights, transparency, and administrative accountability—have generated heightened public expectations for enhanced openness and accountability within the Court (Abrishmi-Rad & Aine-Negini, 2022; Hemmati, 2017).

These developments call for a critical review and strategic redefinition of the Court's jurisdictional limits to maximize the protection of citizens' rights in accordance with evolving social needs and temporal exigencies (Motlabi-Fasharkii & Atrian, 2018).

At the same time, comparative studies of foreign legal systems demonstrate the importance of considering national and international innovations in the delineation of administrative jurisdiction and of employing modern procedural mechanisms (Mohaj & Ketabiroudi, 2014; Molabigi, 2014).

Revising and improving the adjudication procedures of the Administrative Court of Justice, consistent with the conceptual evolution of justice, can significantly contribute to the maturity and efficiency of Iran's administrative law system (Abrishmi-Rad & Aine-Negini, 2022; Basri, 2019).

Ultimately, the continuation of the current situation—without reviewing and redefining the Court's jurisdictional boundaries—may weaken institutional efficiency, reduce public confidence in the judiciary, and increase unresolved claims and societal dissatisfaction (Shah-Beig, 2012).

Accordingly, this study seeks to provide a framework for enhancing the competence and functional role of the Administrative Court of Justice by critically analyzing its current status and proposing practical strategies for the realization of comprehensive administrative justice.

## 2. The Concept of Justice in the Administrative System

Administrative justice is a moral and legal construct that encompasses the notions of public interest, right, and need. Through the application of virtues such as participation, impartiality, and proportionality, the principles of administrative justice strive to balance public and private interests, preserve human dignity, and regulate individuals' social and political lives (Basri, 2019; Jafari-Lengroudi, 2009).

Accordingly, in the framework of overlapping consensus, the concept of administrative justice does not merely pertain to procedural norms or administrative lifestyles but rather functions as a safeguard for human dignity in relation to state authority. The conventional notion of administrative justice is acceptable only when it aligns with the shared beliefs of society across all social strata and is grounded in equality (Basri, 2019).

If a general reflective consensus is to be achieved, a new structure for organizing the principles of contract-based administrative justice must be established. When conflicting claims arise, they must be interpreted in relation to one another. The political dimension of administrative justice does not require an original creation but is expressed through intuitive ideas and shared legal principles that form a coherent and rational body of thought (Hemmati, 2017).

This theoretical framework transcends mere intuition, evolving into a more complex and interconnected system of ideas. At its foundation lies the belief that society should establish a fair system of cooperation between free and equal individuals and the state. The central concern, therefore, is identifying a universal foundation for social consensus within the realm of administrative law (Jafari-Lengroudi, 2009).

Three indicators of social cooperation are essential to achieving this goal. The first is cooperation in coordinated social activities, exemplified by collective participation in administrative processes guided by central authority. The second involves fair conditions of cooperation, which define the reciprocal relationship between citizens and administrative bodies. The third is the rational utility of participation, representing the pursuit of the common good among individuals, families, associations, and even nation-states striving for shared principles (Basri, 2019; Hemmati, 2017).

Administrative justice thus originates from the collective belief that a fair administrative order governs the interactions between public authorities and citizens. When individuals are enabled to participate fully in a just system of social cooperation, they are endowed with two fundamental moral capacities derived from this cooperative framework: first, the capacity to conceive justice, and second, the capacity to conceive the good (Abrishmi-Rad & Aine-Negini, 2022).

The concept of administrative justice, therefore, represents the moral ability to apply the general idea of justice to define equitable conditions of social cooperation. Meanwhile, the conception of the good refers to individuals' rational pursuit of their legitimate interests and well-being. Within the administrative context, this "good" should not be narrowly understood as personal advantage, but as an intrinsic human value embedded within public life and collective governance (Basri, 2019; Jafari-Lengroudi, 2009).

The judicial practice of the Administrative Court of Justice at times demonstrates the predominance of individual interests over public interests. However, there are also instances where the Court does not place public interest above the law, which reflects the complex tension between legality and utility—a dilemma that Cassinelli describes as an inherent feature of democratic ethics (Basri, 2019).

Nevertheless, such an approach cannot be adopted uncritically, particularly in light of Article 173 of the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran, which establishes the Administrative Court of Justice as a supervisory authority to ensure the rule of law within administrative action. This constitutional foundation signifies that human rights-based approaches, emphasizing legality and procedural fairness, are not only compatible with but also necessary for the proper functioning of administrative justice (Mohaj & Ketabiroudi, 2014; Molabigi, 2014).

In accordance with classical public law theory—rooted in the Hobbesian conception of sovereignty—the state exercises jurisdiction on behalf of citizens rather than through an unrestricted right. From this perspective, public interests may, in certain cases, prevail over private rights to preserve collective order and social welfare (Jafari-Lengroudi, 2009).

This interpretation aligns with Article 40 of the Constitution, which explicitly provides that “no one may exercise his rights as a means of harming others or infringing upon public interests.” The Court of Administrative Justice, in applying this principle, must balance the protection of individual rights with the maintenance of public order, ensuring that neither public authority nor private claim exceeds its legitimate bounds (Hemmati, 2017; Shah-Beig, 2012).

In practice, this balance has not always been achieved. Certain rulings of the Court reveal inconsistency in determining the hierarchy between individual entitlements and the collective good. Such inconsistencies stem partly from the lack of a coherent interpretive framework for reconciling conflicting rights and partly from ambiguities in the statutory definition of jurisdiction (Motlabi-Fasharkii & Atrian, 2018).

Hence, the evolving jurisprudence of the Court demonstrates a gradual shift toward integrating human rights considerations and fairness-based criteria into jurisdictional reasoning. This evolution reflects broader trends in comparative administrative law, where the principle of proportionality, as applied in European administrative systems, serves as a key mechanism for reconciling individual and collective claims (Abrishmi-Rad & Aine-Negini, 2022; Hemmati, 2017).

The ongoing challenge, however, lies in institutionalizing this equilibrium within Iran’s legal order by refining statutory provisions, consolidating interpretive consistency, and ensuring that the Court’s jurisdiction remains aligned with both constitutional mandates and the evolving principles of administrative justice (Basri, 2019; Molabigi, 2014).

### 3. Decision-Making System Based on the Principles of Administrative Justice

In addition to the administrative structure derived from the concept of administrative justice, the administrative decision-making mechanism is also contractual and consensual in nature. The administration, as the agent and executor of laws enacted by the parliament, is compelled during implementation to interpret these laws and render decisions which, due to the appointment of executive and public officials, may at times appear inconsistent with the principles of democracy and contractual administrative justice (Basri, 2019).

To reconcile this discrepancy, ensuring the compatibility of administrative decision-making with the principles of administrative justice requires conceptualizing the administrative relationship as a contractual one between the government and citizens—a relationship that demands active participation of stakeholders in the decision-making process (Abrishmi-Rad & Aine-Negini, 2022).

This participatory approach transforms and revises the hierarchical relationship between administration and citizens, fostering a model in which decision-making authority is shared among stakeholders and the public. Expanding delegated powers to administrative officials can be justified only when accompanied by mechanisms that enhance meaningful public involvement (Basri, 2019).

Hence, citizens’ participation in decision-making—while preserving the autonomy of public involvement and the democratic principle of majority rule—introduces efficiency and legitimacy into administrative processes. Citizens have the right to engage in administrative decision-making that affects their rights and freedoms in two principal ways:

1. by participating democratically in the formation of administrative regulations; and
2. by receiving transparent explanations from the administration regarding the rationale and legal basis of its decisions (Hemmati, 2017).

Through these measures, the principle of public participation is realized within administrative decision-making. The theoretical foundation of such decision-making draws upon the concept of democracy as aligned with both representative and

participatory models. Jürgen Habermas, adopting a liberal framework compatible with direct democracy, associates democracy with the rule of law and constitutionalism, while John Rawls conceives constitutionalism and law as grounded in collective rationality. Habermas proposes a democratic theory wherein political participation is not confined to elites but extends to both public and private spheres as an expression of civic activism. The result is the “self-organization of a free society and equality of citizens,” where the coordination of collective affairs occurs through public reason (Basri, 2019).

#### 4. Jurisdiction and Limits of Authority of the Administrative Court of Justice

Jurisdiction is one of the most fundamental issues in the operation of judicial and administrative authorities, and it holds particular importance in all legal systems (Molabigi, 2014). “Competence” literally denotes capability and integrity, while in legal terminology it signifies the ability to exercise statutory powers and duties. In the case of the Administrative Justice Court, competence refers to the legal limits of the Court’s authority to adjudicate complaints and grievances granted to it by law (Molabigi, 2014).

“Authority” within judicial institutions comprises two essential elements: obligation and exclusivity—obligation, because the duty of adjudication is assigned to a competent authority that cannot refuse to hear a case; and exclusivity, because other authorities are precluded from intervening in the same matter (Molabigi, 2014).

The first-instance and appellate branches of the Administrative Justice Court address personal and case-specific matters, while complaints against general government regulations, decrees, or circulars that contravene Islamic laws and statutory provisions are inadmissible before these branches (Mohaj & Ketabiroudi, 2014).

1. Hearing of complaints, grievances, and objections filed by natural or legal persons regarding:
  - A. Decisions and actions of governmental entities, including ministries, organizations, institutions, state-owned companies, municipalities, the Social Security Organization, revolutionary foundations, and affiliated bodies; and
  - B. Decisions and actions of officials of the aforementioned units in matters within their functional responsibilities.
2. Review of objections and complaints against final decisions and opinions of administrative violations boards and commissions—such as tax commissions, labor-management dispute resolution boards, and municipal commissions under Article 100 of the Municipalities Law—limited to cases involving violations of law or regulations (Motlabi-Fasharkii & Atrian, 2018).
3. Adjudication of complaints by judges and civil servants governed by the Civil Service Management Law, as well as employees of military or civil institutions specified by statute, concerning infringements of employment rights.

*Note 1:* Determination of damages sustained by the entities or individuals referred to above shall be conducted by general courts after the Administrative Justice Court establishes the existence of a violation.

*Note 2:* Decisions and opinions of judicial or military courts, disciplinary tribunals, and judges of the judiciary and armed forces are not subject to appeal before the Administrative Justice Court (Abrishmi-Rad & Aine-Negini, 2022).

Article 11. Where contested decisions or actions have violated individual rights, the investigating branch shall issue a ruling to annul the verdict or invalidate the contested decision or action and order restoration of the aggrieved party’s rights. *Note:* Once a ruling becomes final, the adjudicating authority is obliged to implement it and adhere to its reasoning in future analogous cases.

Article 12. The jurisdiction and duties of the General Board of the Court include:

1. Addressing complaints, grievances, and objections by natural or legal persons against regulations or other administrative enactments of the government, municipalities, or non-governmental public bodies in cases of contradiction with Sharia or statutory law, lack of competence of the issuing authority, abuse of power, or failure to perform duties infringing individual rights;
2. Issuing binding decisions in cases where conflicting rulings have been rendered by different branches of the Court;
3. Establishing uniform procedures when multiple branches have issued similar judgments on a single legal issue.

*Note:* The review of judicial decisions of the judiciary, as well as the regulations and decisions of the Head of the Judiciary, the Guardian Council, the Expediency Discernment Council, the Assembly of Experts, and the Supreme National Security Council, falls outside the scope of this article (Molabigi, 2014).

Article 13. Annulment of administrative resolutions takes effect from the date the General Board issues its decision, except when the resolution contravenes Islamic law or when, to prevent infringement of individual rights, the Board orders retroactive effect to the date of the original approval.

Article 14. The authority to resolve jurisdictional conflicts between the branches of the Court and other judicial authorities lies with the branches of the Supreme Court (Mohaj & Ketabiroudi, 2014).

Article 15. Issuance of corrective rulings, clarification of ambiguities, enforcement orders, and termination of dissenting opinions, or any action necessitating reconsideration, falls within the competence of the branch that rendered the final judgment.

The jurisdiction of the first-instance branches of the Administrative Justice Court is derived from Article 10 of the Law on the Organization and Procedure of the Administrative Justice Court. This jurisdiction can be analyzed from three perspectives: the plaintiff, the respondent, and the subject matter of the complaint (Motlabi-Fasharkii & Atrian, 2018).

Article 13. The jurisdiction and limits of the Court's powers are as follows:

1. To hear complaints, grievances, and objections from natural or legal persons concerning:
  2. A. Decisions and actions of governmental units, including ministries, organizations, institutions, and state-owned companies, municipalities, revolutionary bodies, and affiliated organizations;
  3. B. Decisions and actions of officers of the aforementioned units in matters related to their official duties (Molabigi, 2014).
4. To review objections and complaints against final decisions and opinions of administrative courts, inspection boards, and commissions—such as tax commissions, workshop councils, labor–management dispute boards, the commission under Article 100 of the Municipalities Law, and the commission under Article 56 of the *Law on the Protection and Exploitation of Forests and Natural Resources*—exclusively in cases of violation or contradiction with statutory provisions (Motlabi-Fasharkii & Atrian, 2018).
5. To adjudicate complaints by judges and employees governed by the Civil Employment Law, as well as other personnel of the units and institutions mentioned in paragraph (1), whether civil or military, regarding violations of employment rights.

*Note 1.* Determination of damages caused by the institutions and individuals referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) shall be undertaken by the general court following confirmation by the Administrative Justice Court.

*Note 2.* Decisions and opinions of judicial, military, or disciplinary courts of the judiciary and armed forces are not subject to appeal before the Administrative Court of Justice (Abrishmi-Rad & Aine-Negini, 2022).

Article 14. If the decisions and actions subject to complaint have violated individual rights, the investigating branch shall issue an appropriate ruling to annul or neutralize the contested measure or to compel the defendant authority to restore the violated rights.

*Note.* After such ruling becomes final, the relevant authorities must both implement it and observe its reasoning in future analogous decisions (Mohaj & Ketabiroudi, 2014).

Article 15. When the plaintiff asserts—at the time of filing or thereafter—that execution of definitive actions, decisions, or omissions by the authorities mentioned in Article 13 would cause irreparable or difficult-to-compensate damage, the investigating branch, upon establishing urgency, may issue a temporary order suspending the implementation of the contested measure or duty.

*Note.* A temporary order has no bearing on the merits and becomes void if the complaint is dismissed or rejected.

Article 16. If at least one of two judges (or two of three judges) issuing a ruling identifies a procedural or substantive error, they shall record a reasoned written opinion and forward the case to the President of the Court for referral to the Appraisal Branch.

*Note.* Issuance of corrective rulings for clerical or computational errors or clarification of ambiguities by the issuing branch itself is excluded from this article.



Article 17. Should a party obtain new evidence affecting the judgment after issuance of a ruling, that party may petition the same branch for a retrial. The branch shall consider the request on a priority basis.

*Note.* If the branch deems the request justified, it shall order suspension of execution pending review.

Article 18. If the Chief Justice or President of the Court considers a judgment inconsistent with Sharia or law, the matter shall be referred to the Review Branch. If an error is confirmed, the ruling shall be reversed and a new judgment rendered.

*Note.* Decisions issued under this article are final, except when contrary to Islamic law.

Article 19. The jurisdiction and authority of the General Assembly of the Court are as follows:

1. To address complaints, grievances, and objections of natural or legal persons against governmental, municipal, or non-governmental public regulations in cases of illegality, lack or abuse of competence, misuse of power, or refusal to perform duties infringing individual rights;
2. To issue uniform decisions when contradictory rulings have been rendered by the Court's branches;
3. To render a unified ruling when multiple consistent decisions have been issued on a single matter.
4. *Note.* The review of judicial decisions of the judiciary, and the approvals of the Guardian Council, the Expediency Discernment Council, the Assembly of Experts, the Supreme National Security Council, and the Supreme Council of the Cultural Revolution are excluded from this article (Molabigi, 2014).

Article 20. Annulment of administrative resolutions takes effect from the date the General Assembly issues its decision, except for resolutions contrary to Islamic law or where retroactive effect is necessary to prevent violation of individual rights (Abrishmi-Rad & Aine-Negini, 2022).

## 5. The Supreme Court's Authority to Create Unity of Judicial Procedure

In a general sense, *judicial procedure* denotes the courts' consistent approach and interpretation of existing laws derived from their collective judgments. In a narrower sense, it refers to the opinions of a specific body such as the *General Board of the Supreme Court*. Based on whether such rulings are legally binding, judicial procedure is divided into *mandatory* and *ordinary* categories (Jafari-Lengroudi, 2009).

Pursuant to Article 161 of the Constitution—which assigns to the Supreme Court the power to establish unity of judicial procedure—decisions issued to harmonize divergent judicial interpretations are known as *unified procedural decisions*. The principal function of such unification is to prevent inconsistent interpretations of the same legal provisions, thereby ensuring coherence within the judiciary (Molabigi, 2014).

The issuance of uniform decisions has a long history in Iran's legal system, dating to the early twentieth century. On 7 April 1949, the *Law on Uniform Judicial Procedure* enacted by the National Assembly formally defined the competent authority and procedure for issuing unified decisions. The statute declared such rulings binding on all courts, including branches of the Supreme Court, in similar cases, and permitted their modification only through enactment of a new law or issuance of a new unified decision. Consequently, Article 161 of the Constitution did not innovate but merely reaffirmed this existing jurisdiction (Basri, 2019).

Accordingly, given the constitutional mandate that confers upon the Supreme Court authority over judicial-procedure unification, it follows that—if the Administrative Court of Justice is considered a judicial body—the unification of practice among its branches, or between those branches and other courts, falls within the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court (Abrishmi-Rad & Aine-Negini, 2022).

## 6. New Approaches to Enhance and Redefine the Jurisdiction of the Administrative Court of Justice

A foremost approach to redefining the Court's jurisdiction is to revise and clarify existing legislation. Current provisions are often ambiguous and susceptible to conflicting interpretations. Enacting comprehensive, updated regulations—based on expert and judicial consultation—would more accurately delineate jurisdictional boundaries and prevent redundant or erosive litigation (Mohaj & Ketabiroudi, 2014).

A second reform concerns expanding jurisdiction to emerging areas of administrative activity. With the evolution of social and administrative relations, novel disputes concerning citizenship rights, cyberspace regulation, new commissions, and digital

governance have arisen. The Court must adapt its competence to address such developments effectively (Motlabi-Fasharkii & Atrian, 2018).

A third priority is strengthening the Court's authority to provide compensation for administrative harms. To ensure effective judicial protection, a robust framework for prompt compensation and enforcement of interim orders is necessary, empowering the Court to compel administrative bodies to rectify unlawful actions (Abrishmi-Rad & Aine-Negini, 2022).

A fourth innovative measure involves digital transformation of administrative justice procedures. Implementing electronic filing systems, digital case-tracking, and intelligent data analytics will enhance transparency, expedite adjudication, and reduce case congestion (Basri, 2019).

Further improvement requires specialized and continuous training for judges and court staff. Building a knowledgeable workforce ensures consistent interpretation of administrative-justice principles and fosters jurisprudential dynamism (Hemmati, 2017).

Comparative analysis of international experiences offers additional insight. Adopting modern mechanisms such as mediation, quasi-judicial settlement, or AI-assisted adjudication can remedy structural deficiencies and strengthen jurisdictional coherence (Abrishmi-Rad & Aine-Negini, 2022).

Finally, periodic expert evaluation of the Court's performance and its adherence to administrative-justice objectives is essential. Institutionalized monitoring and feedback mechanisms can identify systemic shortcomings, enhance public trust, and ensure the Court's jurisdiction evolves in harmony with the principles of fairness, transparency, and accountability (Molabigi, 2014).

## 7. Conclusion

The purpose of this article was to critically analyze and propose innovative solutions regarding the jurisdictional boundaries of the Administrative Court of Justice in light of the evolving principles of administrative justice within judicial procedure. A critical review of the development of the Court's jurisdiction and the reflection of administrative justice principles in practice revealed that, despite certain advancements in clarifying and expanding its authority, significant challenges persist in ensuring transparency, comprehensiveness, and modernization of its regulations and procedures.

The growing complexity of administrative relationships, the dynamic needs of society, and the imperative to safeguard both individual and collective rights demand continuous review and reform of the Court's jurisdiction and powers. The findings indicate that several existing shortcomings arise from legal ambiguities, inconsistencies between current jurisdictional frameworks and new administrative domains, and insufficient use of innovative mechanisms in adjudication and compensation. These weaknesses contribute not only to procedural delays and accumulation of cases but also to perceptions of inefficiency and inequity in the resolution of administrative disputes.

Addressing these issues requires comprehensive reforms such as legislative amendments, jurisdictional development aligned with social progress, enhancement of technological infrastructure within judicial proceedings, specialized capacity building for judges and staff, and the systematic integration of comparative international experiences. Equally important is the establishment of continuous performance evaluation systems to ensure that the Court's activities remain consistent with the fundamental principles of administrative justice.

The overall conclusion of this study is that achieving genuine administrative justice depends on an ongoing reexamination of the Court's jurisdictional boundaries. Passive reliance on outdated laws or conventional practices cannot adequately respond to the realities and demands of modern governance. Ultimately, adopting a dynamic, adaptive, and innovative approach to defining jurisdiction will strengthen both the efficiency and public confidence in the Administrative Court of Justice as a cornerstone institution of the rule of law.

## Ethical Considerations

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

## Acknowledgments



Authors thank all who helped us through 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**

- Abrishmi-Rad, M. A., & Aine-Negini, H. (2022). Optimizing the Administrative Justice Court Based on the Status and Competencies of the Court of Torts in Iran and Islam. *Quarterly Scientific Journal of New Research in Administrative Law*, 4(12), 129-148.
- Basri, B. (2019). An Essay on the Concept of Administrative Justice. *Journal of Legal Research*, 22(88), 285-309.
- Hemmati, M. (2017). Analysis of the Law of the Administrative Court of Justice from the Perspective of Specific Standards of Fair Administrative Proceedings; With a Look at the Practice of the European Court of Human Rights. *Public Law Research*, 19(55), 245-272.
- Jafari-Lengroudi, M.-J. (2009). *Law of Obligations*. Ganj Danesh Publishing House.
- Mohaj, M. R., & Ketabiroudi, A. (2014). The limits of the jurisdiction of the Administrative Court of Justice in appointing managers of public non-governmental institutions (case study of the CEO of the Social Security Organization). *Perspectives on Judicial Law*(65), 181-204.
- Molabigi, G. (2014). *Jurisdiction and Procedure of the Administrative Court of Justice*. Jangal Publishing.
- Motlabi-Fasharkii, F., & Atrian, F. (2018). Limits of the Competence of the Administrative Court of Justice in Monitoring the Decisions of Administrative Courts. *Quarterly Journal of Legal Studies*, 2(2), 45-56.
- Shah-Beig, A. (2012). *Explanation of the Competences and Powers of the Administrative Court of Justice* Islamic Azad University, Central Tehran Branch].