IBAST
ISSN: 2750-3402

ADMINISTRATIVE AND LEGAL ASPECTS OF ELIMINATING CORRUPTION FACTORS IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Norbutayev Erkin Xurozovich
Acting Professor of the Department of Administrative Law at the Academy of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Uzbekistan, Doctor of Philosophy in Law, Associate Professor
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14288706

Abstract: This article discusses scientifically-based solutions to problems related to the uncompromising fight against all forms of corruption, assessing and eliminating corruption risks in public administration, forming and strengthening spiritual and moral values against corruption in public consciousness, early detection and elimination of corruption factors, forecasting the emergence of corruption factors in state, public, and economic management, and establishing new, effective, and sustainable forms of cooperation between individuals, society, the state, and inter-state relations in combating corruption.

Keywords: corruption, spiritual and moral values, individual - society - state, assessment of corruption risks.

The issue of combating corruption in public administration is one of the important topics not only in legal sciences but also in other social and humanitarian sciences. Therefore, numerous studies on combating corruption have been conducted and are being conducted in fields such as economics, political science, sociology, pedagogy, and psychology. In short, the issue of combating corruption is a very broad topic within the framework of a single science. In this regard, one can fully agree with V.N. Lopatin's opinion that "the fight against corruption is not only a problem of criminal law but also a general legal, social, and political problem."[1]

Public law sciences, particularly administrative law, occupy a special place in the scientific and theoretical foundations of combating corruption. This is because the essence of corruption is directly related to public authority, which is the subject of administrative law.

A.Yu. Vatel considers four aspects of administrative and legal means of combating corruption: anti-corruption standards (a system of substantive norms of administrative law that establishes prohibitions, restrictions, requirements for the actions of officials, as well as positive obligations), administrative procedures to ensure the implementation of anti-corruption standards, measures of liability for violation of anti-corruption standards, incentives and awards, as well as disciplinary administrative and legal proceedings.[2]

In our view, the administrative and legal factors of corruption in public administration are reflected in the following:

First, administrative and legal relations are inherently vertical in nature and express relations related to the exercise of public power. In particular, corruption arises as a result of the illegal use of a person's official position or status. A person's official position or status exists only in the system of administrative and legal relations related to the exercise of public power. For this reason, as K.R. Abdurasulova correctly notes, the most corrupt are employees of the executive branch.[3]

In state governance, public power is exercised in a system of various legal relations. Administrative and legal relations play a particularly important role in this regard. In particular, while constitutional law constitutes the fundamental basis of all state power and administration, it remains merely a "paper sentence" without administrative law. Administrative-legal relations always have a compulsory character, expressing the power of authority. R.R. Khakimov also assumes that one of the essences of state power is the possession of a monopoly on the use of coercive force.[4]

Therefore, administrative and legal relations serve as a favorable environment for the emergence of corrupt factors in public administration, and excessive state involvement in regulating social relations creates opportunities for corruption. However, it is impossible to imagine legal regulation of social relations without state participation. Nevertheless, state involvement in this regard should be based on specific criteria and primarily be strategic and conceptual in nature. On this matter, the First President of the Republic of Uzbekistan, Islam Karimov, noted, "We must not forget that the more we strengthen the state's control functions and increase the number of state structures and bodies engaged in control, the more official abuse and corruption will flourish." Additionally, A.K. Baldin believes that norms in regulatory legal acts and their drafts that imply excessive legal regulation should be understood as factors that contribute to corruption.[5] A.V. Kurakin also argues for the need to minimize unjustified interactions between civil servants and business entities during oversight, inspection, and implementation of various licensing measures.[6] However, it is insufficient to say that corruption factors are related only to "overregulation." Administrative and legal relations, by their very nature, nourish and foster corrupt factors. Where there are no administrative and legal relations, there are no corrupt factors. At the same time, it is incorrect to view administrative and legal relations solely as a corrupt factor, as they also serve as a platform for combating corruption. In short, administrative and legal relations serve both as a breeding ground for corruption factors and as a means to combat them. At the same time, it is incorrect to understand administrative and legal relations as a corrupt factor, administrative and legal relations also serve as a platform for combating corruption. In short, administrative and legal relations serve both for corruption factors and for combating them.

A legal analysis of administrative offenses and crimes related to corruption also shows that these types of offenses are committed by subjects of administrative and legal relations within the framework of such relations and cannot occur otherwise.

As long as a subject with authority always participates on one side of administrative-legal relations, there will be opportunities for discretion. In particular, as a result of the liberalization of public administration and the transfer of certain state functions to the non-state sector, it has been defined as a corruption offense when employees of non-governmental organizations, using their official position, knowingly perform or fail to perform certain actions in the interests of a person offering a bribe, receiving material values or property benefits in return. Therefore, transferring the state's imperative powers to the non-state sector does not necessarily decrease corruption factors; this process may even increase them. The transfer of imperative powers to the state or private sector is of little importance; attention should be paid to how these powers are used. Thus, when discussing corruption factors in the system of administrative and legal relations, it is necessary to ask, first, how well the relevant imperative powers are justified, and second, how to prevent these powers from becoming sources of corruption.

Secondly, the means of administrative and legal regulation are linked to the essence of state governance methods. In some literature, various methods influencing individuals' will and consciousness in performing specific management tasks are described as management methods, divided into administrative and economic methods.[7] In other literature, methods of public administration are defined as techniques and means used within the legal scope by executive authorities and their officials to exert administrative influence on controlled objects and individuals. These are divided into two main methods of influencing public administration objects: persuasion and coercion.[9]

In our view, administrative and legal methods of state administration, based on their mechanism of influence on the subject's behavior, are divided into the following:

prohibiting - forbidding the performance of certain actions;

restrictive - allowing only a specific category of subjects to perform certain actions;

permissive - granting freedom to perform certain actions;

procedural - establishing procedural rules governing the administrative and legal activities of management bodies;

obligatory - imposing on a subject the duty to perform or refrain from certain actions in a prescribed manner.

In administrative and legal relations, the will of the subject acting on behalf of the state prevails, and in this process, the subordinate subject lacks discretionary opportunities. These circumstances are substantial for administrative and legal factors of corruption. Corruption opportunities lie behind any administrative permission or mandatory consent procedures. That is, the possibility of obtaining material benefits in exchange for permission or the presence of opportunities (powers) to introduce essentially unnecessary administrative procedures for corrupt purposes serves as a source of corrupt income for authorized individuals.

The methods of administrative and legal regulation themselves also manifest as methods of committing corruption offenses. This implies only the illegal use of these methods.

Administrative and legal regulation methods often create a bureaucratic apparatus. K.V. Sevryugin also links the essence of corruption to the bureaucratic nature of the state apparatus.[10] The peculiarity of the bureaucratic apparatus is that relations between the state and citizens are regulated in a manner inconsistent with citizens' interests. Entering into administrative and legal relations with the state creates significant inconveniences for citizens in terms of time, physical effort, expenses, and other aspects. These inconveniences particularly manifest themselves in the process of using public services. In this regard, Z. Turysbekov, Zh. Dzhandosova, A. Tagatova, and N. Shilykbaeva characterize administrative barriers related to the provision of public services as follows: time-related (inconvenient hours and working days, unjustified delays in processing requests, difficulty or impossibility of making calls), information-related (lack of information windows, lengthy lists of required documents, repeated document requests at each instance), price-related (lack of forms, high cost of forms, necessity to pay separately for each service), staff-related (absence of staff at workplace, unqualified staff, unfriendly staff, poor organization of cooperation), convenience-related (excessive number of service rooms, payment locations far from service points, lack of comfortable waiting areas), and legality-related (preferential service based on personal connections, fraud, indifference to violations).

It is necessary to continue efforts to transition the relations between citizens and the state to an online format in regulating administrative and legal relations. The further a citizen is physically removed from the state's administrative apparatus, the less likely they are to fall into the trap of corruption. The establishment of public service centers in our country plays an important role in further liberalizing bureaucratic procedures and reducing corruption in the system of providing public services. Currently, 157 public services are provided in these centers, of which 49 are free of charge. More than 80 services have been simplified. The number of required documents has been reduced by 95, and service periods have been shortened by 228 days. 151 public service center buildings and 131 branches have been established.[11] 151 public service center buildings, 131 branches were established.[12]

Thirdly, there are significant mechanisms within administrative and legal means that can create corruption factors. In this regard, O. Oqyulov also acknowledges that permitting, inspection, control, coordination, registration, and similar procedures provide the most favorable conditions for the flourishing of the bureaucratic apparatus. Thus, bureaucratic obstacles in state administration primarily stem from departmental procedural practices. Unfortunately, departmental proceedings are often implemented in a way that unilaterally reflects the interests of the relevant department at the expense of restricting personal freedom. This serves as the "lifeblood" of bureaucracy.

Today, departmental interests remain one of the least studied topics by national legal scholars. Furthermore, there are no mechanisms for identifying departmental interests in the practice of examining legislative acts.

Our analysis indicates that departmental interests that create corruption factors in public administration can be classified into the following groups: departmental interests aimed at deflecting responsibility; departmental interests aimed at facilitating the exercise of administrative and other powers; departmental interests aimed at increasing the influence of the state body; and departmental interests manifesting as corruption.

Corrupt departmental interests imply the "retention" of powers that are not actually necessary for a state body. For example, this can be seen in the presence of certain types of activities that could actually be carried out by the private sector or in powers that functionally and logically belong to other state bodies.

Fourthly, administrative and legal means not only facilitate the emergence of corruption but also nurture and conceal it. Closed environments are the most conducive to corruption. Therefore, the anti-corruption strategy emphasizes ensuring the openness of state bodies. In particular, openness and transparency are considered one of the main principles of combating corruption.[13] Additionally, ensuring the openness of state bodies' activities and their accountability is one of the measures to prevent corruption in public administration.[14] In the practice of combating corruption in foreign countries, openness and transparency are also understood as key issues. Specifically, the Law of the Russian Federation "On Combating Corruption" stipulates the openness of state bodies and local self-government bodies' activities as one of the main principles of combating corruption.[15] Similarly, the Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan "On Combating Corruption" establishes openness and transparency as one of the main principles of combating corruption.[16] The general anti-corruption policies of the United States and European Union countries also include measures to prevent corruption by ensuring the openness of administrative and financial activities of state bodies. Openness and transparency are also considered one of the main issues in the practice of

combating corruption in foreign countries. In particular, the Law of the Russian Federation "On Combating Corruption" provides for the openness of the activities of state bodies and local self-government bodies as one of the main principles of combating corruption.[17] The Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan "On Combating Corruption" also defines openness and transparency as one of the main principles of combating corruption.[18] The general anti-corruption policy of the United States and the European Union also defines measures to prevent corruption by ensuring the openness of the administrative and financial activities of state bodies.

The Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan dated June 16, 2021 No. UP-6247 "On Additional Measures to Ensure the Openness of Activities of State Bodies and Organizations, as well as the Effective Implementation of Public Control" approved a list of 33 types of socially significant information that should be published as open data to improve public control by ensuring the openness and transparency of state bodies and organizations' activities and freedom of information access, which is of great importance in eliminating corruption factors.

Corruption factors are also nurtured by not providing citizens with requested information or by providing false information. In this case, the main technological feature is the absence or weakness of procedures for providing relevant information. For example, the lack of credit transparency serves as the main foundation for corrupt factors in banking activities. An analysis of governance literature shows that openness and transparency as important elements or conditions of governance have been hardly studied in our country. In our view, openness and transparency in management should be formed as values. Only then will they be viable and able to demonstrate their strength as one of the main tools in the fight against corruption.

Fifth, the introduction of comprehensive control is directly related to administrative law. The mere creation of various anti-corruption measures and tools is insufficient. These measures and means remain insignificant unless they are combined into a unified system. The comprehensive control system integrates various anti-corruption measures and tools as an interconnected system within the framework of an organization's administrative competencies and capabilities.

As a comprehensive control system is implemented within each organization, it is primarily organized considering its administrative and legal status, administrative apparatus, and functional tasks. This process integrates legal means, organizational aspects, and institutional foundations into a single system.

Analysis shows that the norms related to the introduction of a comprehensive control system in our national legislation are insufficient. The Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan dated May 27, 2019 No. UP-5729 "On Measures to Further Improve the Anti-Corruption System in the Republic of Uzbekistan" for the first time set the task of strengthening anti-corruption measures in organizations with state shares in their authorized capital, including the introduction of a comprehensive anti-corruption control system and monitoring its effectiveness.[19] However, this decree is insufficient for the widespread implementation of a comprehensive control system. In many countries, this system has already been mandated by law. Specifically, special laws such as the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act (1977), the Sarbanes-Oxley Act (2002), and the Dodd-Frank Act (2010) stipulate that any corporation and company participating in the US market must establish a comprehensive

control system within its structure. Specifically, special laws such as the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act (1977), the Sarbanes-Oxley Act (2002), and the Dodd-Frank Act (2010) stipulate that any corporation and company participating in the US market must establish a comprehensive control system within its structure.

In this regard, Slovenian legislation, aimed at regulating this area, is distinguished by its uniqueness. In particular, the Law "On the State Holding Act of Slovenia" (Slovenian sovereign holding Act, 2014) adopted on April 26, 2014, defines the status and powers of the comprehensive control system. The specificity of the law is that it addresses the issue of personnel in the comprehensive service (compliance officer) and provides a clear rule and procedure for reporting corruption offenses within the company (whistleblowing policy).

The comprehensive control system plays an important role, especially in the activities of organizations with state participation, in the system of public procurement. In our view, it is necessary to form comprehensive legal institutions for the implementation of a comprehensive control system in our country.

Another advantage of the comprehensive control system is that the comprehensive control system sets certain requirements for combating corruption in relation to the behavior of employees. In particular, internal regulatory requirements of each organization, such as the Code of Corporate Ethics, the Gift Policy, the Whistleblowing Policy, the Bribery and Corruption Policy, the Fight against Money Laundering and Terrorist Financing, the Data Security Policy, and the Conflict of Interest Policy ("Chinese Walls") will be created and implemented, reflecting the anti-corruption policy.

A.Yu. Vatel believes that the introduction of administrative restrictions on the official behavior of civil servants is important, as appropriate means do not allow the employee to go beyond the limits of permissible behavior.[20] Indeed, the restrictions and prohibitions imposed on an employee's behavior against corruption force him to stay away from the corrupt environment and situations.

Sixth, other legal measures to combat corruption are directly related to administrative and legal measures, and the ineffectiveness of these measures undermines the effectiveness of other legal measures to combat corruption. For example, the comprehensive control system considered above is provided through administrative and legal measures.

Administrative legal instruments ensure the introduction of other legal measures to combat corruption in the following two forms:

a) represents the mechanism for implementing legal measures to combat corruption. Administrative and legal measures are primarily used in the implementation of preventive measures. One of the main directions of state policy in the field of combating corruption is the implementation of measures to prevent corruption in all spheres of state and public life.[21] In particular, measures to prevent corruption in the field of public administration, socio-economic development and entrepreneurship, measures to prevent and eliminate conflicts of interest, measures to prevent corruption in the field of administrative procedures, measures to prevent corruption in the field of public procurement are directly ensured through administrative and legal norms. In addition, civil law measures to combat corruption are also implemented through administrative and legal norms.

b) means of compelling action - administrative sanctions for non-compliance with legal measures to combat corruption. The national legislation of our country does not establish administrative liability for failure to take measures related to combating corruption. In

particular, there are no grounds for applying a measure of legal influence to the head (or responsible employee) of the organization for not posting socially significant information that should be posted as open data. Therefore, it is necessary to introduce the institution of disciplinary, administrative and criminal liability for violations of anti-corruption legislation. For example, in this regard, B.M. Ismoilov also expressed the opinion that it is necessary to properly regulate the issues of reporting and resolving conflicts of interest among employees during the performance of official duties, as well as to strengthen liability for breaches of these obligations.[22]. Indeed, today there are no unified mechanisms for preventing conflicts of interest in the activities of state bodies. Even a certain level of understanding and skills has not been formed in this regard.

Seventh, regulatory and legal factors are also directly related to the administrative and legal aspects of combating corruption in public administration. In this regard, O.A. Slepkova, emphasizing that anti-corruption expertise is an administrative and legal element of anti-corruption, defines this concept as a preventive measure of state anti-corruption policy, conducted by specially authorized entities established by current legislation, aimed at identifying and subsequently eliminating corruption factors in regulatory legal acts, the results of which are necessarily reflected in the conclusion of justified expert activities. Here, from the author's definition, it is clear that anti-corruption legal expertise is carried out in the administrative and legal space.

Based on the analysis, it was found that many current legal documents contain factors that create conditions for corruption.[23] The issues of conducting an anti-corruption expert review of regulatory legal acts and their drafts are one of the most widely studied topics. However, most studies examine the factors that directly cause corruption in the relevant regulatory legal acts or their drafts. However, there is no mention of factors indirectly causing corruption. In other words, the conversion of normative legal acts and their drafts, along with the concept and idea of other normative legal acts and their drafts, creates corruption factors. According to Article 29 of the Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan "On Normative Legal Acts," adopted on April 20, 2021, anti-corruption expertise is conducted: in relation to draft normative legal acts - by the developers, the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Uzbekistan and its territorial divisions; in relation to normative legal acts - by the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Uzbekistan and its territorial divisions.

The Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. PP-3666 of April 13, 2018, "On Organizational Measures to Further Improve the Activities of the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Uzbekistan," established that from May 1, 2018, all draft normative legal acts should be posted by the organizations developing the draft on the Unified Portal of Interactive Public Services of the Republic of Uzbekistan for public discussion.[25] The Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. PP-3666 of April 13, 2018, "On Measures to Further Enhance the Efficiency of Justice Bodies and Institutions in Ensuring the Rights and Freedoms of Citizens and Providing Legal Services," amending the above norm, states that "projects of normative legal acts of significant economic and socio-political significance, as a rule, should be posted by the organizations developing the draft on the Portal for Discussion of Draft Normative Legal Acts (regulation.gov.uz) for public discussion In this regard, we believe that it is necessary to clarify which projects will be included in the drafts of normative legal acts of significant economic and socio-political importance. Because this norm provides discussion powers to the organizations developing the project.

We mentioned above the opinion of A.K. Baldin that the norms in regulatory legal acts and their drafts, which provide for excessive legal regulation, should be understood as factors that create corruption. Today, in theoretical jurisprudence and law enforcement practice, there is no reflection on the boundaries and criteria for regulating social relations. In other words, the level and dynamics of legal regulation of social relations remain outside the scope of attention. This serves to create corrupt factors. It is incorrect to regulate certain processes "from a to a," and it is also incorrect to leave social relations outside the legal regulation. There should be certain criteria in this regard. The legal influence of the state on social relations should be strategic and tactical.

Eighth, one of the important measures to combat corruption is the connection of disciplinary liability with administrative law. Disciplinary liability is one of the least studied issues in our national jurisprudence. In European countries, disciplinary liability is defined as one of the most important measures in the fight against corruption.

A.V. Kurakin argues that it is necessary to improve disciplinary proceedings as a means of preventing and stopping corruption, defining the time of initiating a case of a disciplinary offense, the tasks of disciplinary proceedings, circumstances beyond the proceedings on a disciplinary offense, mitigating and aggravating liability, as well as other circumstances, clarifying the circumstances of the participants in this proceedings, the circumstances clarified in the case of a disciplinary offense, the procedure for ensuring the conduct of proceedings in the case of a disciplinary We fully agree with this author's opinion. Disciplinary liability serves as the primary means of ensuring compliance with anti-corruption requirements in relation to the behavior of employees of the comprehensive control system. In particular, the Code of Corporate Ethics, the Gift Policy, the Whistleblowing Policy, the Bribery and Corruption Policy, the Fight against Money Laundering and Terrorist Financing, the Data Security Policy, and the Conflict of Interest Policy require the application of disciplinary liability to an employee for non-compliance with the requirements of internal regulatory documents reflecting anti-corruption policy, such as the "Chinese Walls" policy.

Ninth, administrative and legal gaps also contribute to the emergence of corruption factors. In many cases, legal gaps in legislation allow individual officials to adopt departmental acts that unreasonably grant broad powers.[29] In the methodology for identifying corruption factors in regulatory legal acts and their drafts, it has been established that filling gaps in legislation through subordinate legislation can lead to cases of a narrow departmental approach.[30].

When discussing administrative and legal gaps, it is difficult to provide a clear, normative and methodological answer to the question of which situations should be understood as gaps. Currently, state policy on legal regulation is not clearly formulated. The Law "On Normative Legal Acts" provides for the regulation of the most important and stable social relations by law. However, it is not defined which social relations are considered the "most important and stable" social relations. At the same time, when regulating certain social relations, the principle of "law - decision of the Cabinet of Ministers - departmental normative legal act" is followed. In our view, this process should move to the principle of "law - decision of the Cabinet of Ministers."

The absence or incompleteness of administrative procedures is mainly manifested in the following: the implementation of actions and powers of a state body is not regulated; the procedural order for the exercise of powers is not defined; the absence or ambiguity of

grounds for the execution of administrative procedures by state bodies; the absence of an obligation to substantiate the decision being made; the presence of legal gaps; the lack of clear regulation of the exercise of rights belonging to individuals and legal entities; the presence of norms that do not have a clear mechanism for their implementation.

Tenth, issues related to the institutional foundations of combating corruption, i.e., the legal status, competence of relevant entities, and their reflection in a holistic system of mutual governance, are of particular importance. Currently, the Anti-Corruption Agency of the Republic of Uzbekistan, the Prosecutor General's Office of the Republic of Uzbekistan, the State Security Service of the Republic of Uzbekistan, the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Uzbekistan, the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Uzbekistan, and the Department for Combating Economic Crimes under the Prosecutor General's Office are designated as state bodies directly engaged in anti-corruption activities. Of course, anti-corruption entities are not limited to this. However, these listed entities exercise important powers as central actors in the fight against corruption

References:

1.Лопатин В.Н. О системном подходе в антикоррупционной политике / В.Н. Лопатин // Государство и право. – 2001. – № 7. – С. 23.

2.Ватель А.Ю. Административно-правовое регулирование антикоррупцинных стандартов служебного поведения государственных гражданских служащ: Дис. … канд. юрид. наук. – Москва, 2013. – ст. 10-11.

3.Абдурасулова Қ.Р. Коррупция жиноятчилигининг умумий тавсифи, сабаблари ва олдини олиш // Коррупцияга қарши курашиш ва комплаенс-назорат тизимини жорий этиш: муаммолар ва ривожланиш истиқболлари (халқаро онлайн илмийамалий семинари материаллари тўплами). Т.: ТДЮУ, 2020. Б. 24.

4.Хакимов Р.Р. Давлат ҳокимияти тармоқлари ўртасида мувозанатни таъминлашнинг ҳуқуқий механизмларини такомиллаштириш: Автореф. юрид. фан. док. ... дис. – Т., 2018. – Б. 13.

5.Балдин А.К. Правовые вопросы организации проведения антикоррупционной экспертизы нормативных правовых актов органами Минюста России: Дис. … канд. юрид. наук. – Нижний Новгород, 2014. – с. 17.

6.Куракин А.В. Административно-правовые средства предупреждения и пресечения коррупции в системе государственной службы Российской Федерации: Автореф. дис. … канд. юрид. наук. – Люберцы, 2008. – с. 12.

7.Алимов Х.Р., Махмудов А.А., Исмоилов Н.Т. Маъмурий ҳуқуқ: Дарслик. – Т.: Ўзбекистон Республикаси ИИВ Академияси, 2002. – Б. 77.

8.Odilqoriyev H.T., Ismailov I., Ismailov N.T. va boshq. Ma’muriy huquq: Darslik.– T.: O‘zbekiston Respublikasi IIV Akademiyasi, 2010. —Б. 175.

9.Odilqoriyev H.T., Ismailov I., Ismailov N.T. va boshq. Ma’muriy huquq: Darslik.– T.: O‘zbekiston Respublikasi IIV Akademiyasi, 2010. —Б. 176.

10.Севрюгин. К.В. Противодействие коррупции в системе государственной гражданской службы Российской Федерации: административно-правовое исследование: Автореф. дис. … канд. юрид. наук. – Т., 2011. – ст. 11.

11.Турисбеков З., Джандосова Ж., Тагатова А., Шиликбаева Н. Административные барьеры как источник коррупционных правонарушений в сфере госслужбы. Алматы, 2007 – с.14.
12.https://davxizmat.uz/uz/releases/joriy-yilning-29-sentyabr-kuni-aokada-otkazilgan-matbuot-anjumani-press-relizi
13.Ўзбекистон Республикасининг “Коррупцияга қарши курашиш тўғрисида”ги қонуни // https://lex.uz/docs/3088008
14.Ўзбекистон Республикасининг “Коррупцияга қарши курашиш тўғрисида”ги қонуни // https://lex.uz/docs/3088008
15.Федеральный закон от 25.12.2008 N 273-ФЗ (ред. от 01.04.2022) "О противодействии коррупции" // http://www.consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_82959/
16.Закон Республики Казахстан от 18 ноября 2015 года № 410-V «О противодействии коррупции» (с изменениями и дополнениями по состоянию на 29.12.2021 г.)
17.Ўзбекистон Республикаси Президентининг 2019 йил 27 майдаги “Ўзбекистон Республикасида коррупцияга қарши курашиш тизимини янада такомиллаштириш чора-тадбирлари тўғрисида”ги ПФ-5729-сон қарори.
18.Исмаилов Б., Мамажонов С. Коррупцияга қарши комплаенс назорати. У нима ва коррупцияга қай даражада барҳам бера олади? // https://m.kun.uz/news/2020/07/20/korrupsiyaga-qarshi-komplayens-nazorati-u-nima-va-korrupsiyaga-qay-darajada-barham-bera-oladi.
19.Ватель А.Ю. Административно-правовое регулирование антикоррупцинных стандартов служебного поведения государственных гражданских служащ: Дис. ... канд. юрид. наук. – Москва, 2013. – ст. 16.
20.Ўзбекистон Республикасининг “Коррупцияга қарши курашиш тўғрисида”ги қонуни // https://lex.uz/docs/3088008
21.Исмоилов Б.М. Коррупцияга қарши курашиш соҳасидаги қонунчилик ижроси устидан прокурор назоратини такомиллаштириш: автореф. дис. автореф ... ю.ф.б.ф.д – Тошкент, 2021. – б. 10.
22.Слепкова О.А. Понятие и особенности антикоррупционной экспертизы нормативных правовых актов и проектов нормативных правовых актов ФТС России // NB: Административное право и практика администрирования. – 2014. – № 2. – С. 73 - 84.DOI: 10.7256/2306-9945.2014.2.10998 URL: https://nbpublish.com/library_read_article.php?id=10998.
23. Амалдаги норматив-ҳуқуқий ҳужжатларнинг лойиҳаларидаги коррупциявий омиллартаҳлили ишнинг 3-иловасид белгиланган.
24.Ўзбекистон Республикасининг “Норматив-ҳуқуқий ҳужжатлар тўғрисида”ги Қонуни // https://lex.uz/docs/5378966.
25.Ўзбекистон Республикаси Президентининг 2018 йил 13 апрелдаги “Ўзбекистон Республикаси Адлия вазирлиги фаолиятини янада такомиллаштиришга доир ташкилий чора-тадбирлар тўғрисида”ги ПҚ-3666-сон қарори // https://lex.uz/docs/3681790.
26.Ўзбекистон Республикаси Президентининг 2018 йил 13 апрелдаги “Фуқароларнинг ҳуқуқ ва эркинликларини таъминлаш ҳамда ҳуқуқий хизмат кўрсатишда адлия органлари ва муассасалари фаолияти самарадорлигини янада ошириш чора-

IBAST | Volume 4, Issue 12, December

тадбирлари тўғрисида”ги ПҚ-3666-сон қарори // https://lex.uz/docs/5914998?ONDATE=18.03.2022%2000#5916301.
27.Балдин А.К. Правовые вопросы организации проведения антикоррупционной экспертизы нормативных правовых актов органами Минюста России: Дис. ... канд. юрид. наук. – Нижний Новгород, 2014. – ст. 17.
28.Куракин А.В. Административно-правовые средства предупреждения и пресечения коррупции в системе государственной службы Российской Федерации: Автореф. дис. ... канд. юрид. наук. – Люберцы, 2008. – с. 11.
29.Чистов А.А. Административно-правовое регулирование противодействия коррупции в федеральных органах исполнительной власти в современных условиях: Автореф. дис. ... канд. юрид. наук. – Москва, 2010. – с 19.
30.Ўзбекистон Республикаси адлия вазирининг 2021 йил 24 февралдаги “Норматив-ҳуқуқий ҳужжатлар ва улар лойиҳаларининг коррупцияга қарши экспертизасини ўтказиш тартиби тўғрисидаги низомни тасдиқлаш ҳақида”ги2-мҳ-сон буйруғи // https://lex.uz/docs/5306922