



A Comparative Analysis of Normative Bases of Clean Hands Doctrine

Mohsen Izanloo^{1*} | Amir Ghaffari² | Taha Arab Asadi³

1. Associate Professor, University of Tehran, Iran

2. Ph.D. Candidate in Private Law, University of Tehran, Iran

3. Ph.D. Candidate in Private Law, University of Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding Author Email: izanloo@ut.ac.ir

Abstract

This general principle that past wrongdoings of persons in matters related to the dispute may result in the deprivation of their right to be heard is accepted in both common law legal systems as well as transnational soft laws, such as transnational commercial law and international arbitration law. According to continental European law, this principle is known as the principle of prohibition of invoking one's illegal acts, while according to common law, which is the origin of the legal rules related to this principle, it is known as the theory of clean hands. The theory of clean hands has received limited attention from legal philosophers, despite its moral aspect. The common law is well known for the famous expression, "whoever comes to the [court of] equity must come with clean hands". This theory needs to be justified in terms of its normative foundations, since denying the right to be heard is an unusual and strange reaction in law. Even if the claimant has committed wrongdoing, immorality or has been unconscionable in the past, the law generally respects the right of the claimant to be heard; further, legal actions are decided on the basis of the substantive and formal elements of the case and not on the claimant's past actions. The question that arises in this regard is why in some cases the claimant is denied his right to be heard for his past wrongdoings? When previous actions are related or similar to the subject of the current lawsuit, how can they be used to negate the claimant's right to be heard? This legal principle prohibits wrongdoers from bringing lawsuits that relate to or are based on their prior wrongdoings, and is not unique to the common law system. In Iranian law and Islamic jurisprudence, the prohibition of invoking one's own unlawful act has recently been brought up, and its basis has been justified. Thus, this study focuses only on the normative and philosophical foundations of this principle and does not address the legal conditions and effects associated with its application in a particular legal system.

This study attempts to answer the mentioned questions using a comparative study and analytical-library methodology, while also considering the philosophical foundations of the subject. The theories of "preserving the court's integrity" and "Tu Quoque" as moral foundations for the theory of clean hands are presented and analyzed based on that.

In contrast to what most authors believe, the theory of clean hands is not fully compatible with the concept of court integrity. This theory may in fact work against the moral integrity of the court in some cases. The defense of clean hands contributes to the preservation and promotion of the moral integrity of the court in many cases, however, the moral integrity of the court cannot be described as the main norm that underlies this theory. Accordingly, the norm of "maintaining the moral integrity of the court" is of little value, except in two exceptional cases: In cases where the moral integrity of the court is accompanied by the integrity of the judges, as well as when the moral integrity of the court directly impacts the people associated with and affected by the legal system.

Alternatively, "Tu Quoque" can be viewed as the basis for the theory of clean hands. In the field of law, the theory of clean hands represents the manifestation of the norm of "Tu Quoque". The norm voids the statements of their illocutory meanings. Consequently, expressions and statements lose their ability to create normative meaning as a result of the operation of this norm. Accordingly, it is possible that what the claimant says is normatively consistent with reality in such cases, and the counterparty has committed immoral behavior, and should also be blamed and protested against for it, but due to the fact that claimant himself has also committed similar wrongdoing, his expressions and statements cannot create normative meaning that can be attributed. The defense of clean hands encapsulates the legal principle that hypocrites are not permitted to place blame on others.

As part of the normative structure of the theory of clean hands, punishment also plays a significant role. According to the philosophy of punishment, the wrongdoers should be punished for their actions. The two norms (Tu Quoque and punishment) are present in all cases of clean hands. The normative theory of clean hands is based on these two norms. As the theory of clean hands is in harmony with the requirements of punishment and the Tu Quoque (as moral norms), it promotes the positive perception of the people of society regarding the courts and their legitimacy. One of the positive normative results of the clean hands theory is its positive effect on the reliability and integrity of the judicial system. It is important to take into account the deterrent effect of this theory (on potential future wrongdoers) when listing its effects. These results, which follow the theory of clean hands, can be seen as an answer to the question of what the theory's normative objectives are.

Keywords: Clean Hands Theory, No Action Can Arise from One's Illegal Act, Tu quoque, Integrity of Judges, Ethics and Law.



References

Books

1. Al-Razi. Al-jesas., Ahmad. Bin. Ali. (1995), ahkaam ol-Qoran, Vo. 1, (Lebanon, Beirut, Dar ol-kotob al-elmiyah) [in Arabic].
2. Al-Tohidi, Mohammad. Ali. (2007), Mesbah Ol-Feqaha Fil Moaamelaat, Men Taqrir-E-Bahs El-Ostaz El-Akbar Ayatolaah El-Ozmaa Al-Seyed Abol-Qassem Al-Khoei, Vol 2, (Qom: Institute of Ehiyaa Ol-Asaar El-Emam Al-Khoei) [in Arabic].
3. Austin, J.L. (1975), How to Do Things with Words, 2nd ed., (Edited by J. O. Urmson Marina Sbisa), (Cambridge: Harvard University Press).
4. Cox, Damian. & La Caze, Marguerite. & Levine, Michael (2017), Integrity and the Fragile Self, (Oxfordshire: Routledge, 1st ed.).
5. Dobbs, Dan B. (2017), Law of Remedies: Damages, Equity, Restitution, (S.T. Paul, M.N: West Academic Publishing, 3rd ed.).
6. Duff, Anthony (1986), Trials and Punishment, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
7. Duff, Anthony (2003), Punishment, Communication, And Community, (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
8. Fischer, James M. (2014), Understanding Remedies, (New York: Lexis Nexis, 3rd ed.).
9. Gardner, John (2008), Introduction, in H.L.A. Hart, Punishment and Responsibility, (Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2nd ed.).
10. Garner, Bryan A. (2019), Black's Law Dictionary, (London: Thomson Reuters; 11th ed.).
11. Kant, Immanuel (1996), The Metaphysics of Morals (Cambridge Texts in the History of Philosophy), (M. Gregor, ed.), (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
12. Katoozian, Nasser. (2016), Philosophy of Law: Definition and Nature of Law, vol. 1, (Tehran: Sahami Enteshar Pub., 8th ed.) [in Persian].
13. Publisher's Editorial Staff (1996), American Jurisprudence 2d: State and Federal, Vol. 27, Eminent Domain to Escheat, Equity.
14. Sher, Goerge (1987), Desert, (Princeton: Princeton University Press).
15. Tabatabaei, Mohammad Hossein (1998), Translation of Tafsir-e-al-Mizan, Vol 6, 6th pub., Qom: Islami Publishing [in Persian]
16. Williams, Bernard (1981), Integrity, Persons, Character and Morality, in Moral Luck, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
17. Wright, Charles Alan & Miller, Arthur R. (2010), Federal Practice and Procedure, (London: Thomson Reuters, 2nd ed.).

18. York, Kenneth H., Bauman, John A. & Rendleman, Doug (1992), *Cases and Materials on Remedies*, (S.T. Paul, M.N: West Academic Publishing, 5th ed.).

Articles

19. Anenson, T. Leigh (2010), *Beyond Chafee: A Process-Based Theory of Unclean Hands*, *American Business Law Journal*, (47). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=1585990>.
20. Calhoun, Cheshire (1995), *Standing for Something*, 92 *Journal of Philosophy*, (92).
21. Cohen, G.A. (2006), *Casting the First Stone: Who Can, and Who Can't, Condemn the Terrorists?*, *Royal Institute of Philosophy Supplements*, (58).
22. Cox, Damian, La Caze, Marguerite & Levine, Michael (2008), *Integrity*, in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, (Edward N. Zalta ed.), Available at: https://libres.uncg.edu/ir/uncg/f/H_Gert_Hampton_2004.pdf.
23. Davis, Michael (1983), *How to Make the Punishment Fit the Crime*, *Ethics*, (93).
24. Dworkin, Gerald (2000), *Morally Speaking*, in Edna Ullmann-Margalit (ed.), *Reasoning Practically*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
25. Finnis, John (1972), *The Restoration of Retribution*, *Analysis*, (32).
26. Goldberg, John. C.P. & Zipursky, Benjamin C. (2010), *Torts as Wrongs*, *Texas Law Review*, (88).
27. Hampton, Jean (1992), *An Expressive Theory of Retribution*, in *Retribution and Its Critiques*, 1–27 (Wesley Cragg ed.).
28. Herstein, Ori J. (2009), *Historic Injustice, Group Membership and Harm to Individuals: Defending Claims for Historic Justice from the Non-Identity Problem*, *Harvard Black Letter Law Journal*, (25).
29. Herstein, Ori J. (2011), *A Normative Theory of the Clean Hands Defense*, *Journal of Legal Theory*, (17).
30. Hohfeld, Wesley (1913), *Some Fundamental Legal Conceptions as Applied in Legal Reasoning*, *Yale Law Journal*, (23).
31. Holtug, Nils (2004), *Person-affecting Moralities*, in Jesper Ryberg, Torbjörn Tännsjö (eds.), *The Repugnant Conclusion: Essays on Population Ethics*, Kluwer Law International, Dordrecht).
32. Izanloo, Mohsen. & Ghaffari, Amir. & Arabasadi, Taha. (2022), *Principle of No Action Can Arise from One's Illegal Act: A Comparative Study of Islamic Jurisprudence and Iranian Law*, *Journal of Private Law*, (19), 270-247. [in Persian] Doi: 10.22059/jolt.2022.346317.1007122
33. Kolber, Adam Jason (2009), *The Subjective Experience of Punishment*, *Columbia Law Review*, 182, Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=1090337>.

34. Mohseni, Hasan. & Davoodi, Hosein (2021), The Ex Turpi Causa Non Oritur Action, Ex Dolo Malo Non Oritur Action Maxim And Illegality Defense, Legal Journal of Judiciary, (116), 185-207. [in Persian].
35. Mohseni, Hassan & Reazeinejad, Amirhossein (2011), Law & Morality; Morality & Adjudication (Some Reflection on the Credibility of Without Notice Recorded Voice as Proof), Legal Journal of Judiciary, (73), 65-82 [in Persian] Doi: 10.22106/jlj.2011.11091.
36. Moore, Michael S. (1987), The Moral Worth of Retribution, in Responsibility, Character, and the Emotions, (Ferdinand Schoeman ed.)
37. Moore, Michael S. (1993), Justifying Retributivism, Israel Law Review, (27).
38. Mousavi Bojnourdi, Seyed Mohammad (2007), Role of Good Faith in Contracts under Law and Jurisprudence, Journal of Law and Political Sciences, (2), 7-20. [in Persian]
39. Naghibi, Seyed abolghasem, Taghizadeh, Ebrahim & Bagheri, Abbas (2014), Role of Good Faith in Imamiyah Jurisprudence, Journal of Islamic Jurisprudence, (39), 33-57. [in Persian]
40. Walen, Alec (2021), Retributive Justice, The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2021/entries/justice-retributive/>.
41. Wallace, R. Jay (2010), Hypocrisy, Moral Address, and the Equal Standing of Persons, Philosophy & Public Affairs, (38).
42. Wood, David (2010), Punishment: Nonconsequentialism, Philosophy Compass, (5).
43. Zipursky, Benjamin C. (2003), Civil Recourse, Not Corrective Justice, George Washington Law Review, (91).