

**O‘ZBEKISTON
QONUNCHILIGI TAHLILI**

ILMIY-TAHLILIIY JURNAL
2025-YIL 4-SON

**ОБЗОР
ЗАКОНОДАТЕЛЬСТВА
УЗБЕКИСТАНА**

НАУЧНО-АНАЛИТИЧЕСКИЙ ЖУРНАЛ
2025 ГОД № 4

**UZBEKISTAN LAW
REVIEW**

SCIENTIFIC ANALYTICAL JOURNAL
2025 ISSUE 4

VOLUME 2 / ISSUE 4 / 2025

DOI: 10.51788/TSUL.UZLAWREV.2.4.

ISSN 2181-8118

DOI: 10.51788/TSUL.UZLAWREV.



**MUASSIS: TOSHKENT DAVLAT
YURIDIK UNIVERSITETI**

“O‘zbekiston qonunchiligi tahlili” ilmiy-tahliliy jurnali O‘zbekiston matbuot va axborot agentligi tomonidan 2014-yil 21-iyulda 02-0074-sonli guvohnoma bilan davlat ro‘yxatidan o‘tkazilgan.

Jurnal O‘zbekiston Respublikasi Oliy ta‘lim, fan va innovatsiyalar vazirligi huzuridagi Oliy attestatsiya komissiyasi jurnallari ro‘yxatiga kiritilgan.

Mualliflik huquqlari Toshkent davlat yuridik universitetiga tegishli. Barcha huquqlar himoyalangan. Jurnal materiallaridan foydalanish, tarqatish va ko‘paytirish muassis ruxsati bilan amalga oshiriladi.

Nashr bo‘yicha mas‘ul:

O. Choriyev

Muharrirlar:

E. Mustafayev, Y. Yarmolik,
Y. Mahmudov, K. Abduvaliyeva,
F. Muhammadiyeva, M. Sharifova,
Sh. Beknazarova, E. Sharipov

Musahhih:

M. Tursunov

Texnik muharrir:

U. Sapayev

Dizayner:

D. Rajapov

Tahririyat manzili:

100047. Toshkent shahar,
Sayilgoh ko‘chasi, 35.
Tel.: (0371) 233-66-36 (1169)

Veb-sayt: lawreview.uz

E-mail: uzlawreview@tsul.uz

Nashriyot litsenziyasi

№ 174625, 29.11.2023-y.

Jurnal 2025-yil 24-dekabrda

bosmaxonaga topshirildi.

Qog‘oz bichimi: A4.

Shartli bosma tabog‘i: 9,5.

Adadi: 100. Buyurtma: № 211.

Bosmaxona litsenziyasi

29.11.2023 № 174626

TDYU bosmaxonasida chop etildi.

Bosmaxona manzili:

100047. Toshkent shahri,

Sayilgoh ko‘chasi, 37.

© Toshkent davlat yuridik
universiteti

TAHRIR HAY’ATI**BOSH MUHARRIR**

S. Gulyamov – Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti Kiber huquq kafedrasini mudiri, yuridik fanlar doktori, professor

TAHRIR HAY’ATI A’ZOLARI

I. Rustambekov – Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti O‘quv ishlari bo‘yicha prorektor, yuridik fanlar doktori, professor – bosh muharrir o‘rinbosari

Sh. Xo‘jayev – Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti Intellektual mulk huquqi kafedrasini mudiri, yuridik fanlar bo‘yicha falsafa doktori – mas‘ul muharrir

O. Oqyulov – Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti Fuqarolik huquqi kafedrasini professori, yuridik fanlar doktori

A. Ener – Turkiyaning Anqara Haci Bayram universiteti dotsenti, Energetika nizolari arbitraj markazi bosh kotibi o‘rinbosari, yuridik fanlar doktori

M. Bungenberg – Saarlend universiteti Yevropa instituti direktori, yuridik fanlar doktori

S. Tatar – Turkiyaning Anqara Yildirim Boyazid universiteti professori, yuridik fanlar doktori

J. Peeroo – Sarbonna Universiteti professori, Stone 36 yuridik firmasi advokati, yuridik fanlar doktori

B. Musayev – Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti Xalqaro xususiy huquq fakulteti dekani, yuridik fanlar doktori, professor

Sh. Saydullayev – Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti Ommaviy huquq fakulteti dekani, yuridik fanlar nomzodi, professor

D. Habibullayev – Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti Fuqarolik protsessual va iqtisodiy protsessual huquqi kafedrasini mudiri, yuridik fanlar doktori, professor

S. Bozorov – Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti O‘quv-uslubiy boshqarma (Registrator ofis) boshlig‘i, yuridik fanlar doktori, professor

I. Bekov – Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti Konstitutsiyaviy huquq kafedrasini mudiri, yuridik fanlar doktori, professor

V. Ergashev – O‘zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidenti huzuridagi Qonunchilik va huquqiy siyosat instituti direktor o‘rinbosari, yuridik fanlar doktori, professor

Sh. Joldasova – O‘zbekiston Respublikasi Oliy Majlisi huzuridagi Qonunchilik muammolari va parlament tadqiqotlari instituti bosh ilmiy xodimi, yuridik fanlar bo‘yicha falsafa doktori

O. Xazratqulov – Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti Xalqaro xususiy huquq kafedrasini mudiri, yuridik fanlar nomzodi, professor

D. Suyunova – Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti Jinoyat-protsessual huquqi kafedrasini professori, yuridik fanlar doktori

D. Mahkamov – Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti Ekologiya huquqi kafedrasini professori, yuridik fanlar doktori

D. Babadjanova – Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti Fuqarolik huquqi kafedrasini professori v.b., yuridik fanlar doktori

A. Matmurodov – Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti Sud, huquqni muhofaza qiluvchi organlar va advokatura kafedrasini dotsenti, yuridik fanlar bo‘yicha falsafa doktori

E. Rahmatov – Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti Xususiy huquq fakulteti yoshlar masalalari va ma‘naviy-ma‘rifiy ishlar bo‘yicha dekan o‘rinbosari, yuridik fanlar bo‘yicha falsafa doktori, dotsent

M. Turdialiyev – Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti Xalqaro xususiy huquq kafedrasini mudiri o‘rinbosari, yuridik fanlar bo‘yicha falsafa doktori

**УЧРЕДИТЕЛЬ: ТАШКЕНТСКИЙ
ГОСУДАРСТВЕННЫЙ
ЮРИДИЧЕСКИЙ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ**

Научно-аналитический журнал «Обзор законодательства Узбекистана» зарегистрирован Агентством печати и информации Узбекистана 21 июля 2014 года с удостоверением № 02-0074.

Журнал включён в перечень журналов Высшей аттестационной комиссии при Министерстве высшего образования, науки и инноваций Республики Узбекистан.

Авторские права принадлежат Ташкентскому государственному юридическому университету. Все права защищены. Использование, распространение и воспроизведение материалов журнала осуществляется с разрешения учредителя.

Реализуется по договорной цене.

Ответственный за выпуск:
О. Чориев

Редакторы:

Е. Ярмолик, Й. Махмудов,
Э. Мустафаев, К. Абдувалиева,
Ф. Мухаммадиева, М. Шарифова,
Ш. Бекназарова, Э. Шарипов

Корректор:

М. Турсунов

Технический редактор:

У. Сапаев

Дизайнер:

Д. Ражапов

Адрес редакции:

100047. Город Ташкент,
улица Сайилгох, 35.
Тел.: (0371) 233-66-36 (1169)

Веб-сайт: lawreview.uz

E-mail: uzlawreview@tsul.uz

Издательская лицензия

от 29.11.2023 № 174625.

Журнал передан в типографию

24.12.2025.

Формат бумаги: А4.

Усл. п. л. 9,5. Тираж: 100 экз.

Номер заказа: 211.

Лицензия типографии

от 29.11.2023 № 174626

Отпечатано в типографии

Ташкентского государственного

юридического университета.

100047, г. Ташкент,

ул. Сайилгох, дом 37.

© Ташкентский государственный
юридический университет

РЕДАКЦИОННАЯ КОЛЛЕГИЯ

ГЛАВНЫЙ РЕДАКТОР

С. Гулямов – доктор юридических наук, профессор, заведующий кафедрой киберправа Ташкентского государственного юридического университета

ЧЛЕНЫ РЕДАКЦИОННОЙ КОЛЛЕГИИ

И. Рустамбеков – проректор Ташкентского государственного юридического университета по учебной работе, доктор юридических наук, профессор – заместитель главного редактора

Ш. Хужаев – заведующий кафедрой интеллектуальной собственности Ташкентского государственного юридического университета, доктор философии (PhD) по юридическим наукам – ответственный редактор

О. Окюлов – профессор кафедры гражданского права Ташкентского государственного юридического университета, доктор юридических наук

А. Энер – доцент Университета Анкары Хаджи Байрам (Турция), заместитель генерального секретаря Арбитражного центра по энергетическим спорам, доктор права

М. Бунгенберг – директор Европейского института Саарского университета, доктор права

С. Татар – профессор Университета Анкары Йылдырым Беязит (Турция), доктор права

Ж. Пироо – профессор Сорбоннского университета, адвокат юридической фирмы Stone 36, доктор права

Б. Мусаев – декан факультета международного частного права Ташкентского государственного юридического университета, доктор юридических наук, профессор

Ш. Сайдуллаев – декан факультета публичного права Ташкентского государственного юридического университета, кандидат юридических наук, профессор

Д. Хабибуллаев – заведующий кафедрой гражданского процессуального и экономического процессуального права Ташкентского государственного юридического университета, доктор юридических наук, профессор

С. Бозоров – начальник Учебно-методического управления Ташкентского государственного юридического университета (Registrar's Office), доктор юридических наук, профессор

И. Беков – заведующий кафедрой конституционного права Ташкентского государственного юридического университета, доктор юридических наук, профессор

В. Эргашев – заместитель директора Института законодательства и правовой политики при Президенте Республики Узбекистан, доктор юридических наук, профессор

Ш. Жолдасова – ведущий научный сотрудник Института проблем законодательства и парламентских исследований при Олий Мажлисе Республики Узбекистан, доктор философии по юридическим наукам

О. Хазраткулов – заведующий кафедрой международного частного права Ташкентского государственного юридического университета, кандидат юридических наук, профессор

Д. Суюнова – профессор кафедры уголовно-процессуального права Ташкентского государственного юридического университета, доктор юридических наук

Д. Махкамов – профессор кафедры экологического права Ташкентского государственного юридического университета, доктор юридических наук

Д. Бабаджанова – и.о. профессора кафедры гражданского права Ташкентского государственного юридического университета, доктор юридических наук

А. Матмуродов – доцент кафедры суда, правоохранительных органов и адвокатуры Ташкентского государственного юридического университета, доктор философии по юридическим наукам

Э. Рахматов – заместитель декана факультета частного права Ташкентского государственного юридического университета по делам молодёжи и духовно-просветительской работе, доктор философии (PhD) по юридическим наукам, доцент

М. Турдалиев – заместитель заведующего кафедрой международного частного права Ташкентского государственного юридического университета, доктор философии по юридическим наукам

**FOUNDER: TASHKENT STATE
UNIVERSITY OF LAW**

"Uzbekistan Law Review" scientific and analytical journal was registered by Press and Information Agency of Uzbekistan on July 21, 2014, with certificate number 02-0074.

The journal is included in the list of journals of the Supreme Attestation Commission under the Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Innovations of the Republic of Uzbekistan. Copyright belongs to Tashkent State University of Law. All rights reserved. Use, distribution and reproduction of materials of the journal are carried out with the permission of the founder.

Agreed-upon price.

Publication Officer:

O. Choriev

Editors:

Y. Yarmolik, Y. Makhmudov,
E. Mustafae, K. Abduvalieva,
F. Mukhammadieva, M. Sharifova,
Sh. Beknazarova, E. Sharipov

Proofreader:

M. Tursunov

Technical editor:

U. Sapaev

Designer:

D. Rajapov

Publishing department address:

100047. Tashkent city,
Sayilgoh street, 35.
Phone: (0371) 233-66-36 (1169)

Website: lawreview.uz

E-mail: uzlawreview@tsul.uz

Publishing license

№ 174625, 29.11.2023.

The journal is submitted to the
Printing
house on 24.12.2025.
Paper size: A4.
Cond.p.f: 9,5.
Units: 100. Order: № 211.

Printing house license

№ 174626, 29.11.2023.

Published in the Printing house of
Tashkent State University of Law.
100047. Tashkent city,
Sayilgoh street, 37.

© Tashkent State University of Law

EDITORIAL BOARD**EDITOR-IN-CHIEF**

S. Gulyamov – Head of the Department of Cyberlaw of Tashkent State University of Law, Doctor of Law, Professor

MEMBERS OF THE EDITORIAL BOARD

I. Rustambekov – Deputy Rector for Academic Affairs of Tashkent State University of Law, Doctor of Law, Professor - Deputy Editor-in-Chief

Sh. Khujaev – Head of the Department of Intellectual Property Law of Tashkent State University of Law, Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Law - Executive Editor

O. Oqyulov – Professor of the Department of Civil Law of Tashkent State University of Law, Doctor of Law

A. Ener – Associate Professor of Ankara Haci Bayram University, Turkey, Deputy Secretary General of the Center for Arbitration of Energy Disputes, Doctor of Law

M. Bungenberg – Saarlend universiteti Yevropa instituti direktori, yuridik fanlar doktori Director of the European Institute of Saarland University, Doctor of Law

S. Tatar – Professor of Ankara Yıldırım Bayezid University, Turkey, Doctor of Law

J. Peeroo – Professor of the University of Sarbonne, lawyer of the law firm Stone 36, Doctor of Law

B. Musaev – Dean of the Faculty of Private International Law of Tashkent State University of Law, Doctor of Law, Professor

Sh. Saydullaev – Dean of the Faculty of Public Law of Tashkent State University of Law, Candidate of Legal Sciences, Professor

D. Habibullaev – Head of the Department of Civil Procedural and Economic Procedural Law of Tashkent State University of Law, Doctor of Law, Professor

S. Bozorov – Head of the Educational and Methodological Department (Registration Office) of Tashkent State University of Law, Doctor of Law, Professor

I. Bekov – Head of the Department of Constitutional Law of Tashkent State University of Law, Doctor of Law, Professor

V. Ergashev – Deputy Director of the Institute of Legislation and Legal Policy under the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan, Doctor of Law, Professor

Sh. Joldasova – Chief Research Fellow of the Institute of Legislation Problems and Parliamentary Research under the Oliy Majlis of the Republic of Uzbekistan, Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Law

O. Khazratkulov – Head of the Department of Private International Law of Tashkent State University of Law, Candidate of Legal Sciences, Professor

D. Suyunova – Professor of the Department of Criminal Procedure Law of Tashkent State University of Law, Doctor of Law

D. Mahkamov – Professor of the Department of Environmental Law of Tashkent State University of Law, Doctor of Law

D. Babadjanova – Acting Professor of the Department of Civil Law of Tashkent State University of Law, Doctor of Law

A. Matmurodov – Associate Professor of the Department of Court, Law Enforcement Agencies and Advocacy of Tashkent State University of Law, Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Law

E. Rahmatov – Deputy Dean for Youth Affairs and Spiritual and Educational Affairs of the Faculty of Private Law of Tashkent State University of Law, Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Law, Associate Professor

M. Turdaliyev – Deputy Head of the Department of Private International Law of Tashkent State University of Law, Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Law

MUNDARIJA

12.00.01 – DAVLAT VA HUQUQ NAZARIYASI VA TARIXI. HUQUQIY TA'LIMOTLAR TARIXI

- 8 **ESHTURDIYEVA FARANGIZ BAXODIR QIZI**
Qonun ijodkorligi jarayonida lobbizmni tartibga solishning siyosiy-huquqiy zaruriyati

12.00.03 – FUQAROLIK HUQUQI. TADBIRKORLIK HUQUQI. OILA HUQUQI.
XALQARO XUSUSIY HUQUQ

- 16 **MAMANAZAROV SARDOR SHUHRATOVICH**
Biotexnologiya sohasida ishlab chiqarish sirlari (nou-xau): nazariy-huquqiy tahlil
- 24 **ALLAKULIYEV MIRJALOL DAVRONBEKOVICH**
O'zbekiston fuqarolik huquqida delikt majburiyatini amalga oshirish bilan bog'liq muammolar: qiyosiy-huquqiy tahlil va takomillashtirish yo'llari

12.00.06 – TABIIY RESURSLAR HUQUQI. AGRAR HUQUQ. EKOLOGIK HUQUQ

- 36 **SADIKOVA DILAFRUZ RADJABOVNA**
Qayta tiklanuvchi energiya manbalaridan foydalanishda sun'iy intellektning o'rni: AQSh, Yevropa Ittifoqi va O'zbekiston qonunchiligi misolida

12.00.10 – XALQARO HUQUQ

- 48 **USMANOVA SURAYYO BULTAKOVNA**
JSTga qo'shilish jarayonida turizmga oid milliy qonunchilikni muvofiqlashtirish masalalari
- 58 **BEKIMBETOVA TUMARIS BEKPOLAT QIZI**
Milliy tartibga solish tizimiga raqamli xizmatlar to'g'risidagi akt yondashuvini joriy etish istiqbollari
- 68 **XOLMIRZAYEVA SHOXISTA ARZIQL QIZI**
Transmilliy xavf sifatida noqonuniy migratsiya: nazariy va amaliy tahlil

12.00.12 – KORRUPSIYA MUAMMOLARI

- 75 **AHMADJONOV MURODULLO NURALI O'G'LI**
Korrupsion tarmoqlar murakkabligini o'rganishning ilmiy modeli

СОДЕРЖАНИЕ

12.00.01 – ТЕОРИЯ И ИСТОРИЯ ГОСУДАРСТВА И ПРАВА. ИСТОРИЯ ПРАВОВЫХ УЧЕНИЙ

- 8 **ЭШТУРДИЕВА ФАРАНГИЗ БАХОДИР КИЗИ**
Политическая и правовая необходимость регулирования лоббизма в законодательном процессе

12.00.03 – ГРАЖДАНСКОЕ ПРАВО. ПРЕДПРИНИМАТЕЛЬСКОЕ ПРАВО. СЕМЕЙНОЕ ПРАВО. МЕЖДУНАРОДНОЕ ЧАСТНОЕ ПРАВО

- 16 **МАМАЗАРОВ САРДОР ШУХРАТОВИЧ**
Производственные секреты (ноу-хау) в сфере биотехнологий: теоретико-правовой анализ
- 24 **АЛЛАКУЛЛИЕВ МИРЖАЛОЛ ДАВРОНБЕКОВИЧ**
Проблемы реализации деликтных обязательств в гражданском праве Узбекистана: сравнительно-правовой анализ и пути совершенствования

12.00.06 – ПРИРОДОРЕСУРСНОЕ ПРАВО. АГРАРНОЕ ПРАВО. ЭКОЛОГИЧЕСКОЕ ПРАВО

- 36 **САДИКОВА ДИЛАФРУЗ РАДЖАБОВНА**
Роль искусственного интеллекта в использовании возобновляемых источников энергии: на примере законодательства США, Европейского союза и Республики Узбекистан

12.00.10 – МЕЖДУНАРОДНОЕ ПРАВО

- 48 **УСМАНОВА СУРАЙЁ БУЛТАКОВНА**
Вопросы гармонизации национального законодательства о туризме в процессе вступления в ВТО
- 58 **БЕКИМБЕТОВА ТУМАРИС БЕКПОЛАТ КИЗИ**
Перспективы имплементации подхода Digital Services Act в национальную систему регулирования
- 68 **ХОЛМИРЗАЕВА ШОХИСТА АРЗИКУЛ КИЗИ**
Незаконная миграция как транснациональная угроза: теоретический и практический анализ

12.00.12 – ПРОБЛЕМЫ КОРРУПЦИИ

- 75 **АХМАДЖОНОВ МУРОДУЛЛО НУРАЛИ УГЛИ**
Научная модель изучения сложности коррупционных сетей

CONTENTS

12.00.01 – THEORY AND HISTORY OF STATE AND LAW. HISTORY OF LEGAL DOCTRINES

- 8 **ESHTURDIEVA FARANGIZ BAKHODIR KIZI**
The political and legal necessity of regulating lobbying in the law-making process

12.00.03 – CIVIL LAW. BUSINESS LAW. FAMILY LAW. INTERNATIONAL PRIVATE LAW

- 16 **MAMANAZAROV SARDOR SHUHRATOVICH**
Secrets of production (know-how) in the field of biotechnology: theoretical and legal analysis
- 24 **ALLAKULIEV MIRJALOL DAVRONBEKOVICH**
Challenges in the implementation of tort liability in the civil law of Uzbekistan: comparative legal analysis and ways to improve

12.00.06 – THE LAW OF NATURAL RESOURCES. AGRARIAN LAW. ENVIRONMENTAL LAW

- 36 **SADIKOVA DILAFRUZ RADJABOVNA**
The role of artificial intelligence in the use of renewable energy sources: on the example of the legislation of the USA, the European Union, and Uzbekistan

12.00.08 – CRIMINAL LAW. CRIMINAL-EXECUTIVE LAW

- 48 **USMANOVA SURAYYO BULTAKOVNA**
Issues of harmonizing national legislation related to tourism in the process of joining the WTO
- 58 **BEKIMBETOVA TUMARIS BEKPOLAT KIZI**
Prospects for implementing the digital services act approach in the national regulation system
- 68 **KHOLMIRZAEVA SHOKHISTA ARZIQL KIZI**
Illegal migration as a transnational risk: theoretical and practical analysis

12.00.12 – CORRUPTION PROBLEMS

- 75 **AHMADJONOV MURODULLO NURALI UGLI**
A scientific model for examining the complexity of corruption networks

Kelib tushgan / Получено / Received: 26.11.2025
Qabul qilingan / Принято / Accepted: 14.12.2025
Nashr etilgan / Опубликовано / Published: 24.12.2025

DOI: 10.51788/tsul.uzlawrev.2.4./BGTA8467
UDC: 343.37(045)(575.1)

A SCIENTIFIC MODEL FOR EXAMINING THE COMPLEXITY OF CORRUPTION NETWORKS

Ahmadjonov Murodullo Nurali ugli,

Independent Researcher at Tashkent State University of Law,
Assistant to the Prosecutor of Kosonsoy District, Namangan Region

ORCID: 0009-0006-4286-6752

e-mail: murodulloahmadjonov123@gmail.com

Abstract. *This research presents the TASP framework, designed to analyze corruption through four dimensions – Types, Activities, Sectors, and Places. Further, it examines the multifaceted nature of corruption within the public sphere, emphasizing how such practices originate, how they can be effectively measured, and the risks they pose to institutional integrity. Rather than treating corruption solely as a matter of personal misconduct or legal violation, the study conceptualizes it as a systemic and cultural phenomenon embedded within political and administrative systems. By employing the TASP framework, incidents of both actual and suspected corruption can be assessed with greater precision, enabling the formulation of appropriate preventive and corrective measures aimed at transforming unethical practices and enhancing public sector performance. Moreover, the research contributes to identifying the specific patterns, locations, and contexts in which corruption occurs, thereby clarifying areas of heightened vulnerability. Drawing on empirical findings, it ultimately shows that categorizing and comprehending corrupt behaviors in detail is essential for the development of focused and effective anti-corruption policies on the whole.*

Keywords: *institutional integrity, policymaking process, administrative frameworks, bureaucratic structures, ethical failure*

KORRUPSION TARMOQLAR MURAKKABLIGINI O'RGANISHNING ILMIY MODELI

Ahmadjonov Murodullo Nurali o'g'li,

Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti
mustaqil izlanuvchisi,

Namangan viloyati Kosonsoy tuman
prokurorining yordamchisi

Annotatsiya. *Ushbu tadqiqot korrupsiyani to'rt o'lchov: turlar, faoliyat yo'nalishlari, sohalar va joylar bo'yicha o'rganishga mo'ljallangan TYSJ modelini taklif etadi. Shu bilan birga, ushbu maqolada davlat sohasidagi korrupsiyaning turli jihatlarini va ko'rinishlarini, uning paydo bo'lish sabablari, aniqlash usullari hamda institutsional yaxlitlikka xavf tug'dirishi o'rganilgan. Shuningdek, mazkur maqolada korrupsiyaga faqat individual xatti-harakat yoki huquqbuzarlik sifatida emas, balki siyosiy va ma'muriy tuzilmalarga asoslangan tizimli va madaniy hodisa sifatida qaralgan. Maqolada taklif etilgan TYSJ modelini qo'llash korrupsiyaning haqiqiy va taxmin qilinayotgan faktlarini yanada aniqroq baholash*

imkonini beradi, bu esa axloqsiz amaliyotlarni o'zgartirish va davlat sektori samaradorligini oshirishga qaratilgan tegishli profilaktika va tuzatish choralarini ishlab chiqishni ta'minlaydi. Bundan tashqari, tadqiqot korrupsiya namoyon bo'ladigan aniq qonuniyatlar, joylar va kontekstlarni aniqlashga yordam beradi, bu esa yuqori zaiflik zonalarini belgilash imkonini beradi. Empirik ma'lumotlarga asoslanib, muallif korrupsion xulq-atvorni batafsil tasniflash va chuqur tushunish umuman korrupsiyaga qarshi maqsadli va samarali strategiyalarni ishlab chiqish uchun hal qiluvchi ahamiyatga ega degan xulosaga keladi.

Kalit so'zlar: *institutsional yaxlitlik, qonun ijodkorligi jarayoni, ma'muriy mexanizmlar, byurokratik tuzilmalar, axloqiy nojo'ya xatti-harakat*

НАУЧНАЯ МОДЕЛЬ ИЗУЧЕНИЯ СЛОЖНОСТИ КОРРУПЦИОННЫХ СЕТЕЙ

Ахмаджонов Муродулло Нурали угли,
самостоятельный соискатель Ташкентского государственного
юридического университета,
помощник прокурора Касансайского района Наманганской области

Аннотация. *В настоящем исследовании предлагается рамочная модель TASP, предназначенная для анализа коррупции по четырём измерениям: виды, деятельность, секторы и места. Кроме того, в работе рассматривается многоаспектная природа коррупции в публичной сфере, уделяется внимание источникам её возникновения, эффективным методам измерения, а также рискам, которые она создаёт для институциональной целостности. Вместо того чтобы рассматривать коррупцию исключительно как индивидуальный проступок или правонарушение, исследование концептуализирует её как системное и культурное явление, укоренённое в политических и административных структурах. Применение модели TASP позволяет с большей точностью оценивать факты как действительной, так и предполагаемой коррупции, обеспечивая выработку адекватных профилактических и корректирующих мер, направленных на трансформацию неэтичной практики и повышение эффективности публичного сектора. Исследование способствует выявлению конкретных закономерностей, локаций и контекстов, в которых проявляется коррупция, что позволяет обозначить зоны повышенной уязвимости. Опираясь на эмпирические данные, автор приходит к выводу, что детализированная классификация и глубокое понимание коррупционного поведения имеют решающее значение для разработки целевых и результативных антикоррупционных стратегий в целом.*

Ключевые слова: *институциональная целостность, законотворческий процесс, административные механизмы, бюрократические структуры, этический проступок*

Introduction

Corruption remains one of the most persistent and complex barriers to sound governance. It steadily erodes public trust in state institutions, distorts the process of policymaking, and weakens the ethical foundations upon which government authority rests. Although its manifestations differ across political contexts and levels of economic development, corruption invariably damages both the credibility and operational capacity of public administration. From minor misconducts such as bribery and nepotism to large-scale exploitation of governmental systems, corrupt actions undermine respect for the rule of law and obstruct equitable social and economic advancement (Ahmadjonov, 2024).

This study examines the diverse dimensions and situational contexts of corruption within the public sector – its origins, measurable indicators, and the threats it poses to institutional

integrity. Moving beyond the narrow view that corruption is merely a personal moral failure or a breach of legal norms, the research interprets it as a structural and cultural condition deeply rooted in political and bureaucratic environments. Drawing on both theoretical insights and empirical data, the study identifies the specific dimensions of governance (individual conduct, administrative procedures, and institutional principles) that become compromised, and elucidates how such analysis can inform the formulation of more focused preventive interventions and strengthened accountability structures.

This study employs a qualitative, analytical, and comparative methodology to examine the nature, forms, and contextual dimensions of corruption within the public sector. Its primary objective is to identify the conditions that give rise to corrupt practices, determine how they can be classified and evaluated, and analyze the risks they pose to institutional integrity and the efficacy of governance. To accomplish this goal, the research combines theoretical inquiry, documentary analysis, and cross-case comparison, thereby providing a comprehensive understanding of corruption as both a systemic and context-dependent phenomenon.

Main part

The findings of this study reveal that corruption in both public and private sectors is a multifaceted phenomenon operating across various levels of governance, with significant distinctions between developed and developing states. In less industrialized countries, it frequently infiltrates essential public domains such as healthcare, education, and infrastructure, resulting in the decline of social well-being and hampering economic advancement overall. Conversely, within advanced democratic systems, corruption often assumes more refined and institutionalized forms, where lobbying practices, conflicts of interest, and political patronage replace overt acts of bribery. The research sheds light on three core dimensions of corruption: events, referring to isolated actions such as bribery or document forgery; processes, involving recurrent administrative abuses like nepotism or deliberate obstruction; and cultures, representing institutional settings where unethical behavior becomes normalized. This layered framework, in turn, represents how corruption can evolve from individual misconduct into deeply rooted systemic dysfunction within public institutions (Ahmadjonov, 2025).

This research explores key aspects of public sector corruption, including its forms, the contexts of its emergence across institutional and geographical settings, approaches to its measurement, and the risks it poses to ethical governance.

In early 2013, global media drew attention to the Chinese leader's call to confront both "tigers" and "flies," a metaphor symbolizing high-level and low-level corruption, respectively. His statement emphasized the necessity of holding senior officials liable for legal violations while also addressing routine unethical acts that directly affect citizens' everyday experiences (AllahRakha, 2023).

On the other side of the world, Harvard Law Professor Lawrence Lessig, one of the foremost scholars in the study of corruption, identified two broad categories that shape the American policymaking environment. The first includes overtly illicit behaviors such as bribery, extortion, nepotism, and embezzlement that forms closely to correspond to what the Chinese leader described as "flies." The second form, far subtler yet more pervasive, manifests through the systemic dependence of legislators on campaign donors and interest groups. While such contributions seldom carry explicit demands, they often mold legislative preferences, discouraging policymakers from supporting reforms that might displease influential benefactors. According to Lessig, this type of institutional dependency distorts democratic decision-making,

not necessarily for direct monetary reward, but for the preservation of political careers and influence (Alkhodary & Saidat, 2023). Thus, corruption, in his view, originates not solely from individual immorality but from the structural arrangements of political institutions that enable undue influence. Importantly, corruption persists in both wealthy and developing societies, though its magnitude, expression, and systemic traits differ widely. In poorer nations, it typically infiltrates essential public sectors, accounting for healthcare, education, infrastructure, and environmental management. In turn, this phenomenon produces dire ramifications such as water scarcity, a black economy, illegal logging, a weakened judiciary, inequitable healthcare systems, restricted educational access, inflated defense budgets, poorly built infrastructure, and exploitative resource extraction policies (AllahRakha, 2024). These patterns illustrate how corruption can cripple governance and erode human welfare on the whole.

In contrast, in wealthier democracies, petty bribery is comparatively rare and is often met with strong public condemnation. Political scientist Michael Johnston provides a classification of “corruption syndromes” that depend on specific institutional and political contexts (Barrington, 2022). In authoritarian or weakly governed states, corruption thrives under kleptocratic regimes characterized by intimidation and the absence of checks and balances. Transitional governments, where mechanisms of accountability are underdeveloped, also present fertile ground for corrupt practices.

Meanwhile, in mature democratic systems, corruption tends to take more sophisticated forms, appearing as “influence markets,” in which wealth and access are exchanged for favorable policy outcomes, regulatory leniency, or government contracts (Carter, 2023).

Nations such as Denmark, consistently ranking among the least corrupt according to the Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index (2024), illustrate that minor corruption is swiftly reported and penalized. Nonetheless, even in this country, high-level or “grand” corruption can persist subtly within corporate and public-private interactions (Carellini, 2023).

Traditionally, scholars distinguish three broad categories of corruption: petty, grand, and state capture. Below, we delve into the aforementioned forms of corruption.

A. Petty corruption

This type of corruption amounts to low-level officials exercising entrusted power for private gains, for instance, falsifying records for bribes, ignoring penalties in exchange for favors, or fast-tracking permits for payment, each of which, in turn, represents a betrayal of public trust.

B. Grand corruption

This form of corruption, on the other hand, constitutes high-ranking officials or political elites manipulating institutions to consolidate power or gain substantial wealth.

C. State capture

The most damaging form, state capture, occurs when external actors shape the legislative process itself to serve private interests at the cost of public interests. To be specific, this was notably observed in post-Soviet Russia during the 1990s, when privatization, natural resource concessions, and tax reforms were systematically engineered to reward those capable of purchasing political influence (Fazekas, 2019). Legislators facilitating these outcomes often benefited through lucrative appointments or direct payments, effectively monetizing their legislative responsibilities.

Even advanced democracies are not immune. Lobbyists routinely attempt to shape legal and policy frameworks to favor specific sectors or corporations. While lobbying can

demonstrate a legitimate facet of democratic participation, it simultaneously raises the question of whether policymaking is being indirectly purchased through donations, favors, or campaign financing (Huang & Hsiao, 2022). Collectively, these cases demonstrate that corruption, whether petty, systemic, or structural, poses serious challenges to effective governance, equitable policy formulation, and the proper functioning of public institutions.

The definition and conceptual understanding of corruption have long occupied scholars and policymakers alike. Within the civil service, it is broadly understood as the misuse of legally entrusted power for private advantages. To be clear, public officials are entrusted with specific duties and compensated to perform them under lawful authority (Knowledgehub, 2019). According to Caiden, failure to do so may involve maladministration or dereliction of duty. Yet corruption goes further, involving personal enrichment or benefits obtained beyond one's legitimate remuneration. These benefits are not always financial as they may take the form of gifts, preferential treatment, travel opportunities, or favors such as securing a relative's admission into a prestigious institution without proper qualifications (McAllister & Pietsch, 2012).

Motivations behind corrupt behavior are varied. Some individuals act out of loyalty to superiors or solidarity with colleagues, while others are driven by greed, pressure, or necessity. In developing economies, however, underpaid civil servants may resort to corruption as a means of financial survival. Corruption can also serve as an expression of patronage, used to reward allies, friends, or family members. In certain organizations, unethical practices become normalized, forming an institutional culture that tolerates or even encourages misconduct. In other cases, corruption emerges opportunistically (OECD, 2023). Some police officers, health inspectors, or other officials may accept bribes to ignore violations, for example. Such participation may be mutually agreed upon or coercive, depending on whether individuals willingly collude or are extorted.

Despite its ubiquity, corruption remains notoriously difficult to define with precision. Legislative frameworks and academic definitions often struggle to capture its full complexity. It encompasses a broad spectrum of misconduct, including bribery, extortion, favoritism, cronyism, abuse of discretion, and the misuse of confidential information. These behaviors occur across numerous functions, consisting of personnel appointments, procurement, regulatory oversight, licensing, and span sectors such as health, taxation, justice, and energy (Parliamentary Assembly, 2024). Moreover, corruption manifests differently across regions and institutional settings, from municipal departments to national agencies.

To address this complexity, the TASP framework representing Types, Activities, Sectors, and Places provides a systematic model for analyzing corruption in the public sphere. Rather than employing the term "corruption" as a catch-all concept, researchers can apply this framework to categorize and interpret specific corrupt acts with greater clarity as a whole (Salter, 2010). From a risk management perspective, identifying where corruption arises and how it operates is essential for developing preventive and corrective mechanisms. In practice, corruption may occur at the level of events (isolated acts), processes (repeated misconduct), or cultures (institutionalized tolerance of unethical behavior).

Events include singular incidents such as bribery, falsification of documents, or deliberate negligence, as observed in several corruption-prone countries. Processes refer to recurring patterns of misuse, such as favoritism in recruitment, contract manipulation, or the obstruction of justice. Frequently, corruption of both events and processes emerges during the implementation phase of policy, when officials exercise their authority for personal gains. Culture, in contrast, represents systemic corruption, including an institutional or political

environment in which unethical conduct is normalized and perpetuated through weak leadership or a lack of accountability. Assessing corruption, in turn, presents significant methodological challenges, making it one of the most complex fields in governance research. Nonetheless, measurement remains crucially vital for two key reasons below (Schachter, 2022).

First, aggregate indicators help determine how faithfully a government upholds its social contract with citizens. When embezzlement, bribery, and extortion are prevalent, when public projects primarily serve private interests, when corporations secure advantages through unlawful payments, and when justice is inconsistently applied, these factors collectively signal higher levels of corruption than in societies where such behavior is rare.

Second, understanding the scope and character of corruption within a particular context helps policymakers design appropriate preventive and corrective strategies.

Official data on corruption, however, are inherently limited. Because such acts are secretive and mutually beneficial, neither party has an incentive to disclose them. Even when cases surface, they may be prosecuted under alternative legal classifications, accounting for fraud, breach of duty, or extortion. This leads to underreporting and misclassification, complicating efforts to distinguish genuine corruption from administrative failures. Given its hidden character, most corruption indicators rely heavily on perception – based data, reflecting how individuals believe corruption occurs rather than recording verifiable instances. These indicators act as proxies, offering insight into public sentiment but not necessarily into actual incidence rates (Yakovlev, 2023). As administrative quantification of corruption remains nearly impossible, most existing indices capture levels of concern or suspicion rather than empirically confirmed wrongdoing. Consequently, surveys based purely on perception without corroborating evidence, official reports, or legal cases provide only partial understanding of the real extent and gravity of corruption within a given society.

Conclusion

To conclude, a review of empirical findings yields several invaluable insights. When corruption becomes embedded within institutional culture, it distorts policymaking and results in profound governance failures. Such occurrences are considered especially intolerable in advanced democracies, where they frequently evolve into major political controversies. Citizens expect honesty and accountability from their leaders, and when those in power either engage in or condone corrupt behavior, their legitimacy and public confidence quickly erode. At the level of policy implementation, both individual conduct and administrative mechanisms can be undermined. Even when the monetary benefits for the perpetrators or the financial losses to the state appear minor, the resulting erosion of institutional credibility and public trust is severe.

Empirical research indicates that in relatively efficient bureaucratic systems, conventional forms of corruption such as bribery, embezzlement, or extortion are no longer the most visible or pervasive issues. Instead, more nuanced practices like conflicts of interest, favoritism in hiring, and the misuse of confidential information have become increasingly prevalent. Yet, despite this shift, bribery continues to represent one of the most enduring and damaging threats to effective governance.

Addressing deeply rooted corrupt cultures demands the reinforcement of broad, system-wide integrity mechanisms. Conversely, corruption confined to specific events or administrative processes can be mitigated through targeted integrity reforms and context-specific preventive strategies. In this context, the TASP framework serves as a catalyst for the growth of integrity in a particular country.

REFERENCES

1. Ahmadjonov, M. (2024). Anti-Corruption and Compliance Control: Legal Literacy among Lawyers and Law Students. *International Journal of Law and Policy*, 8, 52–67. <https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.145>
2. Ahmadjonov, M. (2025, March). The Impact of corruption factors in public administration. *Review of law sciences*, 9(11), 66–74. <https://review.tsul.uz/2025/04/04/davlat-boshqaruviga-korrupsiyaviy-omillarning-tasiri/>
3. AllahRakha, N. (2023). The impacts of Artificial Intelligence (AI) on business and its regulatory challenges. *International Journal of Law and Policy*, 1, 25–48. <https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.23>
4. AllahRakha, N. (2024). Global perspectives on cybercrime legislation. *Journal of Infrastructure, Policy and Development*, 8, 106–131. <https://doi.org/10.24294/jipd.v8i10.6007>
5. Alkhodary, A., & Saidat, Z. (2023). Examining the Impact of E-Governance on the Performance of Corporations: A Case Study of Companies in Jordan. *Information Sciences Letters*, 26. <https://doi.org/10.30525/2256-0742/2021-7-5-235-242>
6. Barrington, M. (2022). The Social Bases of Obedience and Revolt. *International Journal of Law and Policy*, 13, 22–35. <https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.154>
7. Carter, L. Y. (2023). Analyzing e-government design science artifacts: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Information Management*, 11. 75–92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2021.102430D>
8. Cardellini, L. (2023). Sovereignty beyond Borders: Unraveling the Enigma of Airspace and Outer Space Interplay. *International Journal of Law and Policy*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.201>
9. Fazekas, K. L. (2019). Perils of development funding: The tale of EU Funds and grand corruption in Central and Eastern Europe. *Regulation and Governance*, 17, 52–73. <https://doi.org/10.1111/rego.121>
10. Huang, C., & Hsiao, L. (2022). Effect of Applying Case Method to Anti-Corruption Education on Learning Motivation and Learning Effectiveness. *Revista de Cercetare Si Interventie Sociala*, 23. <https://doi.org/10.33788/rcis.73.17>
11. Knowledgehub. (2019). *Anticorruption Policies in Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine* (pp. 28–35). <https://knowledgehub.transparency.org/assets/uploads/Anti-corruptionpolicies>
12. McAllister, J. & Pietsch, A. G. (2012). *ANU poll: Perceptions of corruption and ethical conduct* (p. 7). <http://politicsir.cass.anu.edu.au/polls-and-surveys/anupoll>
13. OECD. (2023). Collusion and corruption in public procurement No. 6, pp. 103–117. <https://www.oecd.org/daf/competition/46235884>
14. Parliamentary Assembly. (2024). Promoting Integrity to Tackle Political Corruption No. 9 pp. 51–66. <https://assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/Xref-XML2HTMLN.aspfileid=23930>
15. Salter, M. (2010). Lawful but corrupt: Gaming and the problem of institutional corruption in the private sector. *Harvard Business School*, 14. http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1726004
16. Schachter, H. L. (2022). E-participation Opportunities and the Ambiguous Role of Corruption: A Model of Municipal Responsiveness to Sociopolitical Factors. *Public Administration Review*, 79, 10–28. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13049>
17. Yakovlev, E. Zh. (2023). State capture: From Yeltsin to Putin. CEFIR/NES Working Paper series Working Paper No. 942006. *Centre for Economic and Financial Research at New Economic School*, 2. http://www.cefir.ru/ezhuravskaya/research/Yakovlev_Zhuravskaya_Capture_Yeltsin_Putin.pdf

**O'ZBEKISTON
QONUNCHILIGI TAHLILI**

ILMIY-TAHLILIIY JURNAL
2025-YIL 4-SON

**ОБЗОР
ЗАКОНОДАТЕЛЬСТВА
УЗБЕКИСТАНА**

НАУЧНО-АНАЛИТИЧЕСКИЙ ЖУРНАЛ
2025 ГОД № 4

**UZBEKISTAN
LAW REVIEW**

SCIENTIFIC ANALYTICAL JOURNAL
2025 ISSUE 4

VOLUME 2 / ISSUE 4 / 2025

DOI: 10.51788/TSUL.UZLAWREV.2.4.

ISSN 2181-8118

DOI: 10.51788/TSUL.UZLAWREV.