

## Comparison of Contractual Liability Patterns in the British Legal System and the Iranian Legal System

Nancy Asbaghipour<sup>1</sup> and Professor Reza Simbar<sup>2</sup> ✉

<sup>1</sup>Ph.D. Student in Privat Law, Department of Law Sari Branch, Islamic Azad University, Sari, Iran

<sup>2</sup>Professor & Faculty Member, Department Of Political science, University of Guilan, Rasht, Iran; Department Of Law and Political Science, Rasht Branch, Islamic Azad University, Rasht, Iran

✉ **Corresponding Author:** Professor Reza Simbar, **E-mail:** rezasimbar@hotmail.com

---

### ARTICLE INFORMATION

**Received:** 08 October 2021

**Accepted:** 25 November 2021

**Published:** 14 November 2021

**DOI:** 10.32996/ijlps.2021.3.2.2

---

### KEYWORDS

Gracious Risk, Designs of Respectful Risk, British Law, Iranian Law.

---

### ABSTRACT

No part of society can elude legitimate occasions. Some of the time, eagerly or unwillingly, another is hurt, and the issue of hurtful obligation or how to compensate is raised by others. The rules and controls of each nation or other nations may be distinctive, and the way of demonstrating obligation and its components and the approach of the courts in deciding the sum of harms may moreover be diverse. Since the legitimate British framework is to some degree diverse from the legitimate Iranian framework, it appears valuable to know the sees of this framework. The think about of these likenesses and contrasts, counting the way of sanctioning laws, their modification, the way of the trial of courts and the limits of duties and the way of execution of judgments, raises numerous scores and gives other viewpoints for analysts to be utilized in tackling issues in society. The article presented attempts to clarify the perspective of the UK legal framework and compare it with the Iranian legal framework in terms of designing respectful risks within the contract to realize the over the result. All legitimate frameworks look for a full stipend. In this respect, due to the reality that the strategy of remuneration among other remuneration strategies within the UK, the legitimate framework of this nation has set exact criteria based on which the assurance of full emolument. It is more standard and precise. Iranian law is generally appropriate on the issue of damages. This can occur despite the fact that the refusal of the rule of the presence of a way of a stipend in infringement of legally binding commitments has not been considered with assurance.

---

### 1. Introduction

In English law, the gracious risk may be a gracious offense that's more common against people (whether characteristic or lawful people such as organizations) and less common against governments. In brief, gracious obligation law is the rights and interface of the individuals that are ensured by law (Darabpour, 1389, p. 69).

These benefits may be maintained by a court by requesting the installment of an entirety of cash (remuneration); For illustration, this stipend may be due to an infringement of a right recognized by law, or the court may issue a between times directive against the said right; An intervals order is an arrange issued by a court to abstain from doing certain things. It is uncommon for a casualty to be able to guard himself or herself by and by before others without progressing to court and to compensate the casualty (Darabpour, 1389, p. 69).

Within the nineteenth century, the common law courts attempted to turn the law of mistake into the law of blunder, one of which was to extend the domain of carelessness or blame and make it a common guideline of obligation. (Carol Harlow, 2005, pp. 50-51)

The common law does not build up a single rule of risk. Fair as an obligation based on blame isn't acknowledged in all cases. An obligation without blame has not supplanted it. In common law, carelessness and carelessness appear to be based on risk, and in certain cases, such as the capacity of perilous objects or activities that require extraordinary mastery, no obligation is acknowledged.

Carelessness and carelessness in common law imply abstaining from doing what an ordinary human being would have drained those circumstances, as well as doing something that a sensible human being would not have tired those circumstances and has composed nearly comparable to a law blunder which does not incorporate purposefulness blame.

In a claim for harm based on carelessness (blame), it must begin with being demonstrated that the litigant had a commitment to the offended party, that the blameworthy party has abused this commitment with respect to the requirements for sensible care. In this respect, a run the show was made called the guideline of nearness, which was connected when there was a commitment to care. This implies that people must work out sensible care to anticipate the act or exclusion they are sensibly expecting from hurting others. This perspective is based on proper communication and standard arrangements between the parties involved, implying a closed and swift connection in which a person is affected by acts that include guilt. Therefore, consistency, grouping, and robustness are essential prerequisites for fulfilling a supervisory order. Therefore, obligations under common law can be based on expectations, negligence, or explicit obligations. These three types of obligations arise from condemnation-based expectations and negligence. (Flaming, 1971, p. 217)

This paper is based on the qualitative research method. Secondary data sources like books, research papers, newspaper articles are used for collecting data. Secondary data analysis is the main technique as well as a method of gathering and analyzing data in this paper.

## 2. Discussion

English law gives for four sorts (or models) of recompense for breaches of legally binding commitments. These four sorts can be separated into two primary bunches: within the to begin with a bunch, there are cases in which there's a model of compensation for the actual damage and within the moment gather there's a model of compensation for the harm to the harmed party. Compensatory or restorative damages are within the, to begin with, the bunch and therapeutic, ostensible and reformatory harms are within the moment bunch. Compensatory or Helpful Harm: Harm is an emolument for harm caused by a breach of contract. For this reason, compensatory or restorative damages. For this reason, compensatory damages are the most important and common form of compensation for damages; Restorative damages are therefore the general rule and basis for compensation in English law; One of the consequences of repairing damages is that the basis for receiving damages is the loss to the plaintiff and not the profit that the defendant has received (Rogers, 1997, p. 177)

There are numerous special cases to this run the show: In expansion to harms for purposes other than reparations (ostensible harms, reformatory harms, and remedial harms), English lawful journalists have specified other cases in which the premise for emolument may be such harms. The worker does not need the representative to be hurt in hone, as within the case of a breach of employment contract in distant better; a much better; a higher; a stronger; an improved">a higher institution, and on the other hand, his boss has not profited in hone from this breach. In such a case, the harms which will be gotten don't drop beneath the category of any of the over sorts. To evaluate remedial harms in English law, two criteria of anticipated harms and reimbursable harms have been expressed. In expansion to these two criteria, the particular status of non-pecuniary harm must moreover be inspected from the viewpoint of how to repair helpful harms. ) Has made; In other words, in this sort of harms arrange, an amount of stipend is issued that meets the commitments of the oblige, in case the legally binding commitments were satisfied in an opportune and total way. In reality, fair as anticipated harms have a premise such as the reason of emolument in non-contractual liabilities. The reason for a non-contractual obligation is to put the harmed party in a circumstance where it shows up that the hurtful act has not been performed. Took. (Jackson, 1992, p. 109) The foremost common sort of helpful harm basis is anticipated harm. Anticipated harm basically incorporates the harmed guideline, but to incorporates other things that are:

Auxiliary harms: Incorporates harms that an individual regularly causes to avoid advance misfortunes or to supply substitution work or to return flawed merchandise that she has gone through.

Backhanded harms: These are harms that happen due to breach of contract, but they can not be included within the bunch of costs (repayment harms); Non-profit and cases such as tolerating a commitment with third parties or extra harms, such as real wounds or harm to property due to flawed conveyance products drop into this category. Of course, these harms can be compensated on the off chance that they are inside the anticipated run and desires of the parties to the contract. That's, they are not as well improbable; Assume, for illustration, that an individual offers a bovine with a ensure of its health, but the dairy animals get to be sick and the full crowd of the buyer gets to be sick. It'll be conveyed to the client (Jackson, 1992, p. 110)

Within the Joined together Kingdom, two strategies are utilized to calculate the anticipated harm: within the, to begin with, strategy, which is mostly used for flawed or inadequate execution that incorporates a fractional utility, the contrast in esteem between the execution concurred within the contract and the execution that Gotten by the obliging as harms. The moment strategy is utilized where the commitment has not been significantly performed or the execution is flawed or fragmented in a way that has no advantage to the harmed party. In this case, a sum of stipends is paid to the offended party, which is fundamental to get an elective execution. In harms, the harmed party will be compensated for the harm caused by his dependence and belief within the execution of the contract by the obligor; In truth, within the contract, the plaintiff may alter his position with certainty within the perused commitment. For case, the buyer of a plot of arriving may have caused costs related to the property claim (request costs) or may have missed out on openings for other possibly profitable contracts; Or has borrowed a trade to perform a contract or has set up an office; In this manner, in case of breach of contract, the respondent must compensate for such misfortunes that have emerged due to dependence and believe in his commitments. The reason for this sort of therapeutic harm is to put the harmed party in a position earlier to the conclusion of the contract and to depend on the commitments of the other party. Within the sense of risk law, repayment harms are benefits that have been misplaced due to dependence on the commitments studied and the harmed circumstance must be reestablished as in case it had not been concluded on a legally binding premise. (Jackson, 1992, p. 113, p.118)

This is often the address that must be replied to at this organization. What are the components of reinsurance harms and what are the costs and misfortunes that can be gotten with this measure? Return harms comprise of three components.

The first component is the costs brought about by the harmed party after the conclusion of the contract with certainty within the fulfillment of the commitment; This component is without a doubt achievable.

The second component is the costs caused by the obligor earlier to the conclusion of the contract, such costs don't drop inside the strict concept of dependence since at the time of this take a toll a commitment had not however been concluded. In any case, the UK legitimate framework applies a wide concept of dependence on this run the show, so that in case a claim for breach of contract is brought beneath the reinsurance run the show, it is certainly reasonable to get pre-contractual harms emerging from dependence. (James M.F, 2002, p. 313, p.319)

Portion Three - Misfortunes coming about from misfortune of opportunity to enter into other contracts. There's the foremost contradiction around accepting this component of reinsurance harms. At the show, a wide concept of subordinate benefits has been acknowledged by specialists. Which incorporates this component. In choosing each of the two criteria of expected damages and reversible harms, the claimant contains a choice; Be that as it may, in a few cases, the court may discover that a specific run the show is more fitting. Presently the address is, when is the harmed party willing to sue for harm? In reaction, two circumstances can be envisioned:

To begin with - within the occasion that he cannot demonstrate his potential benefit from the execution of the contract or the anticipated harms. A good example of this often exchanges that are exceedingly plausible. Or exchanges in which there's no anticipated premise for deciding the anticipated harms. (Katozian, 2008, p. 201)

Moment - where the harmed party (obligor) is willing to get a stipend for pre-contractual costs. In spite of the fact that, in rule, a choice must be made between anticipated and subordinate harms, in certain circumstances, it is conceivable to claim both harms without driving to "twofold harms". In other words, a combination of the two criteria is possible. First, we need to distinguish between these two disasters: non-critical physical disasters and non-critical non-physical disasters such as anger and discouragement due to breach of contract. There's a clear lawful run the show that harms can be gotten for physical wounds endured by the claimant as a result of a breach of contract; In compensation or compensation harms, the failure repays any benefits he has made due to breach of commitments. The premise of remedial harms is the anticipation of treacherously having a commitment in breach of the genuine harm dispensed on the obligor. This sort of harm is more often than not asked where the individual has entered into a contract including mumbles and, opposite to the two cases said over, the premise for assessing the harms isn't the misfortune to the obligor, but the benefit that the obligor has gotten from breach of contract. For this reason, a few creators don't consider helpful harms as a basis for surveying harms. At first, it was accepted that the cost paid as refundable harms might be refunded when there was a common breach of the commitment, that's, where the claimant had not gotten any portion of the execution. But numerous law scholastics have criticized the run of the show. And nowadays, most legal advisers accept that the money paid ought to be receivable on the premise of a breach of obligation; Whether it may be an infringement of a common commitment or a minor one. In English law, compensation harms have other occasions that appear to be particular to that legitimate framework. On the off chance that a third party offers, the buyer will be entitled to the continues of the deal, indeed in case, it exceeds the misfortune. Another case is the infringement of security commitments; Like an agent who receives a bribe, or where he is hired to purchase property for the initial, he offers his property to the initial. In these cases; The specialist must pay all the benefits he has earned to the initial. (Hosseini Modarres and Golshani, 2013, p.32)

In cases where one of the parties has abused the contract, but in none has not caused any harm to the other party, and the awfully little sum is typically decided as harms and is ruled. Determining this sort of harm isn't to compensate for the misfortune, but to reflect the ugliness of the breach of contract and incorporates a typical perspective. In typical harms, this court arrangement is the foremost fitting way of compensation. Of course, this strategy of emolument does not have a remedial viewpoint. In Iranian law, not at all like English law, there's no institution such as ostensible or typical harms, concurring to the standards of compensation such as no hurt. Hence, mere breach of contract by the obligor without causing harm to the obligee will not make the proper to get harms. Subsequently, "the got to cause misfortunes" is one of the conditions for making the proper to get harms in Iranian law. (Abdullahi, 2004, p.90)

Corrective harms have no therapeutic impact and are issued in arrange to rebuff and anticipate comparable behavior within the future. In truth, the issue of reformatory harms emerges where the obligee strikingly and whimsically abuses the contract. These sorts of harms are a special case to the common run the shows that harms are remedial. In calculating this sort of harm, the behavior of both offended parties ought to be considered. In specific, it ought to be famous that deciding the sum of harms will be adequate to punish the litigant. Typically, why a number of legal scholars accept that such commitments, which are more criminal in nature, can be balanced. And by alluding to passage 2 of Article 4 of the Respectful Obligation Law, in terms of discipline and discipline, these conditions that administer the ensure of breach of contract can be diminished. Lawful harms for breach of contract from the point of view of common law: In common law, any breach of contract, counting non-performance of the contract, delay within the execution of the contract, or flawed and fragmented execution of the contract, grants the offended party (claimant) the correct to sue and claim harms. The casualty has the proper to claim stipend for all the costs brought about within the frame of installment of cash, and as distant as conceivable, the payment of cash must put him in a position or circumstance from a financial point of see, which is able to be in that circumstance in the event that the contract is executed. Would take. (Katozian, 2005, p.102)

In English law, as in Iran, it is one of the essential divisions. Harms coming about from the act of respectful obligation "tort" and breach of contract to claim harms, it is essential that a mistake has happened. This blunder may be a gracious risk or breach of contract, whereas a breach of contract itself is a blunder. (Black, 1968, p. 164)

In common law, any breach of contract, counting non-performance of the contract, delay within the execution of the contract, delay within the execution of the contract, or imperfect and deficient execution of the contract awards the offended party (claimant) the correct to sue and claim harms. Claim all the costs brought about within the frame of installment, and as distant as conceivable, the installment ought to put him in a position or position from a financial point of seeing that he would have been in on the off chance that the contract had been executed. This implies that the offended party has the correct to get a net misfortune that has been denied for non-performance of the contract. Typically related to the principle of compensatory recompense. Within the law of the Commonwealth and the Joined together Kingdom, remuneration is the foremost critical and primary strategy of emolument. In this regard, composed law is distinctive from the legitimate framework of nations. Opposite to other authorization ensures a few of which are constrained or conditional and some of the time subject to the caution of the court, the stipend is continuously conceivable, indeed in case the breach of contract did not result in real misfortune to the claimant or the evidence. Has not submitted to the court with respect to the confirmation of the harm or the assurance of its sum, in which case the last mentioned will be entitled to get ostensible harms. (Baker, 1991, p. 174; Curcio, 1998, p.343; Olson, 1996, p. 13)

The good thing about such an administering is that it demonstrates, firstly, that the commitment has been damaged and, furthermore, that it is the union and acknowledgment of the rights of the claimant. The nature of these two sorts of risk is the same in terms of recompense. That's, in both cases, the harm to the individual due to breach of contract or the commission of a hurtful act (respectful obligation) must be compensated, and as Ruler Blackburn says: the casualty must be in a position sometime recently committing a mistake (breach of contract or respectful risk). In any case, the strategy of its execution and the strategy of deciding the harms are not the same in both. In respectful obligation, the offended party must be in a position sometime recently committing a hurtful act. Be that as it may, with respect to the harms coming about from the breach of contract, it must be in a state of total execution without any absconds or surrenders of the contract. In common, it ought to be famous that the regular strategy of emolument for breach of legally binding commitments within the courts of nations with a common legitimate framework is ordinarily to pay a stipend in cash, whereas, in nations with a composed legitimate framework, it is more often than not the strategy of compelling the guilty party to do so. Legally binding commitments are utilized. (Heriot,1997, p. 58; Black, 1968, 164)

As we have learned, within the case of the commitment to perform the commitment, the court powers the abusing party to fulfill the commitment forced on him by the contract. Be that as it may, in my conclusion, the courts of nations with a common-law framework are doubtful of the strategy of driving the parties to the contract to fulfill their legally binding commitments, and they consider this strategy to be cruel and unforgiving.

The contrast between the condition of "commitment" as one of the ensures of legally binding commitment and the condition of deciding legally binding harms can be expressed as takes after: No harms are required, indeed in the event that no harms are brought about, can be claimed from the violator without any decrease. In any case, within the case of a clear sum of harms, confirmation of the harm (whether fabric or non-profit, etc.) by the oblige is essential, and the conditions and characteristics of the claimable damages must be taken under consideration.

In any case, the sum set cannot be expanded or diminished relative to the real harm, which is comparative to the commitment in this regard. But what is the commitment and what is the harm decided within the contract, which is subject to Article 10 of the Correctional Code. It is essential for the parties to act in agreement with its arrangements.

### **3. Conclusion**

Be that as it may, all legitimate frameworks look for a full stipend. In this respect, due to the reality that the strategy of remuneration among other remuneration strategies within the UK, the legitimate framework of this nation has set exact criteria based on which the assurance of full emolument. It is more standard and precise. Getting assessment criteria such as anticipated, dependence, and compensation harms with particular components and subsets, and exact assurance of obstructions and conditions for making the correct to claim harms is a portion of this standard structure.

In differentiate, Iranian law within the confront of the issue of damages is generally adequate. This can be in spite of the reality that the legislator's refusal of the rule of the presence of a way of a stipend in infringement of legally binding commitments has not been considered with assurance. To correct the current situation and synchronize it with the advancement of diverse lawful frameworks within the confront of the issue of compensation through breach of commitment, the Iranian assembly can utilize the accomplishments of comparative law within the field of contract law, make a comprehensive framework of harms for breach of contract. In order to achieve this goal, in the first place, the types of compensable damages in Iranian law must be specified and the legislator must announce his firm opinion on issues such as; non-benefit, moral damages, etc. In the second stage, the criteria and criteria for damage assessment should be provided; Because, on the one hand, the Iranian judge in assessing damages should not be so unregulated from a legal point of view that he is demoted to the level of an expert.

On the other hand, the degree of the breach of the contract ought to not be considered so unforeseeable that these dangers might not be dispensed with, or secured by devices such as protections. Another essential point that I managed with within the course of my inquire about and it is essential to specify is the explanation that in English law non-profit harms have been acknowledged, but within the Iranian legitimate framework, Note 2 of 515 of an article of Iranian Civil Procedure Law of Respectful Strategy is critical. Non-profit harms cannot be claimed, whereas concurring to article 320 of Iranian Civil Law And the translation that was made with respect to Note 2 of Article 515 of the Code of Iranian Civil Procedure Law affirmed in 2000, can be caught on that in Iranian law, non-profit harms can too be claimed, but harms from harms and harms coming about from non-profit cannot be claimed.

In any case, in arrange to expel the uncertainty and avoid the issuance of diverse conclusions, it is way better for the Iranian lawmaker to unequivocally lay down the controls related to claiming non-profit harms due to non-fulfillment of commitments or delays in the fulfillment of legally binding commitments. Stipend for non-fulfillment of commitments could be a social and legal matter that has been built up to preserve arrange and adjust in society and to regard the contract between the parties to the contract. It appears that this issue ought to be treated with an extraordinary see and The security of the rights of the parties to the exchange ought to be subject to overwhelming commitments and conditions so that the oblige can never be bashful absent from satisfying the commitment beneath the guise and trouble of the commitment.

### **References**

- [1] Darabpour, M. (2006). civil liability arising from property damage, structures, and buildings (comparative study with English law). *Legal Research*, (44), 14.
- [2] Hajji A. B. (2001). methods of compensation in civil liability. *Daneshvar bimonthly*, (36).
- [3] Heuston, R. F. V. & Shambers, R. S. (1981). *Salmond & Heuston on the Law of Tort (8th ed.)*. London.
- [4] Hosseini M., Seyed M., and Golshani, E. (2013). By compensating for the payment of contractual obligations in British law and its design in Iranian law, *Journal of Civil Law Knowledge No. 2*
- [5] Jackson P. (1992). *Professional negligence (3rd ed.)*. London. *Sweet & Maxwell*.
- [6] James, M. F. (2002). *Construction Law (2nd ed.)*. London, *Palgrave*.
- [7] Jone, G., & Goodhart, W. (1986). *Specific Performance (1st ed.)*. London-*Butter Worth*.
- [8] Katouzian, N. (1995). *coercive liability and civil liability*. Tehran, *Tehran University Publications*.
- [9] Katouzian, N. (1997). *general rules of contracts (Vol. 4, 2nd ed.)*. Tehran, Inc. publication.
- [10] Katouzian, N. (1999). *specific and complex responsibilities (8th ed.)*. Tehran *University Publications, Tehran*.
- [11] Katouzian, N. (2004). *liability arising from the manufacturing fault (2nd ed.)*. Tehran, *Tehran University Publications*.
- [12] Lawson, F. H. (1980). *Remedies of English Law (2nd ed.)*. London, *Butterworths*.
- [13] Movahedian, G. (2006). *labor rights (2nd ed.)*. *Fekrsazan Publications*.

- [14] Parchami J. M. (2000). Review of the General Conditions of the Old and New treaty, Master thesis in Civil Engineering, *Construction Management Engineering, Iran University of Science and Technology*.
- [15] Qobadian, V. (2008). principles and concepts in contemporary architecture of West (8th ed.). *Publishing of Cultural Research Bureau, Tehran*.
- [16] Rafeie, A. (2013). labor rights (labor legal opinions and legal system governing labor contracts in Iran). *Tehran, Negahbineh Publication*.
- [17] Ranjbari, A. (1998). labor rights. *Tehran, Majd publications*.
- [18] Rogers, W. V. H. (1997). Tort, Seet & Maxwell (4th ed.). *London*.
- [19] Rubin, H. W., & Scheil, W. H. (1978). *Punitive damage awards the insurance industry in placed on notice*.
- [20] Safai, S. H., & Zakeri-Nia, H. (2015). comparative analysis of compensation practices in the *non-contractual civil liability Privacy Policy Studies Journal, Vol 45, No 2*.
- [21] Shahidi, M. (2001). Commitments, *Majd Publications.Tehran (1st ed.)*.
- [22] Tune, A. (1971). *International Encyclopedia of Comparative Law*. London.