

The Role of Judicial Governance in Combating Administrative Corruption: A Study of Activation Guarantees in Light of Digital Transformation

Dr. Saoucen Kadri

Faculty of Law and Political Science, March 19, 1962 Djillali Liabes, University, Sidi Bel Abbès,
Algeria

Member of the Public Services and Development Laboratory

Email : Saoucen.Kadri@univ-sba.dz

Received : 21/01/2026 ; Accepted : 25/06/2026 ; Published : 17/07/2026

Abstract

This study examines the role of judicial governance in combating administrative corruption in light of digital transformation, by highlighting how digitization can enhance transparency and procedural traceability, while also raising risks related to data manipulation and weak cybersecurity. It focuses on the Algerian experience in modernizing the justice sector, with reference to the French and European experiences, in order to identify the legal, institutional, and technical guarantees needed to make judicial digitization an effective anti-corruption tool rather than a merely formal modernization of procedures. The study concludes that the effectiveness of such governance remains dependent on the integration of legal rules, technical infrastructure, and human competence within the justice system.

Keywords: Judicial governance; Administrative corruption; Digital transformation; Justice modernization; Activation guarantees.

Introduction

Administrative corruption is no longer an incidental phenomenon that can be reduced to isolated violations of public service ethics. Rather, it has evolved into a legal and institutional challenge that affects the very essence of the relationship between public administration and citizens, with significant implications for the principle of legality, the proper functioning of public services, and public confidence in state institutions. The abuse of authority, favoritism, bribery, obstruction of administrative processes, and manipulation of administrative files all illustrate that administrative corruption not only depletes public resources but also undermines the concept of the rule of law, under which public administration is expected to operate in accordance with the law and remain subject to judicial oversight and accountability.¹

This phenomenon has become increasingly complex in the context of digital transformation, as public administration has gradually shifted from traditional paper-based methods to electronic systems for service delivery, data exchange, file management, and communication with service users. Although this transformation offers promising opportunities to enhance transparency, improve efficiency, and reduce direct interaction between public officials and citizens, it also gives rise to new risks related to data manipulation, weaknesses in information system security, and unequal access to digital services. Consequently, digitalization alone cannot eliminate administrative corruption unless it is

accompanied by legal, institutional, and technical safeguards capable of regulating and securing its implementation.²

Within this context, the judiciary emerges as one of the fundamental safeguards against administrative misconduct, not merely as an authority responsible for adjudicating disputes, but also as a mechanism for upholding the principle of legality, reviewing administrative actions, and protecting rights and freedoms. However, the effectiveness of this role has become increasingly dependent upon the ability of the justice system itself to embrace the principles of governance, including judicial independence, transparency, accountability, efficiency, reasoned judicial decisions, and the sound management of judicial data, particularly following the transition of the justice sector into a digital environment characterized by the modernization of procedures, the digitalization of case files, and the adoption of modern communication technologies throughout various stages of judicial proceedings.³

Accordingly, judicial governance represents a comprehensive reform-oriented approach that extends beyond the narrow concept of court administration to become a regulatory framework governing the exercise of judicial functions within an evolving legal and digital environment. It enhances the judiciary's capacity to oversee public administration, strengthens its commitment to transparency, reinforces the obligation to provide reasoned judgments, and ensures the traceability of judicial procedures, thereby reducing the areas of opacity that enable administrative corruption to flourish. Nevertheless, these objectives can only be achieved through effective implementation mechanisms that transform judicial digitalization into a genuine instrument for combating corruption rather than a merely formal modernization of procedures and technical tools.⁴

The significance of this study lies in its attempt to establish the conceptual and practical relationship between judicial governance and the fight against administrative corruption within the framework of digital transformation. It further examines the adequacy of the safeguards adopted by Algeria in the course of modernizing its justice sector and assesses their effectiveness in strengthening judicial oversight over public administration while simultaneously promoting both legal certainty and digital security.⁵

Accordingly, the study seeks to address the following research question: To what extent can judicial governance contribute to combating administrative corruption in Algeria in the context of digital transformation, and what safeguards are necessary to ensure the effective implementation of this role? To address this question, the study adopts the descriptive approach to define the fundamental concepts related to administrative corruption, judicial governance, and digital transformation. It further employs the analytical approach to examine the legal, institutional, and technical safeguards associated with the modernization of the justice sector and the fight against administrative corruption under Algerian legislation, while making limited use of the comparative approach through references to selected comparative experiences, particularly those of France and the European Union.

Based on this framework, the study is organized into two main sections. The first examines judicial governance as an approach to combating administrative corruption in the context of digital transformation by defining the concepts of administrative corruption and judicial governance and analyzing the relationship between them within the digital environment. The second examines the safeguards for implementing judicial governance in combating administrative corruption under Algerian legislation, with particular emphasis on the relevant legal and regulatory safeguards, followed by the technical and institutional mechanisms that support their effective implementation.

Section One: Judicial Governance as an Approach to Combating Administrative Corruption in the Context of Digital Transformation

Examining the role of judicial governance in combating administrative corruption requires an understanding of the interaction among three fundamental dimensions: administrative corruption as a manifestation of the abuse of public authority; judicial governance as a framework for enhancing the performance of the justice system; and digital transformation as a new environment that has reshaped the methods of public administration, oversight, and adjudication. Although digitalization promotes efficiency, transparency, and the reduction of direct interaction between public officials and citizens, it does not, in itself, constitute an absolute safeguard against corruption in the absence of adequate legal, technical, and institutional protections. Accordingly, this section first examines the concepts of administrative corruption and judicial governance within the digital environment and then analyzes the role of judicial governance in combating administrative corruption in the context of digital transformation.⁶

First: Administrative Corruption and Judicial Governance in the Digital Environment

Understanding the relationship between administrative corruption and judicial governance in the era of digital transformation requires a comprehensive analysis of both concepts. Combating corruption depends not only on identifying and defining administrative misconduct but also on determining the institutional mechanisms capable of controlling and holding it accountable. While administrative corruption often thrives in environments characterized by procedural ambiguity, weak oversight, and broad discretionary powers, judicial governance seeks to restore confidence in the justice system through transparency, judicial independence, effectiveness, and the traceability of procedural processes, particularly as these processes increasingly operate within a more complex digital environment.

1) Administrative Corruption Between the Traditional Concept and Its Digital Extensions

Administrative corruption is among the most serious threats to the proper functioning of public services because it fundamentally transforms public office from an instrument for serving the public interest into a means of achieving unlawful private interests. The consequences of such misconduct extend beyond financial losses to the public treasury or the disruption of public services. They also undermine public trust in administrative institutions, reinforce perceptions of inequality before public administration, and weaken the practical application of the principle of legality. Consequently, administrative corruption should not be viewed merely as an ethical failure on the part of public officials but rather as evidence of deeper structural deficiencies in systems of oversight, accountability, and transparency within public administration.⁷

Administrative corruption manifests itself in various forms, including bribery, abuse of influence, favoritism, unlawful mediation, manipulation of administrative files, obstruction of citizens' interests, and abuse of official authority. Although these practices differ in appearance, they share a common characteristic: the misuse of official position to obtain an unlawful private benefit or to cause harm to others. Several studies have indicated that traditional administrative environments, characterized by multiple intermediaries, lengthy procedures, and complex bureaucratic processes, provide fertile ground for the proliferation of such practices, particularly where oversight and monitoring mechanisms are weak.⁸

Digital transformation, however, has fundamentally reshaped this phenomenon. On the one hand, it has contributed to reducing certain traditional forms of corruption by minimizing direct contact between officials and citizens, documenting transactions, and enabling the traceability of administrative procedures. On the other hand, in the absence of adequate safeguards, it may generate new forms of misconduct, such as data manipulation, unauthorized control over access to digital platforms, or the concealment of electronic evidence capable of establishing legal responsibility. Accordingly, corruption cannot be eliminated merely by replacing paper-based procedures with digital systems; rather, it requires a comprehensive governance framework capable of regulating the use of digital technologies and clearly defining responsibilities.⁹

Accordingly, administrative corruption in the digital environment should not be understood merely as a direct extension of traditional corruption but rather as a phenomenon capable of adapting to emerging technological environments. This transformation requires the judiciary to develop more advanced oversight mechanisms and compels judicial governance to evolve from ensuring the integrity of judicial proceedings alone to safeguarding the integrity of the digital environment within which both public administration and the justice system operate.

2) The Concept of Judicial Governance and Its Distinction from Digital Governance and E-Government

Judicial governance is founded upon the administration of the justice system in accordance with the principles of judicial independence, transparency, accountability, effectiveness, and quality of performance, thereby enabling the judiciary to protect rights and ensure the legality of administrative actions. Accordingly, judicial governance extends beyond improving the internal organization of courts to encompass the sound exercise of the judicial function itself by ensuring procedural clarity, reasoned judicial decisions, the timely resolution of disputes, and the traceability of judicial proceedings.

Judicial governance should not be confused with either e-government or digital governance. E-government primarily concerns the delivery of public services through digital technologies, whereas digital governance focuses on regulating decision-making processes, public policies, and the allocation of responsibilities through technological means. Judicial governance, by contrast, is more specialized in both scope and function, as it concerns the manner in which the judiciary exercises its constitutional role in safeguarding legality and combating administrative misconduct, rather than merely digitalizing case files or establishing electronic platforms.¹⁰

In the context of digital transformation, the importance of judicial governance has become increasingly evident, as the administration of justice now relies extensively on information systems, electronic archiving, the digital exchange of documents, and the use of modern communication technologies in various judicial procedures. Consequently, the digitalization of the justice sector alone is insufficient to achieve genuine judicial governance unless it is accompanied by guarantees of transparency, data protection, accountability, and the continuous enhancement of judicial performance.⁽¹¹⁾

Second: The Impact of Judicial Governance on Combating Administrative Corruption in the Context of Digital Transformation

Defining the concept of judicial governance and distinguishing it from related concepts is not, in itself, sufficient. It is equally important to examine its practical impact in addressing administrative

corruption, particularly in light of the ongoing digital transformation of public administration and the justice system. The value of digital transformation lies not merely in replacing paper-based procedures with electronic systems, but rather in its ability to make administrative procedures more transparent, decisions more traceable, and accountability more visible to oversight mechanisms. Accordingly, judicial governance provides the institutional framework through which digitalization is transformed from a neutral technological process into a legal and institutional instrument for promoting transparency, accountability, and the prevention of administrative misconduct.

1) Judicial Governance as a Mechanism for Enhancing Transparency and Accountability

Judicial governance plays a fundamental role in combating administrative corruption by strengthening judicial oversight of administrative actions. Through its authority to review the legality of administrative decisions, annul unlawful acts, and impose legal responsibility where appropriate, the judiciary constitutes an institutional safeguard against administrative misconduct. However, this function can achieve its full effectiveness only when the justice system itself operates in accordance with the principles of transparency, sound organization, procedural efficiency, and the traceability of judicial proceedings.¹²

The significance of judicial governance is also reflected in the requirement that judicial decisions be properly reasoned and that procedures remain transparent. Reasoned judgments disclose the legal and factual foundations upon which judicial decisions are based, thereby enabling litigants and appellate authorities to assess the correctness of judicial reasoning. Likewise, the digital traceability of judicial procedures facilitates effective monitoring of case files and reduces opportunities for concealing documents, delaying administrative processes, or manipulating the order of case files—practices that frequently provide opportunities for administrative corruption.

¹³

Accordingly, the impact of judicial governance extends beyond ex post judicial review of administrative actions to include a preventive function. An administration that recognizes its decisions are subject to judicial challenge, that its procedures are fully traceable, and that the judiciary is capable of reviewing the legality of its actions is less likely to engage in administrative misconduct. Judicial governance therefore serves as an effective mechanism of institutional deterrence, reinforcing transparency and accountability in the relationship between public administration and service users.

2) Judicial Digital Transformation Between Reducing Opportunities for Corruption and Creating New Risks

There is little doubt that the digital transformation of the justice system can contribute to reducing certain opportunities for administrative corruption when supported by clear procedural frameworks, mechanisms ensuring the traceability of case files, comprehensive documentation of operations, and the minimization of unnecessary human intervention. Nevertheless, these advantages do not make digitalization a guarantee in itself, as the digital environment may also generate new forms of risk, including data manipulation, disruption of digital platforms, inadequate data protection, and unequal access to digital judicial services.¹⁴

On this basis, judicial governance in the era of digital transformation should not be understood as an unconditional reliance on technological solutions. Rather, it requires the rational use of technology within a framework governed by legal, technical, and institutional safeguards. Digital

transformation must therefore remain guided by an appropriate balance between procedural efficiency and the guarantees of a fair trial, between transparency and the protection of privacy, and between the effectiveness of judicial administration and every litigant's right to equal access to justice.

In conclusion, the digitalization of the justice system represents a genuine opportunity to combat administrative corruption. However, its full potential can only be realized when it is integrated within a sound framework of judicial governance that places technology at the service of transparency, accountability, and the rule of law, rather than reducing it to a merely formal modernization of judicial procedures.

Section Two: Safeguards for the Effective Implementation of Judicial Governance in Combating Administrative Corruption under Algerian Legislation in the Context of Digital Transformation

The effectiveness of judicial governance in combating administrative corruption cannot be achieved merely through the digitalization of the justice system. Rather, it depends upon the existence of comprehensive legal, regulatory, technical, and institutional safeguards capable of ensuring transparency, the traceability of judicial procedures, and the protection of judicial data against manipulation and cyber intrusion. As part of its efforts to modernize the justice sector, Algeria has adopted a range of digital mechanisms, including the digitalization of case files, the development of remote judicial services, the implementation of electronic signatures and electronic certification, and the use of audiovisual communication technologies in certain judicial proceedings. These mechanisms derive their true value only insofar as they contribute to improving the administration of justice and strengthening judicial oversight over public administration.¹⁵ Accordingly, this section first examines the legal and regulatory safeguards, followed by the technical and institutional safeguards.

First: Legal and Regulatory Safeguards

Judicial governance cannot effectively perform its role in combating administrative corruption unless it is supported by a comprehensive legal and regulatory framework governing the operation of the justice system and enabling the judiciary to exercise effective oversight over public administration free from undue influence or interference. Although digitalization constitutes an important step toward the modernization of justice, it remains dependent upon a legal framework that regulates its implementation, ensures the integrity of judicial procedures, and protects the rights of litigants so that digital technologies do not become merely technical instruments detached from the fundamental objectives of justice.

1) Guaranteeing Judicial Independence, Reasoned Judgments, and Judicial Accountability

Judicial independence constitutes the primary safeguard for the effective implementation of judicial governance in combating administrative corruption. The judiciary cannot effectively supervise public administration unless it remains free from external pressures or directives that may compromise its impartiality. Administrative corruption frequently flourishes where oversight mechanisms are weak or where administrative authorities perceive themselves to be beyond accountability. Consequently, the existence of an independent judiciary capable of reviewing the legality of administrative actions constitutes the cornerstone of effective judicial oversight over public administration.¹⁶

Judicial independence alone, however, is insufficient unless it is complemented by another equally fundamental safeguard: the requirement that judicial decisions be properly reasoned. Reasoned judgments reveal the legal and intellectual reasoning upon which the judge based the decision, thereby preventing the issuance of vague decisions that cannot be properly understood or subjected to judicial review. The Algerian Constitution expressly enshrines this principle by requiring that judicial judgments and orders be reasoned, thereby elevating judicial reasoning from a mere procedural requirement to a constitutional guarantee for the proper administration of justice.¹⁷

The significance of reasoned judgments becomes particularly evident in disputes concerning administrative corruption or the legality of administrative decisions. A well-reasoned judgment makes it possible to identify abuses of authority, violations of the law, or infringements of the principle of equality before public services. It also enables litigants and appellate courts to assess the soundness of judicial reasoning, thereby making judicial reasoning an essential instrument for ensuring both transparency and accountability.

Judicial accountability, moreover, should not be regarded as incompatible with judicial independence. Rather, it represents its necessary complement, provided that it operates within the limits prescribed by law and does not interfere with judicial discretion or the judge's freedom of conviction. In this context, judicial accountability refers to subjecting the justice system to standards of integrity, quality, and effectiveness while ensuring that judicial independence does not evolve into institutional isolation that weakens oversight or undermines public confidence. Sound judicial governance is therefore founded upon a delicate balance: an independent judiciary in its decision-making, transparent in its procedures, and accountable in its performance.

2) Ensuring the Modernization of Justice and the Digitalization of Judicial Procedures

The modernization of the justice system constitutes one of the principal organizational safeguards adopted by Algeria to enhance the performance of the judiciary and improve its responsiveness to the requirements of transparency and efficiency. This policy has been implemented through the digital transformation of the justice sector, the integration of judicial institutions into information systems, and the expansion of remote judicial services, thereby reducing reliance on paper-based procedures and simplifying the relationship between litigants and judicial institutions. Studies examining the digital transformation of the Algerian justice sector indicate that these modernization efforts aim to establish a digital justice system capable of improving judicial performance and enhancing the quality of judicial services.¹⁸

The Law on the Modernization of Justice occupies a particularly significant position in this regard, as it provides the legal foundation for establishing a centralized information system within the Ministry of Justice and for adopting digital mechanisms for the management of judicial files and services. This system is not confined to the internal modernization of judicial administration; it also serves a preventive function in combating administrative corruption by making the movement of case files fully traceable and by reducing opportunities for concealing documents, delaying judicial procedures, or unlawfully interfering with the organization of judicial files.¹⁹

Among the most important manifestations of this modernization is the adoption of electronic signatures and electronic certification as essential safeguards for protecting digital documents and electronic transactions against forgery or repudiation. Likewise, the use of remote videoconferencing has emerged as an important mechanism for expediting judicial proceedings

and reducing the burdens associated with travel and physical attendance. Nevertheless, its implementation must always remain subject to the guarantees of a fair trial, foremost among them the protection of the rights of the defense and the effective participation of all parties in judicial proceedings.²⁰

Accordingly, the modernization of the justice system in Algeria constitutes a central safeguard for the effective implementation of judicial governance. However, its effectiveness can only be fully realized when it is accompanied by guarantees of transparency, data protection, reasoned judicial decisions, and equal access to digital judicial services. The objective is not merely to digitalize the judiciary, but to establish a justice system capable of ensuring effective oversight over public administration, detecting administrative misconduct, and strengthening public confidence in judicial protection against administrative corruption.

Second: Technical and Institutional Safeguards

Legal and regulatory safeguards alone are insufficient to ensure the effective implementation of judicial governance in combating administrative corruption unless they are reinforced by technical and institutional safeguards capable of protecting the digital environment within which judicial procedures and data operate. In the context of digitalization, administrative corruption may manifest itself through the disruption of digital platforms, the manipulation of data, the concealment of digital traces, or the abuse of technical privileges. Accordingly, the principal challenge lies not merely in introducing technology into the justice system, but in securing, governing, and supporting it through qualified human resources capable of using digital technologies effectively and responsibly.

1) Cybersecurity, Data Protection, and the Digital Traceability of Judicial Procedures

The protection of judicial data constitutes one of the most significant technical safeguards required by judicial governance in the era of digital transformation. The digitalization of judicial files and procedures exposes the justice system to the management of substantial volumes of highly sensitive information relating to the identity of litigants, the substance of disputes, documentary evidence, judicial records, and court decisions. Where the protection of such data is inadequate, digitalization may cease to serve as an instrument of transparency and instead become a source of violations of individual rights, opportunities for manipulation and concealment, and a factor undermining public confidence in the justice system.²¹

Within this framework, cybersecurity assumes a central role, serving as the technical shield that protects the digital judicial system against cyberattacks, unauthorized modification, and operational disruption. Every digital judicial procedure, regardless of its apparent simplicity, presupposes the existence of a secure technological infrastructure capable of ensuring the integrity of document transmission, the authenticity of electronic signatures, the confidentiality of communications, and the stability of electronic databases. Consequently, electronic signatures and electronic certification should not be regarded merely as technical means of verifying the origin of electronic documents. Rather, they perform the broader function of strengthening confidence in digital judicial procedures and protecting judicial documents against denial, forgery, or alteration. Studies concerning the digitalization of judicial procedures have demonstrated that the Algerian legislature has attached considerable importance to these mechanisms because of their role in safeguarding the integrity of electronically transmitted documents and communications.²²

Similarly, the digital traceability of judicial procedures constitutes a safeguard with a direct impact on combating administrative corruption, as it enables the identification of the movement of case files, the authority responsible for each procedural step, and the exact date on which every action was performed. Such traceability significantly limits opportunities for unlawful interference with judicial files and reduces the possibility of concealing documents or delaying procedures without legal justification. Administrative corruption frequently thrives in areas lacking transparency, whereas properly designed digital traceability transforms judicial procedures into processes that remain fully subject to review and accountability.

Nevertheless, such traceability must not result in undue interference with privacy or the confidentiality of judicial files, thereby requiring the establishment of a careful balance between transparency and data protection. Not all judicial information is suitable for publication or public dissemination, and digital openness should never imply the removal of safeguards protecting personal data. This balance is clearly reflected in the French experience concerning the publication of judicial decisions as open data, where the disclosure of judgments is preceded by the anonymization of identifying information in order to safeguard the privacy of individuals mentioned in judicial decisions.²³

At the level of the European Union, the same approach is reflected through the regulation of secure electronic data exchange in the field of judicial cooperation in civil and criminal matters via the e-CODEX system. This illustrates the principle that the digitalization of justice cannot be separated from secure data exchange and the preservation of confidence in judicial communications. Likewise, the European framework governing the digitalization of judicial cooperation and access to justice in cross-border matters confirms that digital transformation, even within advanced comparative experiences, is founded not solely upon technology but also upon safeguards designed to secure communications, improve efficiency, and facilitate access to justice.²⁴

2) Capacity Building, Institutional Coordination, and Learning from Comparative Experiences

Digital judicial governance cannot function effectively without qualified human resources capable of understanding digital transformation and employing it in the service of justice. Regardless of the sophistication of technological tools, their effectiveness remains limited if judges and judicial personnel perceive them merely as administrative burdens or formal procedural requirements. Consequently, continuous professional training constitutes an essential institutional safeguard, enabling actors within the justice system to understand digital technologies, operate electronic platforms, protect judicial data, and properly manage digital evidence and electronic documents in accordance with the principles of legality and transparency.

The importance of such training becomes even greater in the fight against administrative corruption, as this form of corruption may increasingly conceal itself within technical processes that can only be understood by individuals possessing adequate digital expertise. Judges or judicial personnel lacking sufficient digital competence may be unable to detect procedural irregularities, assess the consequences of data manipulation, or understand the risks affecting the integrity of electronic evidence. Accordingly, developing digitally competent judicial and administrative professionals performs both preventive and supervisory functions simultaneously.²⁵

Alongside professional training, institutional coordination constitutes an equally indispensable safeguard. Combating administrative corruption is not the responsibility of the judiciary alone but requires coordinated interaction among judicial authorities, public administrations, oversight bodies, and institutions responsible for information system security. Administrative corruption often follows complex patterns involving administrative documents, administrative decisions, digital transactions, and judicial files. Consequently, the absence of effective institutional coordination may hinder the judiciary's ability to obtain relevant information, prolong judicial proceedings, or result in the loss of digital evidence capable of proving administrative misconduct. Furthermore, learning from comparative experiences should not be understood as the automatic transplantation of foreign legal models, but rather as benefiting from the safeguards developed within advanced legal systems. The European experience demonstrates that the digitalization of justice is inseparable from secure electronic communications, robust data protection, and improved access to justice. Similarly, the French experience illustrates the importance of balancing the publication of judicial information and the promotion of transparency with the protection of personal privacy through the anonymization of sensitive information. Such an approach provides valuable guidance for the continued development of the Algerian judicial system, particularly in relation to expanding digital judicial services and making selected judicial information accessible to the public.²⁶

Accordingly, continuous professional training, effective institutional coordination, and the informed adoption of lessons drawn from comparative experiences constitute essential institutional safeguards that enhance the capacity of judicial governance to combat administrative corruption in the context of digital transformation. A judicial institution does not become genuinely digital merely by possessing electronic platforms; rather, it becomes so when it develops a modern organizational culture, highly qualified human resources, and cooperative institutional mechanisms that ensure every digital procedure remains subject to effective oversight and accountability whenever necessary.

Conclusion

The foregoing analysis demonstrates that judicial governance has emerged as an indispensable framework for combating administrative corruption in the era of digital transformation. The mere digitalization of public administration and the justice system is, in itself, insufficient to curb manifestations of misconduct unless it is underpinned by an independent judiciary, transparent procedures, traceable processes, and a robust technological infrastructure capable of safeguarding data against manipulation and cyber intrusion. Although administrative corruption has traditionally been associated with the abuse of public office, within the digital environment it may assume more sophisticated and less visible forms, including data manipulation, the obstruction of access to public services, and the misuse of technical privileges.

The study concludes that Algeria has made notable progress toward the modernization of its justice sector through the digitalization of judicial procedures, the development of integrated information systems, the adoption of electronic signatures and electronic certification, and the broader use of modern communication technologies in selected judicial proceedings. Nevertheless, the effectiveness of these mechanisms remains contingent upon their incorporation into a comprehensive framework of judicial governance that views digital transformation as a means of enhancing transparency,

expediting the adjudication of disputes, minimizing opportunities for file manipulation, and reinforcing judicial oversight over public administration.

Accordingly, the effective implementation of judicial governance extends beyond the existence of legal and regulatory provisions to encompass technical and institutional safeguards. These include, foremost, the protection of judicial data, the strengthening of cybersecurity, the continuous training of judges and judicial personnel, and the enhancement of coordination among judicial authorities, oversight institutions, and anti-corruption bodies. Moreover, comparative experiences, particularly those of France and the European Union, demonstrate that the success of digital justice ultimately depends on maintaining an appropriate balance between transparency and the protection of privacy, as well as between procedural efficiency and the guarantees of a fair trial.

In conclusion, combating administrative corruption in the context of digital transformation cannot be achieved solely through the transition to digital administration or electronic justice. Rather, it requires sound judicial governance that transforms digitalization into an effective instrument for transparency, accountability, and the protection of rights, rather than a mere procedural modernization. Consequently, there remains a pressing need to strengthen the protection of judicial data, advance cybersecurity measures, and expand digital capacity-building within the justice sector in order to establish a resilient digital justice system capable of ensuring effective administrative oversight and consolidating public confidence in the rule of law.

List of Sources and References

First: Legal Texts

1. People's Democratic Republic of Algeria. **Presidential Decree No. 20-442** of December 30, 2020, concerning the promulgation of the constitutional amendment approved by the referendum of November 1, 2020. *Official Gazette*, No. 82, issued on December 30, 2020.
2. People's Democratic Republic of Algeria. **Law No. 15-03** of February 1, 2015, concerning the modernization of the justice system. *Official Gazette*, No. 06, issued on February 10, 2015.
3. People's Democratic Republic of Algeria. **Law No. 15-04** of February 1, 2015, establishing the general rules relating to electronic signatures and electronic certification. *Official Gazette*, No. 06, issued on February 10, 2015.

Second: Comparative Official Sources

1. European Parliament and Council of the European Union. Regulation (EU) 2022/850 of 30 May 2022 on a Computerised System for the Cross-border Electronic Exchange of Data in the Area of Judicial Cooperation in Civil and Criminal Matters (e-CODEX System). *Official Journal of the European Union*, L 150, June 1, 2022, pp. 1–19.
2. European Parliament and Council of the European Union. Regulation (EU) 2023/2844 on the Digitalisation of Judicial Cooperation and Access to Justice in Cross-border Civil, Commercial and Criminal Matters. *Official Journal of the European Union*, 2023.
3. French Ministry of Justice. Open Data of Judicial Decisions. France: Ministry of Justice. Accessed May 30, 2026.

Third: Academic Articles and Studies

1. Zaidi El Aid and Hussein Ben Daoud. "Electronic Governance and Its Role in Consolidating E-Government." *Journal of Legal Studies and Research*, Vol. 10, No. 1, January 2025, pp. 208–227.

2. Youssef El Zine, Cherifa, and IchrakMenad. "The Role of Electronic Administration in Combating Administrative Corruption." *Journal of Academic Studies*, Vol. 03, No. 03, 2021, pp. 142–160.
3. NassiraBenkrou and El Habib Thabeti. "The Role of E-Government in Combating Administrative Corruption: The Case of Algeria." *Journal of Administration and Economics Research*, Vol. 01, No. 02, June 2019, pp. 41–60.
4. Kheniche Mokhtar and Djilali Ben Abbou. "The Journey of Digital Transformation in the Algerian Justice Sector." *Al-Mi'yar Journal*, Vol. 26, No. 7, 2022, p. 297 et seq.
5. BouamraOkba. "The Digitalization of Judicial Procedures and the Speed of Criminal Trials: What Relationship?" *Journal of Law and Interdisciplinary Sciences*, Vol. 03, No. 03, 2024, pp. 139–154.

Footnotes

¹NassiraBerknou and El Habib Thabeti, "The Role of E-Government in Combating Administrative Corruption: The Case of Algeria," *Journal of Administration and Economics Research* 1, no. 2 (June 2019): 42–43.

²Cherifa Youssef El Zine and IchrakMenad, "The Role of Electronic Administration in Combating Administrative Corruption," *Journal of Academic Studies* 3, no. 3 (2021): 142–145.

³Mokhtar Kheniche and Djilali Ben Abbou, "The Journey of Digital Transformation in the Algerian Justice Sector," *Al-Mi'yar Journal* 26, no. 7 (2022): 297–300.

⁴Mokhtar Kheniche, op. cit., p. 307.

⁵People's Democratic Republic of Algeria, Law No. 15-03 of February 1, 2015, concerning the modernization of the justice system, *Official Gazette*, No. 06, issued on February 10, 2015, pp. 5–6.

⁶Cherifa Youssef El Zine and IchrakMenad, op. cit., pp. 142–145.

⁷NassiraBerknou and El Habib Thabeti, op. cit., pp. 42–43.

⁸Berknou and Thabeti, op. cit., pp. 42–44.

⁹El Zine and Menad, op. cit., pp. 142–145.

¹⁰El Aid Zaidi and Hussein Ben Daoud, op. cit., pp. 212–214.

¹¹Mokhtar Kheniche and Djilali Ben Abbou, op. cit., pp. 297–300.

¹²Kheniche and Ben Abbou, op. cit., pp. 298–300.

¹³OkbaBouamra, "The Digitalization of Judicial Procedures and the Speed of Criminal Trials: What Relationship?" *Journal of Law and Interdisciplinary Sciences* 3, no. 3 (2024): 139–142.

¹⁴Bouamra, op. cit., pp. 140–142.

¹⁵Mokhtar Kheniche and Djilali Ben Abbou, op. cit., pp. 306–307.

¹⁶NassiraBerknou and El Habib Thabeti, op. cit., pp. 42–44.

¹⁷People's Democratic Republic of Algeria, Presidential Decree No. 20-442 of December 30, 2020, concerning the promulgation of the constitutional amendment approved by the referendum of November 1, 2020, Official Gazette, No. 82, issued on December 30, 2020.

¹⁸Kheniche and Ben Abbou, op. cit., pp. 297–300.

¹⁹People's Democratic Republic of Algeria, Law No. 15-03 of February 1, 2015, concerning the modernization of the justice system, op. cit.

²⁰People's Democratic Republic of Algeria, Law No. 15-04 of February 1, 2015, establishing the general rules relating to electronic signatures and electronic certification, Official Gazette, No. 06, issued on February 10, 2015.

²¹Bouamra, op. cit., pp. 141–144.

²²People's Democratic Republic of Algeria, Law No. 15-04, op. cit.

²³French Ministry of Justice, “Open Data of Judicial Decisions,” France, accessed May 30, 2026.

²⁴European Parliament and Council of the European Union, Regulation (EU) 2022/850 of 30 May 2022 on a Computerised System for the Cross-border Electronic Exchange of Data in the Area of Judicial Cooperation in Civil and Criminal Matters (e-CODEX System), Official Journal of the European Union L 150, June 1, 2022, pp. 1–19; European Parliament and Council of the European Union, Regulation (EU) 2023/2844 on the Digitalisation of Judicial Cooperation and Access to Justice in Cross-border Civil, Commercial and Criminal Matters, Official Journal of the European Union, 2023.

²⁵Kheniche and Ben Abbou, op. cit., pp. 300–322.

²⁶European Parliament and Council of the European Union, Regulation (EU) 2022/850, op. cit.