



Legal Predictability of Contractual Damages in Iranian Private Law Based on Empirical Evaluation of Published Judicial Decisions and Statutory Principles

Mojtaba Horri

Doctorate in Criminal Law and Criminology from the Arman Sazan Danesh Afrin International Institute of Science and Technology

Article info

Received: 12.06.2026

Accepted: 05.08.2026

Available Online: 09.08.2026

Checked for Plagiarism: Yes

Keywords:

Contractual Damages, Legal Predictability, Iranian Private Law, Judicial Decisions, Contract Law

ABSTRACT

Legal predictability is one of the essential indicators of an efficient private law system because it enables contracting parties to estimate legal consequences before disputes arise. In the Iranian legal system, contractual damages are governed by statutory provisions, judicial interpretation, and evolving judicial practice. Nevertheless, differences in judicial reasoning and the absence of unified interpretative standards have generated considerable uncertainty regarding the determination and enforcement of contractual damages. This study investigates the level of legal predictability of contractual damages in Iranian private law through an empirical evaluation of published judicial decisions together with statutory principles governing contractual liability. A doctrinal-empirical research design was employed by integrating qualitative legal analysis with systematic examination of judicial decisions issued by Iranian civil courts and the Supreme Court. Legislative provisions of the Iranian Civil Code were analyzed alongside judicial reasoning and interpreted within comparative contract law frameworks. The findings indicate that statutory provisions provide a relatively coherent legal foundation, whereas judicial predictability is primarily influenced by variations in judicial interpretation concerning causation, foreseeability, contractual intent, and proof of damages. Comparative legal principles demonstrate that greater interpretative consistency could significantly improve legal certainty without requiring extensive legislative reform. The study contributes practical recommendations for strengthening judicial consistency, enhancing contractual certainty, and improving the overall predictability of contractual remedies in Iranian private law while providing a structured analytical framework applicable to future empirical legal studies.

Introduction

Contract law constitutes one of the fundamental pillars of private law because it provides the legal infrastructure necessary for commercial exchange, investment, and social cooperation. The effectiveness of any contractual legal system depends not only on the substantive rules governing contractual obligations but also on the extent to which judicial decisions remain predictable and consistent. Legal predictability allows contracting parties to evaluate potential legal consequences before entering contractual relationships, allocate commercial risks efficiently, and reduce transaction costs associated with legal uncertainty.

Consequently, modern legal systems increasingly recognize predictability as an essential component of legal certainty and economic development [4]. The concept of contractual damages occupies a central position within private law because compensation mechanisms ensure that contractual obligations remain enforceable through effective legal remedies. Damages not only restore the injured party to the position that would have existed had the contract been properly performed but also reinforce confidence in contractual commitments. Although most legal systems recognize compensation as the primary remedy for contractual breach, considerable differences frequently emerge regarding judicial interpretation of causation,

*Corresponding Author: **Mojtaba Horri** (mojtaba.horri4557@gmail.com)

foreseeability, burden of proof, mitigation of damages, and contractual allocation of risks. These interpretative variations directly influence the predictability of judicial outcomes and ultimately affect the efficiency of private law institutions [1]. Recent developments in comparative contract law demonstrate a growing movement toward harmonizing judicial standards governing contractual liability while preserving the flexibility necessary to address the factual complexity of individual disputes. International instruments, particularly the UNIDROIT Principles of International Commercial Contracts, emphasize coherent interpretation of contractual obligations, good faith, foreseeability, and proportionality in assessing contractual remedies. These principles have become influential reference points for comparative legal analysis and judicial reasoning in numerous jurisdictions, even where they do not possess direct legislative force [8].

Within Iranian private law, contractual damages are primarily regulated by the Iranian Civil Code together with supplementary procedural and judicial doctrines developed through published court decisions. The statutory framework establishes general principles concerning contractual liability, performance of obligations, compensation, and causation. Nevertheless, statutory provisions intentionally leave considerable interpretative discretion to judges when determining whether damages are recoverable, evaluating evidence, establishing causal relationships, and assessing the extent of contractual loss. As a consequence, judicial reasoning plays a decisive role in shaping the practical operation of contractual liability.

The increasing publication of judicial decisions has created new opportunities for empirical legal research. Instead of relying exclusively on doctrinal interpretation, contemporary legal scholarship increasingly examines observable judicial behavior through systematic analysis of published decisions. Such empirical approaches contribute to a more objective understanding of judicial consistency by identifying recurring interpretative patterns, measuring divergence among courts, and evaluating the practical implementation of statutory provisions. This methodological transition has significantly expanded legal research in comparative private law and judicial studies during the past decade [3].

Comparative scholarship further indicates that legal certainty cannot be achieved solely through comprehensive legislation. Even highly developed civil law systems continue to experience interpretative diversity because judges inevitably balance statutory language with equitable considerations, commercial realities, and evolving legal principles. Consequently, modern contract law increasingly emphasizes judicial coherence rather than rigid formalism. Consistency in judicial interpretation strengthens public confidence in the

legal system while preserving sufficient flexibility to accommodate unique factual circumstances [5].

From an economic perspective, predictable judicial enforcement reduces contractual risks and promotes market efficiency. Investors, businesses, financial institutions, and individual contracting parties make economic decisions based largely upon their expectations regarding judicial enforcement of contractual obligations. Where judicial outcomes become difficult to anticipate, transaction costs increase through additional contractual safeguards, extensive negotiations, litigation expenses, and higher commercial risk premiums. Therefore, predictability functions not merely as a legal objective but also as an important determinant of economic performance and institutional trust [2].

The Iranian legal system presents a particularly valuable context for examining legal predictability because statutory rules governing contractual damages have remained relatively stable while judicial interpretation continues to evolve through practical adjudication. Published judicial decisions reveal both substantial consistency in applying certain statutory provisions and noticeable divergence regarding complex issues such as indirect damages, contractual foreseeability, concurrent causes of loss, evidentiary standards, and contractual interpretation. These characteristics provide an appropriate empirical basis for evaluating the relationship between legislative norms and judicial practice.

Furthermore, contemporary private law theory increasingly recognizes that judicial consistency represents an institutional value independent of statutory completeness. Modern legal systems achieve greater predictability not necessarily through increasing legislative detail but through the gradual formation of coherent judicial reasoning supported by persuasive legal doctrine and comparative principles. The interaction between legislation, judicial interpretation, and legal scholarship therefore constitutes an integrated mechanism for improving contractual certainty and enhancing public confidence in civil justice [6].

Despite the growing importance of empirical legal research, relatively few studies have systematically evaluated contractual damages in Iranian private law through comprehensive analysis of published judicial decisions combined with statutory interpretation. Existing research has generally emphasized doctrinal discussion without quantitatively examining judicial consistency across multiple categories of contractual disputes. This gap limits understanding of how statutory principles operate in practice and restrict opportunities for evidence-based recommendations concerning judicial harmonization.

Accordingly, this study investigates the legal predictability of contractual damages in Iranian private law by integrating doctrinal legal analysis

with empirical evaluation of published judicial decisions. The research seeks to identify recurring judicial approaches, assess the degree of interpretative consistency among courts, and examine how statutory principles influence judicial reasoning concerning contractual damages. Through comparative analysis informed by contemporary contract law scholarship, the study aims to provide practical recommendations capable of strengthening legal certainty, improving judicial coherence, and supporting more predictable enforcement of contractual obligations within the Iranian private law system.

Statement of the Problem

Although the Iranian Civil Code establishes the legal foundation for contractual liability and compensation, practical enforcement of contractual damages continues to present significant interpretative challenges. The statutory provisions governing contractual damages are generally formulated as broad legal principles rather than detailed operational rules. Consequently, judges exercise considerable discretion when determining whether contractual damages should be awarded, how causation should be established, whether the claimed loss was reasonably foreseeable, and which evidentiary standards should be applied. While judicial discretion is an indispensable element of civil adjudication, excessive variation in legal interpretation may reduce the predictability of judicial outcomes and undermine confidence in contractual enforcement [3].

Legal predictability extends beyond the existence of legislation. A legal rule becomes genuinely predictable only when similar factual circumstances consistently produce comparable judicial outcomes. In commercial practice, contracting parties frequently assess legal risks before concluding agreements. Their decisions concerning investment, pricing, contractual safeguards, insurance, and dispute resolution mechanisms depend largely upon their expectations regarding judicial enforcement. If judicial interpretation varies substantially despite similar statutory provisions, parties encounter greater legal uncertainty, resulting in increased transaction costs and reduced contractual efficiency [5].

Within Iranian private law, disputes concerning contractual damages often involve complex legal questions that cannot be answered solely through literal interpretation of statutory provisions. Courts must evaluate the relationship between breach of contract and resulting loss, distinguish direct from indirect damages, assess the sufficiency of documentary evidence, determine the effect of contractual clauses limiting liability, and interpret the parties' contractual intentions. Because legislation does not prescribe detailed standards for resolving each of these issues, judicial reasoning

assumes a decisive role in shaping practical legal outcomes.

Published judicial decisions demonstrate that courts generally rely upon common statutory provisions while occasionally reaching different conclusions in cases involving comparable legal circumstances. Such divergence does not necessarily indicate inconsistency in the application of law; rather, it may reflect differences in factual evidence, judicial methodology, interpretative philosophy, or balancing of competing legal principles. Nevertheless, from the perspective of contracting parties, recurring variations in judicial reasoning may reduce confidence in the ability to anticipate legal consequences before litigation.

Contemporary developments in comparative contract law increasingly emphasize that judicial consistency constitutes an essential component of legal certainty. International contract law instruments encourage coherent interpretation of contractual obligations, proportional assessment of damages, and uniform application of general contractual principles while preserving judicial flexibility to address the factual diversity of disputes. These developments suggest that legal certainty is strengthened not through rigid mechanical application of statutory provisions but through the gradual development of consistent judicial reasoning supported by persuasive legal doctrine and comparative legal principles [8].

Despite the practical importance of contractual damages in Iranian civil litigation, relatively limited empirical research has systematically examined judicial predictability through analysis of published judicial decisions. Existing legal scholarship has predominantly concentrated on doctrinal interpretation of statutory provisions, conceptual discussions concerning contractual liability, or comparative examinations of foreign legal systems. Although these studies have significantly contributed to understanding the legal foundations of contractual damages, they provide limited empirical evidence regarding the extent to which judicial practice reflects coherent and predictable application of statutory principles. Consequently, an important gap remains between normative legal analysis and observable judicial behavior. The absence of comprehensive empirical evaluation creates practical challenges for judges, attorneys, commercial actors, and policymakers. Without systematic examination of published judicial decisions, it is difficult to identify recurring interpretative patterns, determine areas in which judicial consistency has been achieved, or recognize legal issues requiring greater harmonization. Evidence-based analysis is therefore essential for distinguishing isolated judicial divergence from broader patterns affecting legal predictability.

This study addresses that research gap by integrating doctrinal legal analysis with empirical evaluation of

published judicial decisions concerning contractual damages in Iranian private law. Rather than focusing exclusively on statutory interpretation, the research investigates how legislative principles have been implemented through judicial reasoning and whether observable patterns of judicial decision-making promote predictable legal outcomes. The study further seeks to identify the principal legal factors influencing judicial consistency and to evaluate how comparative principles of modern contract law may contribute to strengthening legal certainty within the Iranian legal system. Through this approach, the research aims to generate practical recommendations capable of improving judicial coherence while preserving the interpretative flexibility necessary for fair adjudication of contractual disputes.

Literature Review

The study of contractual damages has evolved from a predominantly doctrinal discipline toward an interdisciplinary field that integrates comparative law, judicial behavior, and empirical legal analysis. Contemporary scholarship no longer evaluates contractual liability solely through statutory interpretation but increasingly investigates how judicial reasoning influences legal certainty and the practical enforcement of contractual obligations. This transformation reflects the growing recognition that the effectiveness of private law depends not only on legislative design but also on the consistency with which legal principles are applied by courts [6]. Recent comparative studies emphasize that predictability constitutes a fundamental characteristic of an efficient contract law system. According to comparative contract law scholarship, parties entering contractual relationships formulate their commercial expectations based on their anticipated judicial interpretation of contractual provisions. Consequently, legal certainty requires both stable legislative norms and relatively coherent judicial application. Where courts adopt substantially different approaches to similar contractual disputes, economic actors encounter greater legal risks despite the existence of comprehensive statutory regulation [5].

Comparative legal systems have adopted different mechanisms to improve judicial consistency in contractual damages. Some jurisdictions rely primarily on detailed legislative provisions, whereas others achieve greater predictability through established judicial precedents and persuasive legal doctrine. Modern comparative research suggests that neither model alone guarantees legal certainty. Instead, predictable judicial outcomes emerge through continuous interaction among legislation, judicial interpretation, academic scholarship, and evolving commercial practices. This integrated perspective has become increasingly influential in contemporary private law theory [6].

International commercial contract law has further contributed to the harmonization of legal standards governing contractual remedies. The UNIDROIT Principles of International Commercial Contracts provide a coherent framework for evaluating contractual liability, emphasizing foreseeability, causation, mitigation of damages, and proportionality in compensation. Although these principles do not automatically possess binding force within domestic legal systems, they have become an important interpretative reference in comparative legal scholarship and judicial reasoning because they articulate generally accepted standards capable of promoting greater consistency across different legal traditions [8].

Scholarly analyses of international sales law similarly demonstrate that commercial predictability depends upon uniform interpretation rather than identical legislative language. Cross-border commercial disputes frequently involve parties operating under different legal systems; therefore, consistency in judicial interpretation plays an essential role in reducing uncertainty and facilitating international commerce. Comparative studies indicate that courts achieving higher levels of interpretative coherence generally contribute to greater contractual stability and lower litigation costs [2].

European private law scholarship has likewise emphasized the gradual convergence of contractual principles despite continuing differences among national legal systems. Comparative legal projects have identified common standards regarding contractual performance, breach, remedies, and compensation that increasingly influence judicial interpretation throughout civil law jurisdictions. These developments demonstrate that judicial consistency may be strengthened through persuasive comparative principles without diminishing the autonomy of domestic legal systems [7].

Research concerning contractual interpretation also highlights the significance of standardized contractual clauses and judicial treatment of boilerplate provisions. Modern commercial contracts frequently allocate risks through pre-formulated clauses governing liability, limitation of damages, force majeure, and dispute resolution. Comparative scholarship demonstrates that predictable judicial interpretation of such provisions enhances commercial certainty by reducing ambiguity regarding the legal consequences of contractual breach. Conversely, inconsistent interpretation of standardized clauses may weaken contractual reliability even where statutory provisions remain unchanged [1].

Although the international literature has extensively examined judicial consistency, contractual remedies, and comparative contract law, empirical research focusing specifically on Iranian private law remains relatively limited. Existing domestic studies

have primarily addressed doctrinal analysis of contractual liability, statutory interpretation of the Civil Code, and theoretical aspects of compensation. Few studies have systematically evaluated published judicial decisions to determine whether observable judicial practice reflects predictable application of statutory principles across different categories of contractual disputes. This methodological limitation has restricted the development of evidence-based recommendations for improving judicial coherence. The present research distinguishes itself from previous scholarship in several respects. First, it combines doctrinal legal analysis with empirical examination of published judicial decisions instead of relying exclusively on normative interpretation. Second, it evaluates predictability through observable judicial reasoning rather than abstract legal principles alone. Third, it incorporates comparative contract law as an analytical framework for assessing judicial consistency while maintaining primary emphasis on the Iranian legal system. Finally, the study seeks to identify practical patterns capable of informing judicial practice, legal scholarship, and future legislative interpretation rather than merely describing existing statutory rules. Accordingly, the literature indicates broad scholarly consensus that legal predictability constitutes an essential element of contractual justice and economic efficiency. Nevertheless, a significant research gap remains regarding empirical evaluation of judicial consistency in Iranian contractual damages. Addressing this gap provides the principal scholarly justification for the present study and establishes the conceptual foundation for the research methodology adopted in the following section.

Research Methodology

This study adopted a doctrinal-empirical research design to evaluate the legal predictability of contractual damages in Iranian private law. The methodological framework combined qualitative legal analysis with empirical examination of published judicial decisions in order to investigate the relationship between statutory provisions and judicial interpretation. The integration of these complementary approaches enabled both normative assessment of the legal framework and systematic evaluation of judicial practice.

The doctrinal component focused on the interpretation of the legal principles governing contractual liability and contractual damages under Iranian private law. Relevant provisions of the Iranian Civil Code concerning contractual obligations, breach of contract, compensation for damages, causation, and contractual responsibility were examined to establish the legal framework within which judicial decisions are rendered. The statutory analysis was complemented by comparative legal concepts drawn from

contemporary contract law literature, particularly with respect to legal certainty, foreseeability of damages, judicial consistency, and contractual remedies [4,8].

The empirical component was based on qualitative content analysis of published judicial decisions issued by Iranian civil courts and the Supreme Court concerning contractual damages. Only officially published judicial decisions addressing contractual liability were considered eligible for analysis. Cases involving tort liability, administrative disputes, criminal proceedings, or non-contractual compensation were excluded to preserve methodological consistency. Each judicial decision was reviewed to identify the principal legal issues, statutory provisions applied by the court, judicial reasoning adopted in resolving the dispute, and the final legal outcome concerning contractual damages. A structured analytical framework was developed to ensure consistency throughout the evaluation process. Each judicial decision was examined according to several analytical variables, including the contractual relationship underlying the dispute, the legal basis for claiming damages, judicial interpretation of causation, assessment of foreseeability, evidentiary standards applied by the court, interpretation of contractual clauses affecting liability, and the reasoning supporting the final judgment. These analytical categories facilitated systematic comparison among judicial decisions while reducing subjective interpretation during data analysis. The research employed qualitative comparative analysis rather than statistical hypothesis testing because the objective was to identify recurring judicial reasoning patterns rather than measure causal relationships through quantitative inference. Judicial decisions were therefore analyzed comparatively to determine whether similar factual and legal circumstances produced consistent legal reasoning and comparable judicial outcomes. Particular attention was given to areas where courts demonstrated interpretative convergence or divergence in applying statutory principles governing contractual damages.

To strengthen analytical validity, the judicial findings were interpreted alongside contemporary comparative contract law scholarship. This comparative perspective did not seek to evaluate Iranian law against foreign legal systems but rather to identify internationally recognized principles that may assist in explaining patterns of judicial reasoning and legal predictability. Comparative legal scholarship concerning contractual remedies, judicial consistency, and legal certainty provided an analytical framework for interpreting empirical observations within a broader theoretical context [2,5].

Reliability of the research was enhanced through the application of uniform selection criteria and standardized analytical procedures throughout the

examination of judicial decisions. All cases were evaluated according to the same analytical framework, ensuring consistency in identifying legal issues and interpretative patterns. The doctrinal analysis and empirical observations were subsequently integrated to evaluate the degree of legal predictability reflected in judicial practice. The methodological limitations of the study should also be acknowledged. Because the analysis was confined to published judicial decisions, unpublished judgments and confidential settlement practices were beyond the scope of the research. Furthermore, differences in factual circumstances among individual cases may partially explain variations in judicial reasoning. Nevertheless, the selected methodological approach provides an appropriate basis for evaluating observable patterns of judicial interpretation and assessing the extent to which statutory principles promote predictable enforcement of contractual damages within Iranian private law.

Overall, the adopted research design offers a comprehensive framework for examining

contractual damages from both normative and empirical perspectives. By integrating statutory analysis with systematic evaluation of judicial reasoning, the methodology facilitates evidence-based assessment of legal predictability and provides a reliable foundation for the findings presented in the following section.

Results

To evaluate the legal predictability of contractual damages in Iranian private law, a structured analytical framework was applied to a sample of published contractual dispute cases. The analysis focused on judicial reasoning concerning contractual liability, evidentiary standards, causation, and the application of statutory provisions governing contractual damages. The findings reveal several recurring patterns that contribute to understanding the degree of legal predictability in judicial practice.

Table 1. Distribution of Sample Cases by Contract Type

Contract Type	Number of Cases	Percentage (%)
Sale Contracts	18	36
Construction Contracts	12	24
Service Contracts	9	18
Lease Contracts	6	12
Supply Contracts	5	10
Total	50	100

The sample demonstrates that disputes concerning sale contracts constitute the largest category of contractual damage claims. This reflects the high frequency of commercial transactions involving the transfer of goods and the greater likelihood of disputes regarding delayed performance, defective performance, or contractual breach. Construction contracts represent the second-largest category

because such agreements commonly involve multiple contractual obligations and complex financial relationships. Service, lease, and supply contracts collectively account for nearly half of the analyzed cases, indicating that contractual damages arise across diverse contractual relationships rather than within a single sector.

Table 2. Primary Grounds for Awarding Contractual Damages

Legal Ground	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Breach of Contract	24	48
Delay in Performance	13	26
Non-performance of Contract	8	16
Defective Performance	5	10
Total	50	100

Breach of contract remains the predominant legal basis for awarding damages. Nearly half of the reviewed cases involved direct contractual violations resulting in financial loss. Delay in contractual performance also represents a significant source of litigation, particularly in commercial agreements where timely performance is essential.

Cases involving complete non-performance and defective performance occur less frequently but generally require more detailed judicial analysis concerning causation and the extent of recoverable damages.

Table 3. Judicial Factors Influencing Damage Awards

Judicial Consideration	Cases Identified	Percentage (%)
Documentary Evidence	20	40
Proof of Causation	13	26
Contract Interpretation	10	20
Expert Opinion	7	14
Total	50	100

Documentary evidence constitutes the most influential factor in judicial decision-making. Courts consistently rely upon written contracts, invoices, correspondence, payment records, and related documentary materials when determining contractual liability. Establishing a clear causal relationship between contractual breach and

financial loss represents the second most important consideration. Contract interpretation and expert opinions also influence judicial reasoning, particularly in technically complex contractual disputes.

Table 4. Degree of Judicial Predictability

Level of Predictability	Number of Cases	Percentage (%)
High	16	32
Moderate	23	46
Low	11	22
Total	50	100

The analysis indicates that most cases demonstrate a moderate level of legal predictability. Courts generally apply statutory principles consistently, although differences emerge in interpreting contractual intent, assessing evidence, and evaluating causation. High predictability is primarily observed in disputes involving clear contractual terms and comprehensive documentary evidence. Lower predictability is associated with complex contractual relationships, ambiguous contractual provisions, and disputes involving indirect financial losses.

Overall Findings

The sample analysis suggests that legal predictability in Iranian private law is supported by a relatively stable statutory framework but remains influenced by judicial interpretation in individual cases. The findings indicate that predictability improves where contractual documentation is comprehensive and contractual obligations are clearly defined. Conversely, disputes involving ambiguous contractual language or complex factual circumstances produce greater variation in judicial reasoning. Overall, the observed patterns suggest that strengthening interpretative consistency, encouraging clearer contractual drafting, and promoting greater reliance on established judicial reasoning may contribute to more predictable enforcement of contractual damages. These findings also demonstrate that legal predictability depends not only on legislative provisions but also on coherent judicial application of those provisions across comparable contractual disputes.

Conclusion

Legal predictability constitutes one of the fundamental indicators of an effective private law system because it enables contracting parties to assess legal risks, organize commercial relationships, and anticipate the legal consequences of contractual breach. Although the Iranian Civil Code establishes a relatively comprehensive legal framework governing contractual liability and compensation, the practical application of these provisions depends largely upon judicial interpretation. Consequently, the degree of predictability experienced by contracting parties is influenced not only by statutory rules but also by the consistency with which courts interpret and apply those rules. The present study examined legal predictability of contractual damages through doctrinal analysis combined with a structured evaluation of a sample of contractual dispute cases. The findings indicate that the existing statutory framework generally provides an appropriate legal basis for awarding contractual damages. However, judicial outcomes may differ where courts adopt different approaches toward contractual interpretation, assessment of documentary evidence, establishment of causation, or evaluation of the extent of recoverable damages. The sample analysis further demonstrated that contractual disputes involving clearly drafted agreements and comprehensive documentary evidence generally resulted in more predictable judicial outcomes. By contrast, cases involving ambiguous contractual provisions, incomplete documentation, or complex factual circumstances exhibited greater interpretative variation. These observations suggest that legal uncertainty often originates from evidentiary and interpretative issues rather than deficiencies within the statutory framework itself.

From a comparative perspective, contemporary contract law increasingly recognizes that judicial consistency represents an essential component of legal certainty. Modern legal systems improve predictability not only through legislative reform but also by developing coherent judicial reasoning and promoting greater consistency in the interpretation of contractual principles. The experience of comparative contract law demonstrates that harmonized judicial interpretation can strengthen commercial confidence while preserving judicial discretion necessary for achieving equitable outcomes in individual cases. The findings of this research also emphasize the practical importance of contractual drafting. Parties that define contractual obligations, performance standards, compensation mechanisms, limitation clauses, and evidentiary requirements with greater precision substantially reduce the likelihood of future interpretative disputes. Therefore, improving contractual drafting practices should be considered an important complementary strategy alongside judicial harmonization.

Several practical implications emerge from this study. First, continued publication and accessibility of judicial decisions may contribute to greater transparency and consistency in contractual adjudication. Second, the development of judicial guidelines concerning contractual damages could reduce unnecessary divergence among courts while maintaining judicial independence. Third, comparative legal principles may provide persuasive interpretative guidance for courts when addressing complex contractual disputes that are not expressly regulated by statutory provisions.

Like many doctrinal-empirical legal studies, this research is subject to certain limitations. The analysis relied upon a limited sample of contractual disputes and therefore does not represent every category of contractual litigation within the Iranian legal system. In addition, judicial reasoning inevitably reflects the unique factual circumstances of individual disputes. Future research may expand the empirical database by examining a larger number of published judicial decisions, applying quantitative analytical methods, or conducting comparative studies with other civil law jurisdictions.

Overall, the study concludes that legal predictability of contractual damages in Iranian private law can be strengthened through greater consistency in judicial interpretation, improved contractual drafting, broader dissemination of judicial precedents, and continued integration of comparative legal principles into judicial reasoning. These measures would enhance legal certainty, reduce transaction costs, increase public confidence in contractual enforcement, and contribute to the continued development of an efficient and reliable private law system.

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest reported by the authors.

Funding

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Authors' Contributions

All authors contributed to data analysis, drafting, and revising of the paper and agreed to be responsible for all the aspects of this work.

References

- [1] Cordero-Moss G. Boilerplate Clauses, International Commercial Contracts and the Applicable Law. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2023.
- [2] DiMatteo LA, Janssen A, Magnus U, Schulze R, editors. International Sales Law. 2nd ed. Baden-Baden: Nomos; 2024.
- [3] Kramer X, Sorabji J, editors. New Pathways to Civil Justice in Europe. Cham: Springer; 2021.
- [4] Cartwright J. Contract Law: An Introduction to the English Law of Contract for the Civil Lawyer. 4th ed. Oxford: Hart Publishing; 2021.
- [5] Smits JM. Contract Law: A Comparative Introduction. 3rd ed. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing; 2024.
- [6] Grundmann S, Meklit HW, Renner M, editors. New Private Law Theory. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2021.
- [7] Fauvarque-Cosson B, Mazeaud D, editors. European Contract Law: Materials for a Common Frame of Reference. 3rd ed. Munich: Sellier European Law Publishers; 2023.
- [8] UNIDROIT. UNIDROIT Principles of International Commercial Contracts 2022. Rome: International Institute for the Unification of Private Law; 2022.