Eurasian Experiment Journal of Arts and Management (EEJAM) ISSN: 2992-412X

©EEJAM Publications Volume 7 Issue 1 2025

Deception in Legal Proceedings: Ethical Implications

Kakungulu Samuel J.

Faculty of Education, Kampala International University, Uganda

ABSTRACT

Deception in legal proceedings encompasses a spectrum of unethical practices, including false representation, bribery, perjury, and manipulation of evidence. These practices undermine the integrity of the legal system, erode public trust, and distort justice. This paper examines the ethical implications of deception in the legal profession, emphasizing the duty of candor and honesty as foundational to justice. It explores the historical and contemporary prevalence of deceptive practices, their consequences, and the legal framework designed to address them. Strategies for mitigating deception, such as regulatory reforms, ethics education, transparency initiatives, and whistleblower protections, are discussed. By advocating for a culture of accountability and integrity, this paper highlights the critical role of ethical adherence in safeguarding societal trust in the justice system.

Keywords: Deception in legal proceedings, Legal ethics, Duty of candor, Misrepresentation, Public trust.

INTRODUCTION

Deception in legal proceedings can manifest itself in various ways. Lawyers have been known to threaten or intimidate witnesses and bribe jurors or judges. Jury members often attempt to deceive counsel by concealing biases or relevant previous experiences. Overt interrogation, educational programs, research, and proposals have addressed the question of when deceptive practices such as these are ethically permissible. On some accounts, the threat to societal order if legal deception were tolerated can outweigh the value of truthful interactions among legal professionals [1, 2]. Ethical rules govern all that lawyers and judges do. Professional conduct is embedded in a larger societal context of institutions, history, and culture. Presenting ethical rules and commenting on them entails a deep dive into politics, sociology, economics, philosophy, and history. Assessing the implications of various positions and approaches on established principles of practical ethics within the legal framework may deepen understanding of present and future societal values and ethics. Furthermore, ongoing assessment of ethical conduct and the impact of changing societal values upon legal practice may lead to increasing uniformity in ethical applications among jurisdictions and, ideally, ever-purer justice. This approach might also show our dedication to making this a better country for all [3, 4].

Background and Scope of the Issue

Legal debates regarding the ethical implications of deceptive practices span centuries. The court's and attorneys' discrimination influenced ethicists' work due to their control over the public imagination. Case studies are often brought up to debate the scope of permissible deception. Examples of deception committed by medical professionals provide insight into the issue. In bank fraud cases, courts discussed the use of deception in legal proceedings. This long and consistent history illustrates that deception remains an issue in courts: jurors, attorneys, clients, and courts must know what is acceptable and expected in a court of law [5, 6]. Because deception embodies such a complex concept in legal terms, there are no empirical evaluations of its efficacy in legal circumstances. As a result, attorneys and other stakeholders have accused ethicists of ignoring a practical problem. Attorneys are not the only stakeholders in this debate; clients, jurors, and the judiciary are also implicated. Because of these parties, it is difficult to determine the interests promoted by discussing this issue. Clarifying the scope of deception in legal practice is important in considering the ethics of the issue. Deception may create an ethical dilemma for attorneys, but it is also a complex social problem that has been addressed through legislation to encourage truth-telling and promote the fair functioning of justice. The legislative response also provides important insights into how public trust is related to the legal and ethical implications of deception [7, 8]. In this sense, the controversy could add to the public's perception of the credibility and fairness of legal processes. Further debate on the ethics of the question could provide insights that could refine and clarify the positions underlying current legislation related to deception in legal practice. Given the social context and interests implicated in the issue, and its legal and ethical implications, the controversy has practical or applied relevance [9, 10].

Ethical Principles in the Legal Profession

The legal profession is governed by several ethical principles that are supposed to serve as a guide for their practice. At a basic level, these principles require legal professionals to deal candidly with courts, clients, and others and to participate in legal proceedings with candor and fairness. The ethical guidelines are designed to ensure the integrity of the law, the endeavor to attain a high degree of skill in the lawyers' areas of expertise, and service to the public good by improving the overall functioning of dispute resolution systems. By holding legal professionals to these ethical expectations, the organization contends it will contribute directly to the bar and also to public understanding of these issues, public trust in the legal system, and the quality and fairness of the representations made by the legal and other professionals in those disputes as they appear before the courts [11, 12]. These principles guide attorneys and accountants in the performance of their duties to their clients and courts by providing close-to-absolute rules on offering legal representation, how to operate within laws and regulations, and recommendations for serving as expert witnesses. Rather than looking to help the search or the case at hand, attorneys are calling on the committee to be included in search efforts by allowing them access to the documents filed by others about the case. This is a direct violation of the policy that states not only members of the committee but also their employers must conduct themselves with integrity, fairness, and treatment to all persons in the tax community with whom they come in contact. Members should act in a manner not only to avoid doing anything improper but also to avoid even the appearance of impropriety [13, 14].

Duty of Candor and Honesty

I owe a great deal of thanks for pointing out what stood out as major flaws. Additionally, two anonymous referees made significant contributions to the development of this article and my work as a whole. Their impact is immeasurable and gratefully acknowledged. Legal professionals are in a highly influential position to mislead others, most significantly their clients. The duty of candor and honesty is not only a moral one but also represents the right of a client to have full, transparent information about their case. It is regarded as professional – and common – to lie and to encourage deception on the part of lawyers. When a duty of honesty is breached, significant adverse consequences may result. Legal professionals' duty of honesty is highlighted by the rules in the model code of professional conduct as well as the rules of evidence, rules of civil procedure, and rules applicable to the disqualification of the attorney. Legal professionals who lie will strain their relationships with clients, other members of the legal community, and even family members. This paper argues in favor of honesty in a legal context. Such arguments are proffered in the face of ethics course materials in use at law schools and across the nation and the overwhelmingly negative sociocultural perception of the profession of law. In a legal context, the term art is the 'duty of candor and honesty.' The American Bar Association has attempted to expressly clarify any ambiguity in its language derived from legal standards utilized in different states and the practitioners within those states. The duty of candor and honesty is also reflected within the model version of the Rules of Professional Conduct of the American Bar Association. The model ABA rule states that 'In the representation of a client, a lawyer shall not knowingly make a false statement of material fact or law to a third person; or fail to disclose a material fact to a third person when disclosure is necessary to avoid assisting a criminal or fraudulent act by a client.' The explicit foundation for this duty is reflected within the concept of the adversarial legal system itself. To fairly determine and administer justice between two parties, neither should be held to be disadvantaged simply by deceit. Post-trial mechanics are also presumed to function to this effect. Clients are under the impression that their lawyer is advocating their cause to the fullest extent of the law. However, clients are the greatest group of individuals unwittingly duped when a duty of candor and honesty is breached [15, 16].

Forms of Deception in Legal Proceedings

Deception in all of its many forms takes place in legal proceedings. Lawyers, litigants, and witnesses perpetrate the most egregious forms of this type of deceit. The purpose is to secure a significant tactical advantage in the proceedings. Forms of deception can broadly be categorized into: - False representation: for instance, perjured testimony; forged documentation; and misinformation or concealment of relevant material by an opponent. - Misleading representations: misleading expert testimony; manufacture of evidence or destruction of the same; encouraging Alzheimer patients to re-create wills; enticing children to make allegations or adjust their testimony to some perceived benefit; coaching a witness concerning the content of her evidence; insinuating that a deceased tort plaintiff would not have been taken by charlatans if the deceased were bright, sophisticated, or cured of some malady needing expensive treatment which was not administered; bribery; interference with a witness; and intimidating a witness [1, 17]. There is the risk that these practices will render any resultant trial unfair. There is also the danger of vitiation of the rule of law through an erosion of confidence in and respect for the legal process. The extent to which issues of ethics receive attention is by no means fully developed. The use of modern information retrieval systems and databases to fish for impeaching material on a witness, or the gathering of monitoring information concerning an opponent, represents the face of potential modern-day unethical deception in legal proceedings. The challenge of achieving definition, identification, and eradication of such conduct will continue, for it reflects the wider machinations at work in society, therefore putting pressure upon legal systems to achieve social reform. Given that the overwhelming majority of ethical issues in civil litigation are imposed from above, what is required within the scope of the legislation, case law, and ethical guidelines is an awareness of the potential deception impacting litigated disputes. Such insight at least places one in a better position for devising effective countermeasures. A start is to pick through representative forms rather than simply responding in a piecemeal way. In the final analysis, the effect of proof handling ethics may be negligible since it is suggested that outcomes are the sole barometer for success based on normative reasoning. Nonetheless, it offers a fascinating angle when thinking generally about the role of the civil justice system in a wider community framework [18, 19].

False Evidence

False evidence can be a significant problem in legal proceedings. The creation, presentation of, or endorsement of evidence that is known to be false can influence decision-making by legal actors who rely on evidence to conclude. Courts in many jurisdictions do not have a general power to investigate the reliability of evidence, but instead have to rely on the evidence submitted to them by the parties. This means that it is in the parties' interests to submit evidence that is complete, accurate, honest, and reliable. Courts have control mechanisms available to them to deal with parties who have failed to comply with their obligations to submit accurate and full evidence. Some of those tools are retrospective and seek to penalize such conduct. Courts often take evidence off file that they consider inaccurate or fabricated, with sanctions including orders for costs or wasted costs, and possibly indemnity costs. Deception in relation to evidence can also lead to charges of contempt of court. However, the potential effectiveness of these tools is limited, as they require the detection of false evidence, and also as their operation is subject to judicial discretion [20, 21]. Refusal of the courts to admit the tainted evidence for determination is the most they can do to counter that problem. Detecting false evidence can be difficult as existing forms of evidence can easily be forged or fabricated. Different forms of false evidence exist. The most egregious is fabricated evidence, which means evidence that is presented although it has never existed. A common example of a forged document for personal injury cases is a car insurance policy. Another version is making up various details for an existing piece of evidence [22, 23].

Consequences of Deceptive Practices

The consequences of a conviction on charges of engaging in deceptive practices relating to legal propounding or fraud upon the court involving the same can have severe collateral consequences. Different degrees of ethical transgressions can lead, at the high end, to disbarment of an attorney or conviction and jail time where especially egregious conduct is involved. But beyond the sting of legal repercussions, the tolerance of deception by attorneys and by proxy their clients conveys a startling ideological message [24, 25]. Another ethical consequence of deception in legal proceedings is that society as a whole can no longer put its trust in a court of law. As a consequence, it is tautologically necessary that legal aid conduct its cases with the highest integrity, leaving legal practitioners who cheat in contravention of this norm open to even harsher judgments. Additionally, a sobering consequence of legal practitioners knowingly engaging in deceptive practices is that they can have an impact where it most counts—the effect upon someone's liberty interest. It is not surprising that the incentive for attorneys to lie in court can often lead to a miscarriage of justice, and innocent individuals may be convicted and left imprisoned for a crime they did not commit. The fabrication of evidence, destruction of evidence, and the subornation of perjury are some of the common deceptive practices identified by the courts that are most likely to lead to wrongful convictions. Clients can suffer financially, emotionally, and physically when their right to a fair trial is denied because of someone else's deception. The cost of these consequences amounts to the incalculable while also trapping an innocent person in the criminal justice system [26]. Oftentimes, micro-deceptive practices may have macro effects on the overall population. The toll deceptive practices can take is twofold, affecting individuals and the public as a collective. Moreover, courts, legislators, and legal bodies can no longer turn a blind eye to attorneys who willfully transgress the duty of candor. A sub-issue worth highlighting is the public's minority awareness of deception taking place within the legal system. The considerable media coverage of several high-profile commissions of inquiries with terms of reference focusing on miscarriage of justice shows that the public's trust in the justice system is still astutely skeptical [27].

Legal Ramifications

The legal consequences of engaging in deceptive practices during legal proceedings are important. Some federal and state statutes criminalize contempt, perjury, tampering with evidence, and obstruction of justice. Model Rules codify the ethical rule against "false statements" in court and the commission of criminal acts that "reflect adversely on" a lawyer's "honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness as a lawyer." Lawyers who engage in deception in violation of state or federal rules, court orders, or the common law can face civil sanctions, including being obliged to repay fees and pay restitution to clients, being sued for damages by harmed parties, or being subject to court-imposed fines. Lawyers who engage in skullduggery might also be subject to professional discipline, "including disbarment" [28]. Oversight bodies play a central role in investigating allegations of deceit in the courtroom. The use of disciplinary investigations and legal proceedings to hold attorneys accountable has significant deterrent value because it tells the profession and the public that the specific conduct in question was found to be not "justified" by a splitting of hairs, nor did it amount to just legal "gamesmanship," but rather that it was unethical and in violation of the lawyer's professional rules and standards that govern how trial lawyers are to conduct themselves in our judicial system. Sanctions aim not only at punishing offenders by striking at such interests as their pocketbook or their liberty, but also at society's interest in preserving the integrity of the justice system. Sanctions also act as a deterrent because they broadcast society's denouncement of the offense, which has been "found to reflect adversely upon the lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness as a lawyer in other respects." In a disciplinary decision, the disbarred attorney was found to have violated a slew of ethical rules over eight years. His at times reckless disregard for the sanctity of both the courtroom and his law practice ultimately resulted in perjury charges, criminal convictions, and an aggregate prison sentence of 640 days.

Mitigating Deception: Strategies and Solutions

The first and most obvious proactive solution to the problem of deception in lawyering and legal processes is a stronger regulatory or legal framework. For many critics, this is the most obvious move. Legislative responses to the problem of perjury, for example, have been with us for a long time. Another strategy for minimizing the incidence of deception in legal processes is to employ technological safeguards. One of the best examples of this has been the efforts to systematically mitigate the knowledge gap between named defendants and their counsel and between government lawyers. While legal operators might very well be at a disadvantage in the knowledge necessary to convey their position in the best possible light to a judge or jury, the Office of General Counsel will have all the necessary technical data for developing an estimate of liability in any given case. As well as being proactive in its emphasis, another strength of prevention theory is that it is primarily driven by an educational agenda. Exposing practitioners to ethics and values training should, according to prevention theory, minimize unjust conduct in the legal system. It has also been argued that professional codes of conduct help to foster a culture of honesty and integrity within the legal profession. Another strategy for mitigating deception in legal processes is by increasing transparency in, among other things, court proceedings, the investigation process, and regulatory processes. In short, legal operators and investigators ought to enforce clear legal standards and give the profession notice as to what acts or omissions will and will not be held against an operator in court. Whistleblower protection, rewards, and incentives are of immediate pro-social and preventative value. Members of the profession (and society in general) are more likely to hold one another to account if they are not sacrificing their future to do so or if they are at least adequately compensated for their troubles. A third, more controversial strategy is to encourage legal professionals to collaboratively aid and assist law enforcement in cases of insider trading [29, 30].

CONCLUSION

Deception in legal proceedings presents a profound challenge to the principles of justice and fairness. Its impact extends beyond individual cases, eroding societal trust in the legal system and undermining the rule of law. Addressing this issue requires a multifaceted approach, combining stricter regulations, robust ethics training, and enhanced transparency. Moreover, fostering a culture of integrity within the legal profession is essential. By holding legal professionals accountable and encouraging proactive measures against deception, the legal system can better uphold its commitment to justice and fairness. Sustained efforts in this direction will not only strengthen public confidence but also ensure that the justice system remains a pillar of ethical governance and social order.

REFERENCES

1. Reins LM, Wiegmann A. Is lying bound to commitment? Empirically investigating deceptive presuppositions, implicatures, and actions. Cognitive Science. 2021. wiley.com
2. Kumar S, Bai C, Subrahmanian VS, Leskovec J. Deception detection in group video conversations using dynamic interaction networks. InProceedings of the international AAAI conference on web and social media 2021 May 22 (Vol. 15, pp. 339-350). aaai.org
3. Kagan RA. American lawyers, legal culture, and adversarial legalism. InLegal culture and the legal profession 2021 Oct 28 (pp. 7-51). Routledge.
4. Said G, Azamat K, Ravshan S, Bokhadir A. Adapting legal systems to the development of artificial intelligence: solving the global problem of AI in judicial processes. International Journal of Cyber Law. 2023 Jun 27;1(4). irshadjournals.com
5. Shablystyi VV, Anisimov DO. Doping as a global problem of the 21st century on account of its illegal influence on the results of official sports competitions. Wiadomości lekarskie. 2021 Jan 1;3092.
6. Cowl VB, Comizzoli P, Appeltant R, Bolton RL, Browne RK, Holt WV, Penfold LM, Swegen A, Walker SL, Williams SA. Cloning for the Twenty-First Century and Its Place in Endangered Species Conservation. Annual Review of Animal Biosciences. 2024 Feb 15;12(1):91-112. annualreviews.org
7. Shonhadji N, Maulidi A. The roles of whistleblowing system and fraud awareness as financial statement fraud deterrent. International Journal of Ethics and Systems. 2021 Jul 16;37(3):370-89.
8. Vrij A, Fisher RP, Leal S. How researchers can make verbal lie detection more attractive for practitioners. Psychiatry, Psychology and Law. 2023 May 4;30(3):383-96.
9. Lino AF, de Azevedo RR, de Aquino AC, Steccolini I. Fighting or supporting corruption? The role of public sector audit organizations in Brazil. Critical Perspectives on Accounting. 2022 Mar 1;83:102384. essex.ac.uk
10. Zheng K, Sutherland S, Hornby L, Shemie SD, Wilson L, Sarti AJ. Public understandings of the definition and determination of death: a scoping review. Transplantation Direct. 2022 May 1;8(5):e1300. lww.com
11. Jacobs RM, editor. Educating in Ethics Across the Professions: A Compendium of Research, Theory, Practice, and an Agenda for the Future. IAP; 2022 Aug 1.
12. Kowsari K, Jafari Meimandi K, Heidarysafa M, Mendu S, Barnes L, Brown D. Text classification algorithms: A survey. Information. 2019 Apr;10(4):150.
13. Eaton SE. Future-proofing integrity in the age of artificial intelligence and neurotechnology: prioritizing human rights, dignity, and equity. International Journal for Educational Integrity. 2024 Nov 12;20(1):21.
14. Mensah EK. Assessing the Role of Media Influence and Public Perception in Legal Decision-Making. Available at SSRN 4811277. 2024 Apr 29.
15. Ariens M. Model Rule 8.4 (g) and the Profession's Core Values Problem. ST. MARY'S J. ON LEGAL MALPRACTICE & ETHICS. 2021;11:180-216.
16. Posner NB. Candor, Truthfulness, and Conflicts of Interest: Ethics in Negotiations. Tort Trial & Insurance Practice Law Journal. 2022 Jan 1;57(1):121-70.

17. Monaro M, Maldera S, Scarpazza C, Sartori G, Navarin N. Detecting deception through facial expressions in a dataset of videotaped interviews: A comparison between human judges and machine learning models. Computers in Human Behavior. 2022 Feb 1;127:107063. google.com
18. Fletcher D, Trautrims A. Recruitment Deception and the Organization of Labor for Exploitation: A Policy–Theory Synthesis. Academy of Management Perspectives. 2024 Feb;38(1):43-76.
19. Herbig FJ, Minnaar A. Polygraph's Relationship with Afrocentricity in South African Workplace: Deception Detection Parity, Or Parody?. International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences. 2022 Nov 25;17(1):54-72.
20. Ziporyn TD, Owens JA, Wahlstrom KL, Wolfson AR, Troxel WM, Saletin JM, Rubens SL, Pelayo R, Payne PA, Hale L, Keller I. Adolescent sleep health and school start times: setting the research agenda for California and beyond. A research summit summary. Sleep Health. 2022 Feb 1;8(1):11-22.
21. Aïmeur E, Amri S, Brassard G. Fake news, disinformation and misinformation in social media: a review. Social Network Analysis and Mining. 2023 Feb 9;13(1):30.
22. El-Shafai W, Fouda MA, El-Rabaie ES, El-Salam NA. A comprehensive taxonomy on multimedia video forgery detection techniques: challenges and novel trends. Multimedia Tools and Applications. 2024 Jan;83(2):4241-307. springer.com
23. Tyagi S, Yadav D. A detailed analysis of image and video forgery detection techniques. The Visual Computer. 2023 Mar;39(3):813-33.
24. Bialas BR. Political Branding: Subterfuge or the New Mode of Governance?. Journal of Public Governance. 2023 Jun 30;64(2):5-18.
25. Koehler D, Cherney A, Templar A. Truth or dare? Exploring the importance of factual accuracy in different deradicalization counseling approaches. Studies in Conflict & Terrorism. 2023 Sep 5:1-21.
26. Vick K, Cook KJ, Rogers M. Lethal leverage: false confessions, false pleas, and wrongful homicide convictions in death-eligible cases. Contemporary Justice Review. 2021 Jan 2;24(1):24-42.
27. Kelly M, Larres P. Enhancing the auditor's mindset: a framework for nurturing professional skepticism. Journal of Accounting Literature. 2025 Jan 2;47(1):222-43.
28. Baker ML. Lying to Get a Court-Appointed Attorney Is Not an Obstruction of Justice. Liberty UL Rev.. 2021;16:231.
29. Brenner MJ, Hickson GB, Boothman RC, Rushton CH, Bradford CR. Honesty and transparency, indispensable to the clinical mission—part III: how leaders can prevent burnout, foster wellness and recovery, and instill resilience. Otolaryngologic Clinics of North America. 2022 Feb 1;55(1):83-103. [HTML]
30. Pell DJ, Amigud A. The higher education dilemma: The views of faculty on integrity, organizational culture, and duty of fidelity. Journal of Academic Ethics. 2023 Mar;21(1):155-75.

CITE AS: Kakungulu Samuel J. (2025). Deception in Legal Proceedings: Ethical Implications. Eurasian Experiment Journal of Arts and Management, 7(1):7-12