

Research Article

From Contractual Compliance to Economic Human Security: A Re-Evaluation of Penalty Clauses in Islamic Banking

Dr. Yousif Ahmed Omar^{1*}, Dr. Mohamad Abdullah Alsaied², Zaleekha salem ahmed alhosani³, Salem Mohamed Omer Alseiri⁴, Ayat Saleh Alkatheei⁵

¹Islamic Studies Department Mohamed bin Zayed University for Humanities. Email: yousif.omar@mbzuh.ac.ae

²Department of Islamic Studies Mohamed bin Zayed University for Humanities. Email: mohamad.alsaied@mbzuh.ac.ae

³Department of Islamic Studies Mohamed bin Zayed University for Humanities. Email: 202300116@mbzuh.ac.ae

⁴Department of Islamic Studies Mohamed bin Zayed University for Humanities. Email: 202400276@mbzuh.ac.ae

⁵Department of Islamic Studies Mohamed bin Zayed University for Humanities. Email: 202300108@mbzuh.ac.ae

*Correspondence:

Submitted: 25 January 2026 | Revised: 21 March 2026 | Accepted: 10 April 2026 | Published: 30 April 2026

Abstract: The long-term resilience of modern financial systems increasingly relies on achieving an appropriate equilibrium between institutional debt enforcement and the economic well-being of borrowers. This study investigates the implementation of penalty provisions and charges for delayed payments within Islamic banking, identifying a marked disparity between traditional Shariah jurisprudence and contemporary institutional practice. Such discrepancies extend beyond matters of regulatory compliance, as financial sanctions may gradually shift from serving as deterrent measures to becoming drivers of socio-economic hardship. Adopting a threefold methodological framework comprising descriptive, inductive, and comparative approaches, the research assesses the implications of prevailing practices adopted by Islamic financial institutions for borrower welfare and overall financial system stability. The findings indicate that fragmented regulatory arrangements and uneven institutional implementation heighten financial vulnerabilities, particularly at the household level. The study advocates the adoption of a unified, borrower-oriented framework grounded in the objectives of Shariah (Maqasid al-Shariah), with particular emphasis on safeguarding wealth and preserving human dignity. It recommends replacing inflexible contractual enforcement with a more balanced approach that simultaneously promotes institutional sustainability and strengthens borrower protection.

Keywords: Penalty Clause, Late Payment Fine, Islamic Jurisprudence, Financial Transactions, Islamic Banking Applications.

1. Introduction

1.1 Theoretical Grounding and Research Roadmap

The architecture of contemporary banking has progressively evolved beyond its traditional emphasis on liquidity management and asset optimisation to encompass wider concerns relating to socio-economic exposure and financial vulnerability. Amid escalating household debt and increasingly intricate financial obligations, payment delays and loan defaults should be interpreted not merely as violations of contractual commitments but also as manifestations of broader economic fragility [2]. This perspective assumes particular importance within Islamic finance, where financial transactions are expected to satisfy not only legal and contractual requirements but also the higher objectives of Shariah (Maqasid al-Shariah), notably the preservation of wealth and the avoidance of harm [7]. Although penalty clauses and charges for overdue payments are commonly incorporated to encourage contractual discipline, their legitimacy, implementation, and wider socio-economic implications remain subjects of considerable debate. While certain scholars consider such measures permissible when governed by stringent conditions, others contend that they may constitute a form of *riba* if they generate unjustified financial benefit or impose disproportionate hardship upon debtors [9, 18].

This research adopts the complementary perspectives of economic human security and financial vulnerability, redirecting the analysis from institutional financial performance towards the borrower's capacity to sustain economic well-being and maintain freedom from want. Viewed through this lens, penalty clauses extend beyond their legal character and become financial mechanisms capable of directly influencing household welfare. Where these sanctions surpass their compensatory purpose or are enforced without sufficient procedural safeguards, they may weaken household financial resilience and conflict with the principles of justice and equity embedded within Islamic jurisprudence [10]. The practical relevance of this investigation encompasses several

stakeholder groups. Policymakers require integrated regulatory frameworks capable of reconciling domestic legislation, including the UAE Civil Transactions Law No. 5 of 1985, with Shariah principles to ensure equitable enforcement. Likewise, Shariah supervisory boards bear significant responsibility for determining both the permissibility and ethical limitations of penalty clauses, particularly regarding the appropriate utilisation of funds generated through such penalties [22]. Islamic financial institutions must simultaneously preserve operational sustainability and fulfil their ethical obligations, whereas borrowers, especially economically vulnerable households, require adequate protection against practices that may intensify indebtedness or contribute to financial hardship.

The remainder of this paper is organised as follows. It first establishes a conceptual framework that repositions penalty clauses from a narrow issue of contractual enforcement to one of economic human security. It subsequently examines the existing body of literature to identify prevailing theoretical and methodological deficiencies. The discussion then outlines the tripartite methodological design, comprising descriptive, inductive, and comparative approaches. Thereafter, institutional practices adopted by selected Islamic financial institutions are critically evaluated together with their broader implications. The paper concludes by presenting a unified, human-centred framework intended to harmonise contemporary financial practices with both the objectives of Shariah and present-day economic realities.

1.2 Conceptual Pivot: Penalty Clauses as a Human Security Concern

Penalty clauses are conventionally regarded as legal mechanisms designed to secure contractual performance and compensate for losses associated with delayed payment. Within Islamic finance, however, their significance extends beyond contractual enforcement to encompass broader ethical and socio-economic considerations. Evaluated from the standpoint of economic human security, such clauses function not only

as deterrent measures but may also become sources of financial vulnerability when the penalties imposed exceed the actual losses sustained [5, 10]. Conventional legal doctrine and banking practice primarily prioritise creditor protection and institutional stability, treating penalty clauses as essential instruments for strengthening repayment discipline and reducing default risk [2]. Nevertheless, this institutional perspective frequently gives limited attention to borrowers' financial circumstances and the wider effects that financial sanctions may have on household well-being. In contrast, the human security approach places the borrower at the centre of the analysis, assessing financial arrangements according to their capacity to safeguard economic stability and preserve freedom from want, objectives that closely reflect the principles embodied in Maqasid al-Shariah [7].

Adopting this perspective exposes an inherent tension between the enforcement of contractual obligations and the protection of socio-economic welfare. Although compensatory penalties may be considered legitimate when they accurately reflect demonstrable losses [6], sanctions that are excessive or inappropriately structured risk assuming the characteristics of *riba* by imposing additional financial obligations unrelated to actual economic harm [9, 18]. Accordingly, Shariah governance frameworks, including the AAOIFI standards, maintain that penalties should never constitute a source of institutional profit; instead, any funds collected should be allocated to charitable purposes to preserve ethical integrity and ensure Shariah compliance [22]. Reconsidering penalty clauses through the framework of economic human security therefore necessitates revised evaluation criteria. Rather than limiting assessment to legal validity and reductions in default rates, greater priority should be accorded to preventing borrower insolvency, limiting debt accumulation, and preserving financial dignity. Such an orientation supports both regulatory and institutional reforms aimed at addressing the structural causes of financial vulnerability instead of merely imposing sanctions after financial hardship has emerged.

This conceptual reorientation is fundamental to narrowing the disconnect between classical Islamic jurisprudence and present-day Islamic banking practices. It establishes the basis for a more balanced framework in which contractual discipline is maintained while protecting the socio-economic welfare of borrowers, thereby promoting consistency with both the objectives of Shariah and the practical demands of contemporary financial systems.

1.3 Research Problem and Objectives

The use of penalty clauses and charges for delayed payments within Islamic banking continues to generate substantial academic discussion and practical controversy. A key area of debate concerns whether these financial sanctions are fully compatible with the principles of Islamic Shariah or whether, under certain circumstances, they may resemble *riba*, which is unequivocally prohibited [9, 18]. Differences in scholarly interpretation have consequently produced diverse institutional practices, resulting in regulatory inconsistency and raising important ethical concerns. Although some jurists regard penalty clauses as legitimate compensatory measures intended to recover actual financial losses, others maintain that their application—particularly when disconnected from demonstrable harm or imposed routinely—may create inequitable financial obligations for borrowers and conflict with the principles of justice, fairness, and harm prevention embodied in Maqasid al-Shariah [5, 10]. Furthermore, current institutional practices reveal considerable variation in the calculation, implementation, and utilisation of penalty charges, including whether collected amounts are directed towards charitable causes or retained for administrative purposes [22]. Accordingly, this study pursues the following research objectives:

1. To establish the conceptual and legal basis governing penalty clauses and late payment fines within the framework of Islamic jurisprudence.
2. To assess the consistency of these mechanisms with the objectives of Shariah (Maqasid al-Shariah), with particular emphasis on justice, equity, and the avoidance of harm.
3. To investigate the implementation of penalty clauses across Islamic financial institutions, focusing on institutional differences and the role of Shariah governance.
4. To determine whether penalty clauses effectively discourage payment default while avoiding disproportionate financial hardship for borrowers.
5. To develop a more uniform and comprehensive framework that reconciles contractual enforcement with the protection of socio-economic welfare.

To achieve these objectives, the study addresses the following research questions:

- What legal position do penalty clauses and late payment fines occupy within Islamic banking?

- In what ways are penalty clauses implemented across different Islamic financial institutions?
- To what extent do prevailing institutional practices conform to Shariah principles and the objectives of Maqasid al-Shariah?
- How successful are penalty clauses in mitigating default without imposing unjust financial consequences on borrowers?

By examining these issues, the study seeks to narrow the divide between classical Islamic jurisprudence and contemporary banking practice. In doing so, it contributes towards the formulation of a more coherent, ethically grounded, and Shariah-compliant framework for the application of penalty clauses within Islamic finance.

2. Literature Review

Penalty clauses constitute a well-established feature of contemporary financial systems, where they are primarily employed to reinforce contractual obligations and compensate for losses resulting from payment defaults or delayed performance [2]. Although the expression "penalty clause" belongs to modern legal terminology, its underlying principles originate from classical Islamic jurisprudence. Early jurists examined contractual stipulations (*al-shurūt*) and debated the permissibility of attaching specified consequences to contractual non-compliance [16, 19]. Both classical and contemporary scholarship have interpreted these provisions through the broader objectives of Maqasid al-Shariah, emphasising justice, equity, and the prohibition of unjust enrichment. In this regard, Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn Qayyim recognised the validity of contractual conditions provided they neither produced oppression nor facilitated exploitation, thereby establishing an important doctrinal foundation for present-day discussions surrounding financial penalties. Likewise, Al-Zarqa [8] maintained that compensation corresponding to genuine financial loss may be acceptable under Shariah, whereas any amount exceeding actual harm and producing unwarranted financial benefit may assume the characteristics of *riba*.

Contemporary literature demonstrates considerable divergence regarding both the permissibility and practical implementation of penalty clauses within Islamic banking. Souma'ah [21] compared Islamic jurisprudence with Yemeni legislation, illustrating significant differences in the legal interpretation and enforcement of financial penalties across jurisdictions. Although the study offers valuable doctrinal analysis, its emphasis remains largely confined to legal provisions, providing limited consideration of the wider socio-economic effects experienced by borrowers. Similarly, studies investigated the legitimacy of monetary sanctions from the perspective of Islamic jurisprudence, concentrating primarily on theoretical legal principles while giving comparatively little attention to their operation within modern Islamic banking institutions.

Subsequent research has sought to address these limitations by extending the analysis beyond doctrinal interpretation. Al-Houti [4] examined regulatory approaches adopted across the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC), observing that Islamic financial institutions increasingly allocate penalty proceeds to charitable purposes in order to satisfy Shariah requirements. Nevertheless, the study adopts a predominantly descriptive approach and does not empirically evaluate whether such arrangements effectively safeguard borrowers from financial hardship. Al-Salhi [5] further advanced the discussion by assessing penalty clauses in light of Maqasid al-Shariah, concluding that appropriately designed penalties may promote justice while discouraging payment default. However, the analysis primarily considers institutional effectiveness and gives relatively limited attention to financial vulnerability at the household level. Institutional governance has also been significantly influenced by standards issued by the Accounting and Auditing Organization for Islamic Financial Institutions [17]. These standards generally require that revenue generated through late payment penalties should not be retained as institutional profit but instead be channelled towards charitable activities [22]. Although this requirement reduces concerns relating to unjust enrichment, it does not comprehensively address the financial burden imposed upon borrowers or resolve the considerable inconsistencies that continue to characterise institutional implementation.

Despite the valuable contributions of existing scholarship, several important deficiencies remain unresolved. The first is a regulatory gap, as previous studies acknowledge substantial jurisdictional variation yet stop short of proposing a comprehensive framework capable of promoting regulatory harmonisation [21]. A second limitation concerns the empirical evidence, with relatively little research evaluating how penalty clauses influence borrower welfare, financial resilience, or economic vulnerability in practice [5]. A third gap relates to institutional functionality, since existing literature generally explains the mechanisms governing the allocation of penalty funds without critically examining their broader ethical and socio-economic consequences [22]. Finally, a judicial

gap persists because limited attention has been devoted to the methods by which courts assess actual financial harm and modify penalty amounts under contemporary legal regimes, including the UAE Civil Transactions Law No. 5 of 1985.

Collectively, these shortcomings demonstrate the necessity for a more comprehensive analytical framework that integrates legal doctrine, empirical evidence, and ethical evaluation within a single perspective. Addressing these unresolved issues, the present study seeks to advance a more coherent, standardised, and human-centred approach to the application of penalty clauses in Islamic banking.

2.1 Conceptual and Legal Framework

The legal governance of penalty clauses in Islamic banking is founded upon the convergence of classical Islamic jurisprudence and contemporary statutory regulation. Legislative instruments such as the UAE Civil Transactions Law No. 5 of 1985 establish the legal basis for enforcing contractual penalties while authorising courts to revise such provisions where necessary to reflect the actual loss sustained. This judicial discretion promotes proportionality and fairness by ensuring that financial penalties remain commensurate with proven damage and do not become vehicles for unjust enrichment [1].

A comparable principle is evident within Islamic jurisprudence, which recognises the validity of contractual stipulations (*al-shurūt*) provided they neither conflict with Shariah principles nor result in injustice or exploitation. Classical jurists, including Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn Qayyim, maintained that contractual conditions are enforceable when they pursue legitimate objectives and prevent harm rather than facilitate it. Consequently, financial penalties intended solely to compensate for verifiable economic loss may be regarded as permissible, whereas penalties that exceed demonstrable damage or create unwarranted financial benefit may assume the characteristics of *riba* and therefore become unacceptable under Shariah [9, 10]. The practical implementation of these principles has been further clarified through the governance standards issued by AAOIFI. These standards require Islamic financial institutions to refrain from recognising late payment penalties as institutional income. Instead, the proceeds generated from such penalties are expected to be channelled towards charitable purposes. This arrangement is intended to eliminate any financial incentive associated with borrower default while preserving the disciplinary function of penalty clauses in discouraging deliberate payment delays [22].

Despite this broad consistency between statutory legislation and Shariah principles, notable differences persist in institutional practice. Islamic financial institutions adopt varying approaches to the management and utilisation of penalty proceeds. While some institutions allocate all collected amounts exclusively to charitable activities, others apply part of these funds to recover administrative expenses. Such divergent practices raise important concerns regarding their consistency with the objectives of *Maqasid al-Shariah*, particularly in relation to justice, transparency, and the prevention of harm. Regulatory inconsistency is further reinforced by variations among jurisdictions in the interpretation and judicial enforcement of penalty clauses. Certain legal systems provide explicit mechanisms enabling courts to review and adjust contractual penalties according to the principle of proportionality, whereas others operate with comparatively limited judicial oversight. As a consequence, borrowers in some jurisdictions may be exposed to financial obligations that exceed equitable limits. These disparities underscore the need for a harmonised regulatory framework capable of integrating effective legal enforcement with the ethical foundations that distinguish Islamic finance.

In response to these challenges, the present study develops a conceptual framework that combines statutory compliance with the broader objectives of *Maqasid al-Shariah*, giving particular attention to justice, fairness, and socio-economic protection. By evaluating penalty clauses through both legal and ethical perspectives, the study seeks to assess not only their legitimacy under Shariah but also their broader implications for financial stability, borrower welfare, and sustainable economic well-being.

3. Methodology

This research employs a mixed methodological design that integrates descriptive, inductive, and comparative approaches to facilitate a comprehensive examination of penalty clauses within Islamic banking. Combining these three complementary methods enables the study to connect theoretical jurisprudence, statutory regulation, and institutional practice within a unified analytical framework. The descriptive approach is adopted to investigate the conceptual and legal foundations governing penalty clauses under both Islamic jurisprudence

and contemporary legal systems. Particular attention is given to statutory instruments, including the UAE Civil Transactions Law No. 5 of 1985, together with the Shariah governance standards promulgated by AAOIFI [22]. Through this analytical process, the study establishes the legal characteristics, underlying principles, and permissible boundaries of penalty clauses within Islamic finance.

The inductive approach focuses on institutional practice by examining evidence drawn from selected Islamic financial institutions. Case-based analysis involving organisations such as IDB and KFH is utilised to evaluate the practical implementation of penalty clauses within operational environments. This method facilitates the identification of recurring practices, institutional differences, and implementation challenges, particularly those associated with Shariah compliance and operational effectiveness [5]. The comparative approach is employed to evaluate how penalty clauses are treated across different legal and banking systems. Particular emphasis is placed on contrasting Islamic banking with conventional financial practice. Whereas conventional institutions generally apply penalties as compensatory mechanisms that benefit the creditor, Islamic banking adopts a fundamentally different philosophy by treating such measures primarily as deterrents and requiring the allocation of penalty proceeds to charitable purposes in accordance with Shariah principles [21, 22]. This comparative assessment enables the study to identify regulatory divergence, institutional inconsistencies, and areas where greater harmonisation is required.

The integration of these complementary methodologies provides a holistic analytical foundation consistent with the conceptual framework underpinning this research, which is centred upon justice, fairness, and the objectives of *Maqasid al-Shariah* [7]. Within this framework, the descriptive approach establishes the doctrinal and legal context, the inductive approach evaluates institutional realities, and the comparative approach exposes regulatory deficiencies together with opportunities for policy reform. Collectively, these methods provide a multidimensional assessment of penalty clauses by examining their legal legitimacy, institutional implementation, and broader socio-economic consequences within Islamic banking.

4. Findings and Analysis

4.1 Definition and Types of Penalty Clauses

Penalty clauses represent a key mechanism in modern financial contracts, designed to ensure compliance and address losses resulting from delayed or non-performance.

Penalty clauses constitute an essential feature of contemporary financial contracts, serving to reinforce contractual compliance and provide a mechanism for addressing losses arising from delayed fulfilment or contractual default. Although the expression itself is rooted in modern legal terminology, its underlying principles originate from classical Islamic jurisprudence, particularly the jurisprudential discourse concerning contractual stipulations (*al-shurūt*) [16, 19]. Within Islamic banking, the application of penalty clauses is governed by Shariah principles, most notably the prohibition of *riba* and the obligation to uphold justice and equity in contractual relationships. Accordingly, scholars maintain that financial penalties should either correspond to demonstrable loss or function solely as deterrents without producing unwarranted financial gain or unjust enrichment [5, 10]. Based on their legal structure and practical consequences, penalty clauses may be classified into three principal categories:

- **Excessive Penalty Clauses:** These clauses impose financial charges that exceed the actual loss sustained by the affected party. Islamic jurists generally regard such penalties as impermissible because they may result in injustice, create disproportionate financial obligations, and exhibit characteristics associated with *riba* [10].
- **Equal (Compensatory) Penalty Clauses:** These clauses require compensation that is proportionate to the verified loss suffered by the creditor. Such penalties are generally considered acceptable within Islamic jurisprudence when they are supported by evidence of actual damage and remain confined to genuine compensation rather than financial gain [6].
- **Under-Compensatory (Deterrent) Clauses:** These provisions prescribe relatively limited financial penalties intended primarily to discourage deliberate payment delays instead of compensating for economic loss. They are generally viewed as being more consistent with Shariah principles, particularly where the collected amounts are allocated to charitable purposes in accordance with the governance standards established by AAOIFI [22].

4.2 Jurisprudential Perspectives on Penalty Clauses

The permissibility of penalty clauses remains a subject of scholarly debate.

Considerable disagreement persists among both classical and contemporary Islamic scholars regarding the permissibility of penalty clauses, largely because of differing interpretations of Shariah principles governing financial transactions. One scholarly perspective, represented by jurists such as [Al-Zarqa](#) [8] and [Al-Dareer](#) [3], accepts the use of financial penalties when they are strictly intended to compensate for genuine economic losses arising from delayed payment or contractual non-performance [9]. A separate line of opinion permits the imposition of such penalties solely as a deterrent against intentional default, subject to the condition that the proceeds are not retained for the lender's financial benefit but are instead allocated to charitable purposes in accordance with the governance requirements established by [AAOIFI](#) [22].

By contrast, opposing scholars contend that the routine or excessive application of penalty clauses may blur the distinction between legitimate contractual sanctions and interest-based financial practices. Where penalties generate additional financial gain beyond their permissible purpose, they may exhibit characteristics associated with *riba* and consequently become incompatible with Shariah requirements [18]. These contrasting interpretations demonstrate the continuing challenge of balancing effective contractual enforcement with faithful adherence to the ethical and legal principles underpinning Islamic finance.

4.3 Institutional Applications in Islamic Banking

In practice, Islamic financial institutions adopt varying approaches to the implementation of penalty clauses:

- **Islamic Development Bank (IDB):** IDB requires that all proceeds generated from penalty clauses be transferred to charitable causes, thereby preventing the institution from obtaining any financial advantage from delayed repayments. This model reflects a rigorous commitment to Shariah principles and ethical financial governance [12].
- **Kuwait Finance House (KFH):** KFH utilises penalty charges primarily to offset the administrative expenses incurred through payment delays. Although this approach does not permit profit generation, it emphasises the recovery of operational costs associated with managing default cases [15].
- **Qatar Islamic Bank (QIB):** QIB implements penalty clauses in accordance with [AAOIFI](#) standards by directing collected funds towards public welfare initiatives administered under Shariah supervision. This framework promotes both transparency and compliance with recognised ethical requirements [13].
- **Dallah Al-Baraka Group:** This institution adopts a comparatively conservative position by rejecting compensatory financial penalties and restricting the utilisation of penalty proceeds exclusively to charitable purposes. Such an approach reflects a more stringent interpretation of Shariah compliance within Islamic banking practice [14].

These institutional examples illustrate the absence of a uniform approach to implementing penalty clauses across Islamic banking. The observed variations largely stem from differing jurisprudential interpretations, governance frameworks, and regulatory environments, resulting in diverse institutional practices despite a shared commitment to Shariah principles.

4.4 Comparative Legal Frameworks Across Jurisdictions

The implementation of penalty clauses is shaped not only by institutional policies but also by the legal frameworks operating within individual jurisdictions. For instance, the UAE Civil Transactions Law No. 5 of 1985 empowers courts to review and modify contractual penalties so that they correspond to the actual loss incurred. By allowing judicial adjustment, the legislation promotes proportionality and equitable treatment while preventing the imposition of excessive or unjustified financial sanctions. This approach is broadly consistent with Shariah principles, which require that contractual remedies remain fair and avoid unjust enrichment. By comparison, comparable judicial safeguards are absent or less developed in certain jurisdictions, resulting in differences in both the enforcement of penalty clauses and the degree of conformity with Shariah requirements. Although [AAOIFI](#) standards provide a common reference point for regulating such practices, their adoption and practical implementation vary considerably among Islamic financial institutions. Consequently, the absence of uniform application continues to contribute to regulatory fragmentation and institutional inconsistency

across the Islamic banking sector.

4.5 Regulatory and Operational Gaps

The analysis identifies several key gaps in the current framework:

- **Operational Disparities:** Considerable differences exist in the manner in which Islamic financial institutions implement penalty clauses, resulting in inconsistent institutional practices and unequal treatment of borrowers across the sector.
- **Allocation of Funds:** Divergent approaches to the utilisation of penalty proceeds, whether channelled towards charitable activities or applied to administrative cost recovery, continue to generate important ethical and regulatory concerns despite the guidance provided by [AAOIFI](#) [22].
- **Judicial Oversight:** Although certain legal systems empower courts to review and revise contractual penalties to ensure proportionality, many jurisdictions provide only limited judicial supervision, thereby increasing the likelihood of disproportionate financial sanctions.
- **Transparency Issues:** Inadequate disclosure regarding the methodology used to determine penalty amounts and the subsequent utilisation of collected funds weakens institutional accountability and may undermine stakeholder confidence in Islamic financial institutions.

4.6 Proposed Applications and Recommendations

To address these challenges, the study proposes several practical measures. First, Islamic financial institutions should adopt standardised frameworks governing the application of penalty clauses in order to promote greater institutional consistency while ensuring continued compliance with Shariah principles. Second, closer collaboration between international standard-setting organisations, particularly [AAOIFI](#), and national regulatory authorities is required to encourage greater harmonisation of regulatory practices across different jurisdictions. Furthermore, the adoption of financial technology (Fintech) offers significant opportunities to improve transparency and institutional oversight. Advanced digital platforms can support the early identification of potential payment defaults, automate the assessment and administration of penalty clauses, and provide transparent mechanisms for tracking the distribution of penalty proceeds to charitable purposes [20]. The integration of these technological solutions has the potential to enhance operational effectiveness while reinforcing ethical governance, accountability, and public confidence within Islamic banking.

4.7 Practices of Islamic Banks in Implementing Penalty Clauses

4.7.1 Dallah Al-Baraka Group

Application: Dallah Al-Baraka Group does not permit the use of penalty clauses that generate financial benefit for the lender. Instead, all amounts collected from late payment penalties are channelled exclusively to charitable purposes.

Shariah Compliance: Its Shariah Board considers compensatory penalty clauses to be impermissible on the grounds that they are comparable to *riba* (interest).

4.8 Kuwait Finance House (KFH)

Application: KFH prohibits any increase in a debtor's outstanding liability as a consequence of late payment. However, it permits the imposition of late payment penalties on the condition that the amounts collected are directed exclusively to charitable purposes and do not provide any financial benefit to the lender.

Policy: According to its Shariah Supervisory Board, these penalties serve as a deterrent against intentional payment delays and reinforce the ethical obligation to fulfil financial commitments.

5. Discussion

The findings of this study highlight the intricate relationship between jurisprudential principles, legal frameworks, and institutional practices governing the application of penalty clauses in Islamic banking. Although these clauses are founded upon established concepts within Islamic jurisprudence, their contemporary implementation demonstrates considerable inconsistency, raising concerns regarding both their practical effectiveness and their conformity with Shariah principles. Conceptually, penalty clauses are intended to uphold justice, encourage

contractual fulfilment, and discourage deliberate payment default. These objectives are consistent with the broader aims of Maqasid al-Shariah, particularly the protection of wealth and the prevention of harm [7]. Nevertheless, the analysis indicates that their implementation differs substantially across institutions and jurisdictions, producing inconsistent outcomes. In certain contexts, penalty clauses operate effectively as deterrents, whereas in others they may impose disproportionate financial obligations on borrowers, thereby conflicting with the principle of fairness emphasised within Islamic jurisprudence [10].

The governing legal framework substantially influences these outcomes. The United Arab Emirates provides an illustrative example through the UAE Civil Transactions Law No. 5 of 1985, which authorises judicial modification of contractual penalties according to the actual loss incurred. This mechanism promotes proportionality and prevents excessive financial sanctions, thereby maintaining consistency with Shariah principles. Conversely, jurisdictions lacking comparable judicial safeguards are more susceptible to regulatory inconsistency and uneven levels of borrower protection. Institutional practice also varies considerably. Organisations such as IDB, KFH, and Dallah Al-Baraka Group require penalty proceeds to be allocated exclusively to charitable purposes, thereby preventing financial benefit to the lender and reducing the possibility of unjust enrichment. Although these institutions pursue the common objective of Shariah compliance, differences in governance arrangements and implementation continue to raise concerns regarding transparency, consistency, and ethical coherence across the Islamic banking industry.

The analysis further identifies several operational challenges. Although existing evidence suggests that penalty clauses can contribute to reducing payment defaults [5], their implementation continues to be affected by shortcomings in transparency, governance, and standardisation. In particular, inconsistent practices concerning the management of penalty proceeds, together with limited disclosure mechanisms, may weaken stakeholder confidence and generate uncertainty regarding compliance with Shariah principles. Moreover, the limited availability of empirical evidence examining borrower-level outcomes restricts a comprehensive assessment of the influence of penalty clauses on financial vulnerability. These findings underscore the importance of establishing a more unified and human-centred framework capable of balancing the legitimate interests of financial institutions in securing repayment with the ethical responsibility to protect borrowers from excessive financial hardship. Achieving this objective requires both greater regulatory harmonisation and the adoption of technological solutions, including digital monitoring systems, to improve transparency and facilitate early intervention in cases of potential default [20].

Ultimately, ensuring that penalty clauses remain consistent with the objectives of Maqasid al-Shariah requires moving beyond a purely contractual perspective towards a broader framework that gives due consideration to socio-economic outcomes. Such an approach would strengthen the ethical foundations of Islamic banking while enhancing its institutional resilience and credibility within the contemporary financial system.

6. Conclusion and Recommendations

This study has examined the application of penalty clauses and late payment fines within Islamic banking, highlighting the continuing challenge of reconciling contractual enforcement with compliance with Shariah principles. The findings demonstrate considerable variation across scholarly opinions, legal frameworks, and institutional practices, producing a fragmented landscape characterised by inconsistencies in regulatory application, transparency, and ethical conformity. Although some scholars and Islamic financial institutions recognise penalty clauses as legitimate compensatory or deterrent mechanisms, others reject their use because they may exhibit characteristics of *riba*, particularly where they generate unwarranted financial benefit or impose disproportionate obligations on borrowers [9, 18]. Institutional practice likewise differs, with organisations such as Dallah Al-Baraka Group, IDB, and KFH requiring penalty proceeds to be allocated exclusively to charitable purposes in accordance with Shariah requirements [22]. These differences illustrate the continuing absence of a unified regulatory framework. Nevertheless, the findings indicate that appropriately designed and effectively implemented penalty clauses can contribute to reducing payment default while strengthening financial discipline [5]. Their legitimacy and effectiveness, however, depend upon transparency, proportionality, and faithful adherence to Shariah principles, particularly the values of justice, fairness, and the prevention of harm embodied in Maqasid al-Shariah [7]. To address the identified gaps, the study proposes the following recommendations:

- **Regulatory Standardization:** International standard-setting bodies, particularly AAOIFI, in collaboration with national regulatory authorities, should formulate harmonised guidelines governing the

implementation, calculation, and allocation of penalty clauses to promote consistency and strengthen Shariah compliance.

- **Clear Enforcement Frameworks:** Islamic financial institutions should introduce transparent policies explaining the procedures for imposing, calculating, and allocating penalty charges, thereby enhancing accountability and reinforcing stakeholder confidence.
- **Strengthening Judicial Oversight:** National legal systems should adopt mechanisms comparable to those provided under the UAE Civil Transactions Law No. 5 of 1985, enabling courts to revise contractual penalties according to actual loss and prevent disproportionate financial burdens.
- **Integration of Financial Technology (Fintech):** The adoption of digital technologies can improve the monitoring of repayment behaviour, automate the administration of penalty clauses, and provide greater transparency in the allocation of penalty proceeds, thereby enhancing both operational efficiency and Shariah compliance [20].
- **Empirical Research Expansion:** Future studies should investigate the long-term effects of penalty clauses on borrower behaviour, financial stability, and broader socio-economic welfare.
- **Transparency in Fund Allocation:** Islamic financial institutions should establish comprehensive reporting mechanisms to ensure that penalty proceeds are managed in accordance with Shariah principles and allocated transparently to their intended purposes.

In conclusion, the continued advancement of Islamic banking depends upon achieving an appropriate balance between effective legal enforcement and ethical responsibility. Adopting a standardised and human-centred framework for the application of penalty clauses would enhance institutional effectiveness while reinforcing the pursuit of socio-economic justice. Such an approach would not only strengthen adherence to Shariah principles but also promote greater trust, stability, and long-term sustainability within the Islamic financial system.

References

- [1] U. C. T. L. N. 5, *Available at UAE Official Gazette archives.*, (1985).
- [2] H. Ahmed, & Ullah, S, *Islamic Financial Contracts: Resolving Issues of Defaults and Compliance.*, Palgrave Macmillan. (2022).
- [3] M. A. Al-Dareer, *Penalty Clause*, Journal of Islamic Fiqh Academy (2000).
- [4] S. A. Al-Houti, *Rulings on Financial Penalties in Overdue Debts.*, Islamic Studies and Academic Research Journal. (2022).
- [5] K. Al-Salhi, *Late Payment Penalty: Its Jurisprudential Rulings and Economic Effects*, Martyr Hamo Lakhdar University, 2019.
- [6] A. R. Al-Sanhouri, *The Mediator in Explaining Civil Law: General Theory of Obligation*, Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiya (1963).
- [7] I. Al-Shatibi, *Al-Muwafaqat fi Usul Al-Sharia (Reconciliation in Shariah Principles)*, Dar Ibn Qayyim, Riyadh, 2008.
- [8] M. Al-Zarqa, *Is It Legally Permissible to Penalize a Defaulting Debtor?*, Islamic Economics Research Journal. (1985).
- [9] M. A. Al-Zarqa, *Agreement to Oblige the Debtor to Compensation for Default.*, Journal of Islamic Economic Research. (1985).
- [10] W. Al-Zuhayli, *Contemporary Financial Transactions.*, 2014.
- [11] A. Y. Ali, & Osman, A. H., *Comparative Analysis of Penalty Clauses in Islamic and Conventional Banking*, International Journal of Islamic Economics **10** (2022), 45-59.
- [12] I. D. Bank, *Shariah Governance in Islamic Financial Institutions: Best Practices and Case Studies.*, Islamic Research and Training Institute (IRTI). (2022).
- [13] Q. I. Bank, *Annual Shariah Supervisory Board Report.*, Doha, Qatar., 2023.
- [14] D. A.-B. Group, *Shariah Supervisory Guidelines.*, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia., 2023.
- [15] K. F. House, *Policy on Late Payment Penalties.*, Kuwait City, Kuwait., 2023.
- [16] A. Ibn Rushd, *Bidayat al-Mujtahid.*, Dar Al-Ma'arif, 1998.
- [17] M. Iqbal, & Khan, S, *The Role of AAOIFI Standards in Islamic Banking Practices: A Contemporary Review*, Journal of Islamic Finance **14** (2023), 23-34.
- [18] Z. Iqbal, A. Mirakhor, *An introduction to Islamic finance: Theory and practice*, John Wiley & Sons, 2011.
- [19] M. H. Kamali, *Principles of Islamic Jurisprudence.*, Islamic Texts Society, Cambridge, 2011.
- [20] M. M. Rahman, & Saad, N. M, *Fintech Solutions for Enhancing Compliance and Efficiency in Islamic Banking*, Journal of Financial Innovation **7** (2022), 78-91.
- [21] A. A. souma'ah, *Financial Penalties in Islamic Sharia and Yemeni Law and Their Yemeni Applications.*, PhD Dissertation, University of Malaya., 2015.

- [22] A. Standards, *Shariah Compliance in Financial Transactions*. , Accounting and Auditing Organization for Islamic Financial Institutions. (2022).