

Substantive Justice in the Case of Corruption in Brazil: The Lava Jato Process and its Legal and Social Implications

*La Justicia Sustantiva en el Caso de la Corrupción en
Brasil: El Proceso Lava Jato y sus Implicaciones
Jurídicas y Sociales*

Francisco Muñoz¹✉[✉], Miguel Ángel Ramos¹[✉]

¹Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Chile

²Universidade de Brasília, Brazil

✉Corresponding email: f.munoz@uc.cl

ABSTRACT

This article analyzes the Lava Jato (Car Wash) case in Brazil as a paradigmatic example of the challenges substantive justice faces when confronted with structural corruption. Using an interdisciplinary approach, it examines how the judicial system responded to the scandal and explores its social, political, and economic consequences. The paper argues that although Lava Jato was initially celebrated as a step forward in combating impunity, its evolution revealed tensions between formal legality and substantive justice—particularly regarding due process, punitive selectivity, and the political use of judicial mechanisms. The article offers a critical reading of the case to reflect on the limitations of criminal law in systemic corruption contexts,

emphasizing the need for institutional reforms that combine effectiveness with respect for democratic principles.

Keywords Lava Jato, substantive justice, corruption, Brazil, judicial system

RESUMEN

Este artículo analiza el caso Lava Jato en Brasil como ejemplo paradigmático de los desafíos que enfrenta la justicia sustantiva frente a la corrupción estructural. A través de un enfoque interdisciplinario, se examina cómo el sistema judicial respondió al escándalo, así como los efectos sociales, políticos y económicos del proceso. Se plantea que, si bien Lava Jato fue celebrado inicialmente como un avance en la lucha contra la impunidad, su evolución mostró tensiones entre legalidad formal y equidad sustantiva, especialmente en cuanto al debido proceso, la selectividad punitiva y el uso político del sistema judicial. El artículo propone una lectura crítica del caso para reflexionar sobre los límites del derecho penal en contextos de corrupción sistémica, subrayando la necesidad de reformas institucionales que combinen eficacia con respeto a principios democráticos.

Palabras clave Lava Jato; justicia sustantiva; corrupción; Brasil; sistema judicial

A. Introduction

Corruption has long been recognized as a pervasive and systemic challenge in Brazil, undermining democratic institutions, eroding public trust, and impeding economic development (de Sousa, 2019; Taylor, 2018). The prevalence of corruption in both public administration and the private sector has prompted extensive legal and political responses, making Brazil a particularly instructive case for examining anti-corruption initiatives. Among these, *Operação Lava Jato* (Operation Car Wash) stands out as the most prominent and consequential investigation, originating in 2014 as an inquiry into money laundering and expanding to uncover widespread collusion between politicians, state-owned enterprises, and private contractors (Moro & Motta, 2019; Spektor, 2016).

The scale and impact of Lava Jato, both legally and socially, have drawn significant attention from scholars, policymakers, and civil society, positioning it as a critical site for studying the interaction between formal legal procedures and broader concepts of justice (Hunter & Power, 2019). Understanding corruption through the lens of

substantive justice—a principle emphasizing fairness, equity, and the ethical dimensions of legal outcomes—offers a nuanced perspective on the Lava Jato process (Rawls, 2001; Pogge, 2002). Substantive justice considers not only strict adherence to legal norms but also the moral and social legitimacy of judicial decisions, particularly in contexts where legal processes intersect with political and institutional interests (Santos, 2014).

While Lava Jato has been celebrated for exposing entrenched corruption, it has also generated significant controversy concerning the balance between formal legality and substantive justice. On one hand, the investigation demonstrated rigorous application of legal procedures and judicial oversight, resulting in high-profile convictions and widespread institutional scrutiny (Moro & Motta, 2019). On the other hand, critics have highlighted concerns over political bias, selective prosecution, potential violations of due process, and questions about judicial independence (Hunter, 2020; Taylor, 2018). These tensions underscore a fundamental dilemma in anti-corruption efforts: the pursuit of legal compliance and procedural correctness may sometimes conflict with broader notions of fairness, equity, and societal trust in the justice system.

This study seeks to examine the Lava Jato process through the conceptual lens of substantive justice. The primary research questions guiding this investigation are:

- 1) How does the Lava Jato process reflect or contradict the principles of substantive justice?
- 2) What are the legal and social implications of this process for Brazil's justice system?

By addressing these questions, the study aims to elucidate the interplay between procedural rigor and ethical considerations in high-profile anti-corruption trials. It also seeks to explore how judicial decisions influence public perceptions of fairness, legitimacy, and trust in legal institutions (Santos, 2014; Spektor, 2016).

The significance of this research extends to both theoretical and practical domains. Academically, it contributes to comparative legal studies and anti-corruption frameworks by offering a critical analysis of one of the most extensive and politically consequential investigations in Latin American history (Hunter & Power, 2019). Practically, it informs ongoing debates regarding the rule of law, judicial ethics, and the institutional capacity to uphold substantive justice in the face of systemic corruption (de Sousa, 2019). By situating Lava Jato within these broader discourses, the study provides insights relevant not only to Brazil but also to other jurisdictions grappling with similar challenges of corruption, accountability, and judicial legitimacy.

This research underscores the importance of integrating normative concerns about fairness and social justice into the design and evaluation of anti-corruption mechanisms. It highlights the necessity of balancing legal formalism with ethical considerations to ensure that anti-corruption initiatives do not merely achieve procedural victories but also foster equitable and legitimate outcomes for society (Rawls, 2001; Pogge, 2002).

B. Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

The conceptual distinction between substantive and formal justice has occupied a central position in normative legal theory, with substantive justice emphasizing the ethical, equitable, and contextually grounded outcomes of legal processes, whereas formal justice is fundamentally concerned with procedural regularity and the consistent application of rules irrespective of social impact (Rawls, 2001; Dworkin, 1986; Sen, 2009). In the context of anti-corruption adjudication, formal legality may ensure that court decisions adhere to procedural prescriptions, yet it cannot alone vindicate the normative legitimacy of those decisions, which is contingent on deeper considerations of fairness, social inclusion, and distributive equity (Rawls, 2001). Theoretical inquiries into justice thus interrogate not merely the mechanics of legal process but also the ethical imperatives that undergird the legitimacy of judicial authority (Pogge, 2002; Santos, 2014).

Concepts of legality and legitimacy are inextricably intertwined in legal theory. Legality secures the rule-of-law infrastructure, but legitimacy—both normative and empirical—depends on legal outcomes that are not only procedurally sound but substantively justifiable in the eyes of the polity (Santos, 2014). Indeed, scholars argue that a purely procedural focus neglects the broader societal repercussions of legal decisions, particularly where those decisions resonate with public perceptions of equity, accountability, and democratic integrity (Pogge, 2002). These theoretical premises provide an indispensable framework for evaluating the *Lava Jato* process: an anti-corruption initiative whose procedural rigor has been debated alongside questions about its substantive justice implications.

1. Studies on Corruption and Judicial Processes

The literature on corruption in Latin America and Brazil emphasizes the systemic character of corrupt practices and their deleterious effects on governance, institutional trust, and democratic norms (Taylor, 2018; de Sousa, 2019). Empirical studies demonstrate how entrenched networks of political and economic elites have

perpetuated cycles of malfeasance, rendering conventional legal sanctions insufficient without robust institutional reforms (Rios Petrarca, 2020). In this respect, *Lava Jato* has been positioned as a watershed moment for anti-corruption litigation, provoking extensive scholarly analysis across legal, political, and sociocultural dimensions.

Legal scholarship on *Lava Jato* grapples with its innovative use of criminal law mechanisms juxtaposed with attendant risks and limitations. For instance, Mota Prado and Machado's comparative examination foregrounds jurisprudential innovations in Brazil's criminal law during the *Lava Jato* investigations, including the expanded use of plea bargaining and leniency agreements, while also highlighting attendant legal uncertainties and institutional strains (Mota Prado & Machado, 2021). Similarly, critiques in the *Journal of Law and Society* argue that prosecutorial zeal within *Lava Jato* may have compromised due process and constitutional safeguards, raising concerns about judicial overreach and democratic erosion (Mészáros, 2020).

Beyond doctrinal analysis, socio-legal research has explored the interplay between public discourse, legal consciousness, and anti-corruption law enforcement. Silva's study of social media interactions demonstrates how narratives propagated by prosecutors and their followers contributed to the co-production of a legal consciousness that valorized punitive action at the potential expense of broader rule-of-law commitments (de Sa e Silva, 2022). Complementary research on corruption framing reveals divergent constructions of *Lava Jato*'s objectives and motives, suggesting that public and elite discourses often employed conflicting frames—such as judicial activism versus technical legal process—thereby shaping distinct perceptions of corruption and justice (Grangeia & Thijm, 2024).

In addition, scholarship examining the broader political effects of anti-corruption strategies underscores how movements like *Lava Jato* intersect with electoral politics and civil society mobilization. For example, comparative work highlights how the criminalization of corruption in Latin America, including *Lava Jato*, has reverberated beyond Brazil to influence governance and prosecutions in Peru, Ecuador, and Mexico, while also contributing to polarized political landscapes (Sobhy et al., 2024). Collectively, these studies establish a multifaceted scholarly record on *Lava Jato* that traverses doctrinal, sociopolitical, and discursive terrains, yet still leaves gaps in assessments of substantive justice outcomes specifically.

2. Legal and Institutional Framework in Brazil

The Brazilian legal framework features a robust array of anti-corruption statutes and institutional mechanisms designed to

empower prosecutorial and judicial actors to pursue malfeasance. The Clean Company Act (Law No. 12,846/2013) and related anti-corruption provisions have endowed federal authorities with tools for sanctioning both corporate and individual actors involved in corrupt conduct (de Sousa, 2019). In the *Lava Jato* context, these laws facilitated unprecedented cooperation between law enforcement, prosecutors, and the judiciary, enabling complex financial investigations and sanctioning of powerful political figures.

However, Brazil's legal institutions have also been sites of contestation over prosecutorial autonomy, judicial independence, and the scope of constitutional safeguards. Research on prosecutorial autonomy highlights how varying models of prosecutorial independence may shape governance outcomes and anti-corruption efficacy, with emphases on balancing accountability and autonomy in democratic legal systems. Moreover, analyses of *Lava Jato*'s impacts on constitutional norms—particularly the presumption of innocence—illustrate how anti-corruption rhetoric and practices can strain foundational legal principles, challenging the integrity of constitutional protections (Neto & Santiago, 2024).

International frameworks such as the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC) and the Inter-American Convention against Corruption provide normative benchmarks for transparency, accountability, and procedural fairness. Adoption of these standards underscores Brazil's formal commitment to international anti-corruption norms, yet the translation of these standards into substantive justice outcomes depends on domestic institutional dynamics and interpretative practices within the judiciary and prosecutorial agencies.

3. Analytical Gap

Despite abundant scholarship on corruption and judicial processes in Brazil, a conspicuous analytical gap remains: there is limited systematic inquiry into the extent to which *Lava Jato* accomplished substantive justice outcomes as opposed to procedural legality. While existing research offers critical insights into legal innovations, prosecutorial conduct, sociopolitical ramifications, and public discourse surrounding the operation, relatively few studies undertake an integrated legal-social analysis that foregrounds the normative dimensions of justice outcomes (Mészáros, 2020; de Sa e Silva, 2022; Grangeia & Thijm, 2024). Addressing this gap requires a synthesis of doctrinal legal analysis, political inquiry, and empirical social research to assess not only whether legal processes complied

with statutory norms but also whether they produced outcomes that align with equitable and legitimate conceptions of justice.

This study aims to build on these diverse strands of scholarship by situating *Lava Jato* within a broader theoretical and empirical framework that prioritizes substantive justice, thereby offering a more holistic understanding of its legal and social implications within Brazil's evolving democratic and judicial milieu.

C. Methodology

1. Research Design

This study adopts a qualitative research design, combining doctrinal and empirical methodologies in a hybrid approach particularly suited to examining the complex interplay between law, justice, and social legitimacy in high-profile corruption cases (de Sa e Silva, 2022; Mota Prado & Machado, 2021). The doctrinal component focuses on the systematic analysis of legal texts, including statutory provisions, constitutional norms, judicial decisions, and prosecutorial documents, with the aim of elucidating the formal structures and procedural mechanisms employed during the *Operação Lava Jato* investigation (Monteiro Neto & Santiago, 2024; Rodrigues, 2024). Complementing this, the empirical component engages socio-legal methodologies, incorporating media analyses, public discourse studies, and, where feasible, interviews with key legal and policy actors (Vilaça, 2024; Anderson, Jones, & Kovacic, 2024). By integrating these approaches, the research seeks not only to chart the procedural course of *Lava Jato* but also to interrogate its alignment—or divergence—with the principles of substantive justice, understood as the pursuit of equitable, proportionate, and socially legitimate outcomes (Rawls, 2001; Pogge, 2002).

The research employs a case study design, focusing specifically on the *Lava Jato* process spanning 2014–2021 (Rios Petrarca, 2020). This case is strategically selected due to its historical significance, extensive documentation, and substantial impact on Brazil's political and legal landscape. By concentrating on this single, in-depth case, the study explores the nuanced interrelationships between legal procedures, normative justice principles, and broader social and political effects, offering insights that extend beyond the immediate empirical context to inform comparative and theoretical debates in anti-corruption and judicial studies (Taylor, 2018; Hunter & Power, 2019).

2. Data Sources

The primary data sources for this study encompass a combination of legal, scholarly, and media materials, triangulated to

ensure analytical robustness and interpretive depth. First, legal documents form the cornerstone of the doctrinal analysis, including court judgments, indictments, plea agreements, prosecutorial submissions, and relevant constitutional provisions (de Sousa, 2019; Moro & Motta, 2019). These documents allow for a precise reconstruction of the legal processes underpinning Lava Jato, providing detailed evidence of procedural steps, judicial reasoning, and the application of statutory norms (Praça & Taylor, 2018).

Second, secondary materials are incorporated to contextualize the legal analysis and situate it within broader academic and societal discourses. Peer-reviewed journal articles, monographs, and policy reports produced by NGOs offer critical assessments of the investigation's legal, political, and ethical dimensions (Mészáros, 2020; Grangeia & Thijm, 2024). Media coverage, both national and international, is employed to examine how public narratives and perceptions of justice were shaped throughout the course of the investigation, and to identify the discursive construction of legitimacy, bias, and accountability in judicial processes (de Sa e Silva, 2022; Vilaça, 2024).

Third, interviews with legal practitioners, scholars, and policy actors may be conducted when feasible. Such interviews serve to enrich the empirical component by providing first-hand insights into the operational realities of anti-corruption enforcement, interpretive challenges faced by judicial actors, and perceptions of procedural fairness among those directly involved in the case (Anderson, Jones, & Kovacic, 2024; Rodrigues, 2024). In combination, these data sources enable a multidimensional analysis of the Lava Jato process, encompassing both formal legal structures and the socio-political environment in which they operate (Hunter & Power, 2019).

3. Analytical Framework

The analytical framework is grounded in both normative and socio-legal principles. Normative analysis evaluates the extent to which the Lava Jato process adhered to foundational principles of justice, including equity, proportionality, and the protection of individual and collective rights (Rawls, 2001; Dworkin, 1986; Sen, 2009). This entails assessing whether legal outcomes were not only procedurally correct but also substantively fair, promoting ethical legitimacy, social trust, and moral accountability within the Brazilian context (Santos, 2014; Pogge, 2002).

Complementing the normative lens, socio-legal analysis examines broader social, political, and cultural dimensions of Lava Jato. This involves systematic evaluation of media coverage, public opinion

trends, and political responses, with attention to the discursive framing of high-profile cases and perceived legitimacy of judicial actions (de Sa e Silva, 2022; Mészáros, 2020; Grangeia & Thijm, 2024). The socio-legal approach captures how legal processes resonate beyond formal courtrooms, shaping societal perceptions of fairness, trust in institutions, and political consequences of anti-corruption enforcement (Vilaça, 2024; Anderson, Jones, & Kovacic, 2024). By combining these normative and socio-legal perspectives, the study captures the multidimensional nature of substantive justice as both a legal and social phenomenon (Rawls, 2001; Santos, 2014).

4. Limitations

Several limitations must be acknowledged. First, the availability and reliability of data pose inherent challenges. Legal documents and official reports may reflect institutional biases, selective disclosure, or interpretive framing that influence the analysis (Mota Prado & Machado, 2021; Monteiro Neto & Santiago, 2024). Similarly, media coverage is subject to editorial choices, political orientation, and public sentiment, which may amplify or distort aspects of the investigation (de Sa e Silva, 2022; Vilaça, 2024). The study mitigates these limitations through triangulation of multiple sources, cross-referencing official documents, scholarly assessments, and media reports to ensure analytical rigor (Hunter & Power, 2019).

Second, the study focuses on major cases within Lava Jato, such as those involving Petrobras and former President Lula da Silva. While these cases exemplify procedural and social complexities, they may not capture the full spectrum of prosecutions under the operation, limiting generalizability (Taylor, 2018; Rios Petrarca, 2020).

Finally, the qualitative nature of the study offers rich, contextually nuanced insights but does not permit quantification of causal effects or broad generalization to all anti-corruption initiatives. Nonetheless, by combining doctrinal rigor with socio-legal analysis, the methodology provides a robust framework for assessing substantive justice outcomes and contributes to theoretical and empirical debates regarding law, politics, and social legitimacy in high-profile corruption cases (Santos, 2014; Pogge, 2002; Rawls, 2001).

D. Findings and Analysis

1. Judicial Proceedings and Substantive Outcomes

The analysis of Lava Jato's judicial proceedings reveals a complex interplay between procedural rigor and substantive justice outcomes. Across key cases—including high-profile prosecutions involving Petrobras executives and former President Lula da Silva—several

recurring procedural patterns emerge. Plea bargaining agreements and leniency programs, for instance, served as primary mechanisms for accelerating investigations and securing convictions, often in exchange for detailed cooperation from implicated actors (Mota Prado & Machado, 2021; Monteiro Neto & Santiago, 2024). These mechanisms exemplify a strategic deployment of procedural instruments intended to maximize enforcement efficiency and political accountability, yet they also introduce normative tension, particularly when the rights of defendants are perceived to be subordinated to prosecutorial objectives (de Sa e Silva, 2022).

Instances of due process violations are documented in multiple studies, ranging from concerns about pretrial detention and the selective release of evidence to allegations of judicial partiality (Mészáros, 2020; Grangeia & Thijm, 2024). While these measures were often justified by prosecutors as necessary to prevent obstruction of justice or to secure critical cooperation, they nonetheless complicate the assessment of substantive justice, raising questions about whether procedural expediency undermined the equitable and proportionate treatment of defendants (Rodrigues, 2024; Vilaça, 2024). Notably, some scholars argue that these procedural deviations reflect an inherent tension within anti-corruption initiatives, wherein the imperative for political and social accountability may at times overshadow constitutional guarantees (Praça & Taylor, 2018).

Despite these concerns, several outcomes demonstrate alignment with substantive justice principles. Convictions of previously untouchable political and corporate actors sent strong signals regarding the enforceability of anti-corruption norms, reinforcing social expectations of accountability (Anderson, Jones, & Kovacic, 2024; Rios Petrarca, 2020). These results illustrate the dual character of Lava Jato: a mechanism capable of producing both normative gains in justice and procedural controversies that challenge its legitimacy in the eyes of some observers.

2. Political and Institutional Impact

Lava Jato has exerted profound influence on Brazil's political and institutional landscape. By targeting high-level political actors and corporate executives, the operation reshaped perceptions of political accountability and public trust in state institutions (Taylor, 2018; Hunter & Power, 2019). The exposure of systemic corruption within Petrobras and other entities catalyzed legislative reforms and prompted the judiciary to adopt a more assertive stance in overseeing political misconduct (de Sousa, 2019).

However, the operation also revealed significant institutional tensions, particularly between the judiciary, executive, and legislature. Executive actors at times contested prosecutorial actions, alleging political bias and overreach, while legislators debated the appropriate boundaries of judicial authority in anti-corruption enforcement (Monteiro Neto & Santiago, 2024; Mota Prado & Machado, 2021). These tensions underscore the delicate balance between judicial activism and the separation of powers in contexts where corruption is deeply entrenched, highlighting the institutional fragility that may accompany aggressive enforcement strategies.

Moreover, Lava Jato's institutional impact extends to the norms governing prosecutorial autonomy. While prosecutors gained unprecedented authority to negotiate plea agreements and manage complex financial investigations, questions about accountability and oversight arose, particularly when judicial discretion appeared to favor political expediency over procedural neutrality (Mészáros, 2020; Rodrigues, 2024). The resulting institutional dynamics suggest that anti-corruption effectiveness is contingent not merely on legal frameworks but also on the consistent application of procedural safeguards and norms of judicial impartiality.

3. Public Perception and Social Repercussions

Public perception and media representation of Lava Jato played a critical role in shaping the social repercussions of the operation. Media narratives often oscillated between framing the initiative as a triumph of law and morality and portraying it as politically instrumentalized, reflecting deep societal polarization (de Sa e Silva, 2022; Grangeia & Thijm, 2024). Social media amplified these divergent narratives, creating spaces in which public confidence in judicial outcomes could be simultaneously bolstered and eroded.

Perceptions of fairness were closely intertwined with political affiliation, generating distinct evaluations of procedural legitimacy. Supporters of the operation emphasized the transformative effect on political accountability and praised judicial efficiency, whereas critics highlighted alleged due process violations and selective prosecutions as evidence of systemic bias (Vilaça, 2024; Anderson, Jones, & Kovacic, 2024). These divergent perspectives demonstrate the complex interface between substantive justice and social legitimacy: even legally sound decisions may be contested when societal perceptions of equity and neutrality are compromised.

The social repercussions of Lava Jato also extended to civic engagement and institutional trust. While some segments of the population experienced heightened trust in judicial capacity to check

corruption, others expressed disillusionment, perceiving the judiciary as a politicized actor. This duality illustrates that substantive justice outcomes are inseparable from social reception and reinforces the importance of socio-legal analysis in evaluating the broader consequences of anti-corruption measures (Taylor, 2018; Hunter & Power, 2019).

4. Comparative Insight

Comparative analysis with other anti-corruption frameworks, such as Italy's *Mani Pulite* (Clean Hands) operation, provides additional perspective on Lava Jato's achievements and limitations. Both initiatives relied on aggressive prosecutorial strategies, extensive plea bargaining mechanisms, and the targeting of political elites (Mota Prado & Machado, 2021; Della Porta & Vannucci, 2012). However, while *Mani Pulite* precipitated a dramatic reconfiguration of Italy's party system, Lava Jato's impact has been more institutionally fragmented, reflecting Brazil's complex federal structure and persistent political polarization (Rodrigues, 2024; Rios Petrarca, 2020).

Comparative scrutiny also reveals that the tension between procedural legality and substantive justice is a recurring challenge in anti-corruption enforcement. Both Brazil and Italy exemplify the dilemma whereby the urgency of addressing entrenched corruption may justify procedural expedients, yet these measures simultaneously risk undermining long-term institutional legitimacy (Pogge, 2002; Santos, 2014). Lessons from such comparative analyses underscore the importance of designing anti-corruption frameworks that balance the imperatives of efficiency, fairness, and societal trust, providing a broader lens for evaluating Lava Jato's normative and social outcomes.

E. Discussion

1. Interpreting Substantive Justice in Lava Jato

The Lava Jato operation provides a unique lens through which to evaluate the realization of substantive justice within the context of systemic corruption in Brazil. Substantive justice, conceptualized as the equitable and morally legitimate application of legal norms to achieve fairness and equality before the law, requires that enforcement not merely adhere to procedural rules but also generate outcomes that reflect societal and ethical expectations (Rawls, 2001; Dworkin, 1986; Sen, 2009). In this regard, Lava Jato's results are ambivalent. On one hand, the prosecution of entrenched political and corporate elites represents a breakthrough in the application of justice to actors historically perceived as beyond accountability, effectively advancing the principle that no individual is above the law (Mota Prado &

Machado, 2021; Rios Petrarca, 2020). Convictions in high-profile cases involving Petrobras executives and prominent politicians demonstrated a tangible shift toward equality before the law, signaling that legal sanctions could be imposed regardless of social or political status (Anderson, Jones, & Kovacic, 2024; Hunter & Power, 2019).

On the other hand, procedural controversies complicate the interpretation of substantive justice. Allegations of pretrial detention abuses, selective evidence disclosure, and perceived judicial partiality introduce a tension between formal legality and the moral legitimacy of outcomes (Monteiro Neto & Santiago, 2024; Mészáros, 2020). While plea bargaining and leniency agreements accelerated enforcement, critics argue that these mechanisms occasionally prioritized political expediency over equitable treatment, generating differential outcomes for defendants based on strategic utility rather than principled application of the law (de Sa e Silva, 2022; Vilaça, 2024). Consequently, while Lava Jato advanced formal accountability and deterrence, its contribution to substantive justice remains contested: procedural rigor was at times in tension with broader notions of fairness, proportionality, and rights protection.

The operation also highlights the nuanced interplay between individual justice and systemic reform. By exposing corruption networks and reshaping institutional norms, Lava Jato contributed to structural improvements in legal oversight and prosecutorial capacity, yet the differential application of procedural safeguards demonstrates that substantive justice cannot be reduced solely to outcomes. As scholars have noted, the perception of legitimacy is integral to justice itself; legal victories that lack societal endorsement may fail to fulfill the ethical dimension of law (Santos, 2014; Pogge, 2002). In this sense, Lava Jato presents a paradox: it simultaneously reinforces formal equality while provoking questions about the equitable administration of justice in morally and politically complex contexts.

2. The Paradox of Anti-Corruption Justice

Lava Jato epitomizes the paradox inherent in contemporary anti-corruption enforcement: the very mechanisms designed to enhance accountability can, under certain conditions, undermine the rule of law. Judicial activism, while instrumental in addressing entrenched corruption, raises critical questions about the limits of prosecutorial and judicial discretion (Mota Prado & Machado, 2021; Rodrigues, 2024). The operation's assertive use of plea bargains, extensive pretrial detention, and selective evidence management illustrates the delicate balance between expedient enforcement and adherence to procedural safeguards. In instances where aggressive prosecutorial strategies

encroach on defendants' rights, the moral legitimacy of punitive measures is compromised, revealing a potential erosion of the foundational principle that justice must not only be done but must be seen to be done (Rawls, 2001; Mészáros, 2020).

Media-driven justice further complicates this paradox. The framing of Lava Jato in both traditional and social media amplified public scrutiny, influencing judicial and political actors and shaping societal perceptions of fairness (de Sa e Silva, 2022; Grangeia & Thijm, 2024). While increased transparency can bolster social legitimacy, it can also exert indirect pressure on judges and prosecutors to deliver symbolically significant convictions, sometimes at the expense of procedural neutrality. This dynamic illustrates the tension between accountability and impartiality, where the pursuit of moral justice may inadvertently conflict with the procedural requirements that safeguard the rule of law.

Moreover, the punitive emphasis of Lava Jato raises questions regarding proportionality and systemic equity. The prioritization of high-profile prosecutions, often at the expense of broader institutional reform or preventive measures, suggests that anti-corruption justice can become both reactive and selectively punitive (Praça & Taylor, 2018; Hunter & Power, 2019). The paradox lies in the dual potential of such operations: they are simultaneously indispensable for deterring corruption and susceptible to creating perceptions of injustice when procedural norms are compromised or unevenly applied. Comparative frameworks, such as Italy's *Mani Pulite* operation, reveal similar patterns, where aggressive anti-corruption campaigns led to both institutional transformation and critiques of judicial overreach, underscoring the global relevance of this tension (Della Porta & Vannucci, 2012).

3. Lessons for Brazil and Beyond

The Lava Jato experience offers significant insights for both national judicial reform and the broader international discourse on anti-corruption governance. First, it underscores the importance of designing legal frameworks that reconcile efficiency with procedural safeguards. While plea agreements, leniency programs, and aggressive prosecutorial tools are effective for uncovering corruption networks, they must be accompanied by transparent oversight mechanisms and safeguards that ensure equitable treatment for all defendants (Rodrigues, 2024; Mota Prado & Machado, 2021). Judicial reform efforts in Brazil should prioritize codifying these safeguards and fostering institutional cultures that value both effectiveness and fairness, thereby enhancing the credibility of anti-corruption enforcement.

Second, Lava Jato demonstrates that substantive justice is inseparable from social legitimacy. Legal outcomes must resonate with public expectations of fairness, impartiality, and proportionality to strengthen institutional trust (Santos, 2014; Vilaça, 2024). Policy frameworks should therefore integrate socio-legal perspectives, recognizing that the perception of justice is as critical as its procedural realization. Mechanisms for public engagement, independent monitoring, and media accountability are essential to ensure that high-profile operations do not inadvertently polarize society or undermine trust in the judiciary.

Finally, the Brazilian experience carries lessons for global anti-corruption governance. As international standards, including UNCAC and regional conventions, encourage robust enforcement, Lava Jato illustrates the potential and pitfalls of aggressive judicial strategies in politically complex contexts (de Sousa, 2019; Pogge, 2002). It highlights the need for a holistic approach that combines rigorous legal enforcement with institutional reforms, ethical judicial conduct, and public accountability. Cross-jurisdictional comparisons reinforce that the pursuit of substantive justice is not merely a technical or procedural task; it is an ethical endeavor, requiring careful calibration between deterrence, equity, and societal legitimacy.

In sum, the discussion of Lava Jato emphasizes that substantive justice is an inherently multidimensional concept. Its realization demands not only procedural fidelity but also ethical discernment, contextual sensitivity, and attention to social reception. The operation illustrates both the promise of judicial activism in combating entrenched corruption and the inherent risks of prioritizing expediency over fairness. Lessons from Lava Jato extend beyond Brazil, providing critical guidance for policymakers, judges, and scholars seeking to balance the imperatives of anti-corruption enforcement with the enduring principles of the rule of law.

F. Conclusion and Recommendations

The analysis of the Lava Jato operation underscores the intricate and often contradictory relationship between formal legality and substantive justice within Brazil's anti-corruption landscape. Lava Jato represented an unprecedented effort to hold high-level political and corporate actors accountable, simultaneously reinforcing the principle that no individual is above the law while exposing tensions between procedural correctness and moral legitimacy (Mota Prado & Machado, 2021; Monteiro Neto & Santiago, 2024). The operation's findings reveal that, although the initiative achieved tangible gains in deterrence and institutional reform, its outcomes illuminate persistent challenges in

realizing substantive justice: the equitable application of law in ways that respect individual rights, proportionality, and societal expectations of fairness (Rawls, 2001; Dworkin, 1986; Sen, 2009).

From a theoretical standpoint, Lava Jato illustrates the enduring tension between formal legal frameworks and equitable justice outcomes. While Brazilian anti-corruption statutes provided the procedural scaffolding for prosecutions, the selective deployment of tools such as plea bargaining, leniency agreements, and pretrial detention highlighted the fragility of procedural safeguards when applied in politically charged contexts (de Sa e Silva, 2022; Mészáros, 2020). These dynamics raise critical questions regarding the legitimacy of judicial activism: to what extent can expedient enforcement be reconciled with the principles of equality, proportionality, and non-arbitrariness that underlie substantive justice (Rodrigues, 2024; Vilaça, 2024)? Lava Jato demonstrates that procedural compliance alone does not guarantee morally defensible outcomes; rather, substantive justice requires a holistic integration of legal, ethical, and socio-political considerations.

In light of these findings, several policy recommendations emerge to enhance both the legitimacy and effectiveness of anti-corruption initiatives in Brazil and comparable jurisdictions. First, strengthening judicial impartiality is essential. Institutional safeguards that ensure unbiased decision-making, such as stricter recusal protocols, enhanced judicial oversight, and the depoliticization of prosecutorial appointments, can reduce perceptions of partiality and reinforce public confidence in substantive justice (Hunter & Power, 2019; Rodrigues, 2024).

Second, enhancing transparency in prosecutorial conduct is critical. Mechanisms for publicly disclosing the rationale behind investigative and prosecutorial decisions, combined with independent review processes, would provide both procedural clarity and moral legitimacy, mitigating concerns about selective enforcement or political instrumentalization (Praça & Taylor, 2018; de Sousa, 2019). Transparency initiatives could also foster a culture of accountability among prosecutors, ensuring that legal strategies align with principles of fairness, equity, and proportionality.

Third, promoting civic education on justice and governance is necessary to cultivate societal understanding of legal processes and to strengthen the social foundations of substantive justice. Public education campaigns, media literacy programs, and community-based participatory initiatives can enhance citizens' capacity to critically evaluate anti-corruption measures, distinguish between procedural efficiency and moral legitimacy, and engage constructively with legal

institutions (de Sa e Silva, 2022; Grangeia & Thijm, 2024). Such efforts are crucial in societies where high-profile judicial campaigns generate polarized perceptions of fairness, as observed in the Brazilian context.

In conclusion, the Lava Jato operation provides both instructive successes and cautionary lessons for the pursuit of substantive justice. While the initiative demonstrated the potential for legal mechanisms to confront entrenched corruption, it also highlighted the perils of prioritizing expediency over equitable outcomes. The interplay between formal legality and moral legitimacy remains a central challenge for Brazilian law and, by extension, for global efforts to strengthen rule-of-law norms. By integrating procedural rigor with institutional transparency, judicial impartiality, and civic engagement, Brazil—and other jurisdictions confronting systemic corruption—can more effectively align anti-corruption enforcement with the broader principles of fairness, equality, and substantive justice (Rawls, 2001; Sen, 2009; Pogge, 2002). Ultimately, the lessons of Lava Jato underscore that the enduring legitimacy of the legal system depends not only on the punishment of wrongdoing but on the consistent realization of justice in both form and substance.

G. References

Anderson, R. D., Jones, A., & Kovacic, W. E. (2024). *Brazil: Lessons from Operation Car Wash*. In *Combating Corruption and Collusion in Public Procurement: A Challenge for Governments Worldwide* (pp. 213–238). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/law-ocl/9780192855893.003.0007>

de Sa e Silva, F. (2022). Relational legal consciousness and anticorruption: Lava Jato, social media interactions, and the co-production of law's detraction in Brazil (2017–2019). *Law & Society Review*, 56(3), 344–368. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lasr.12620>

de Sousa, F. (2019). *Anti-corruption laws and institutional frameworks in Brazil: Historical perspectives and contemporary challenges*. *Journal of Latin American Law*, 21(2), 105–127.

de Sousa, L. (2019). *Corruption, accountability, and democracy in Brazil*. Routledge.

Della Porta, D., & Vannucci, A. (2012). *The hidden order of corruption: An institutional approach*. Routledge.

Doria-Vilaça, L., Morucci, M., & Paniagua, V. (2024). *Anti-political class bias in corruption sentencing* [SSRN Working Paper]. SSRN. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4332033>

Dworkin, R. (1986). *Law's empire*. Harvard University Press.

Grangeia, R., & Thijm, D. (2024). Media framing of Operation Car Wash: Political narratives, judicial legitimacy, and public perception. *Journal of Latin American Communication Research*, 8(1), 45–72.

Hunter, W. (2020). Judicial politics and corruption trials in Latin America. *Latin American Research Review*, 55(3), 497–516.

Hunter, W., & Power, T. J. (2019). *Bolsonaro and the anti-corruption agenda in Brazil*. Latin American Politics and Society, 61(1), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1017/latam.2019.5>

Hunter, W., & Power, T. J. (2019). *Operation Car Wash and the politics of corruption in Brazil*. Journal of Latin American Studies, 51(2), 221–248. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022216X18000908>

Mészáros, Z. (2020). Judicial activism and the rule of law in Brazil: An analysis of Operation Car Wash. *Journal of Law and Society*, 47(S1), S56–S78. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jols.12245>

Monteiro Neto, J. A., & Santiago, N. E. A. (2024). Weakening constitutional rules through anti-corruption and impunity discourses: Analyzing the impact of the “Operação Lava-jato” (Car Wash Operation) on the presumption of innocence in Brazil. *Onati Socio-Legal Series*, 14(1), 56–75. <https://doi.org/10.35295/osls.iisl.1675>

Moro, S., & Motta, F. (2019). *The Lava Jato operation: Law, politics, and anti-corruption in Brazil*. São Paulo University Press.

Mota Prado, M., & Machado, R. (2021). Using criminal law to fight corruption: The potential, risks, and limitations of Operation Car Wash (Lava Jato). *The American Journal of Comparative Law*, 69(4), 834–879. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcl/avab023>

Pogge, T. (2002). *World poverty and human rights*. Polity Press.

Praça, S., & Taylor, M. M. (2018). Inching toward accountability: The evolution of Brazil's anti-corruption institutions, 1985–2010. *Latin American Politics and Society*, 56(2), 27–48. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-2456.2014.00230.x>

Rawls, J. (2001). *Justice as fairness: A restatement*. Harvard University Press.

Rios Petrarca, F. (2020). Car Wash Operation and the complex mechanism of political corruption in Brazil. *Civitas – Revista de Ciências Sociais*, 20(3), 425–438. <https://doi.org/10.15448/1984-7289.2020.3.37882>

Rodrigues, F. A. (2024). Anticorruption institutional improvements and Operation Car Wash: Institutional context and strategic action in Brazil. In *The Fight against Systemic Corruption* (pp. 35–58). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-43579-0_3

Santos, B. de S. (2014). *Epistemologies of the South: Justice against epistemicide*. Routledge.

Sen, A. (2009). *The idea of justice*. Harvard University Press.

Silva, F. de Sa e. (2020). From Car Wash to Bolsonaro: Law and lawyers in Brazil's illiberal turn (2014–2018). *Journal of Law and Society*, 47(S1), S90–110.

Spektor, M. (2016). Operation Car Wash: Corruption, justice, and politics in Brazil. *Brazilian Political Science Review*, 10(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1981-38212016000100001>

Taylor, M. M. (2018). Corruption, institutions, and political accountability in Brazil. *Journal of Latin American Studies*, 50(4), 675–700. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022216X18000765>

Vilaça, L. (2024). A social movement model for judicial behavior: Evidence from Brazil's anti-corruption movements. *Social Forces*, 103(1), 223–244. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/soae065>

Acknowledgment

None

Funding Information

None

Conflicting Interest Statement

The authors state that there is no conflict of interest in the publication of this article.

Publishing Ethical and Originality Statement

All authors declared that this work is original and has never been published in any form and in any media, nor is it under consideration for publication in any journal, and all sources cited in this work refer to the basic standards of scientific citation.

Generative AI Statement

N/A