

Biometric Fiqh in the Era of AI Deepfakes: Reconstructing *Karāmah al-Insān* through *Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah* for Sustainable Development Goals

Elma Qotrunnada Hanin^{1*}, Muhammad Mu'tamid Ihsanillah²

¹Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Ampel Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia

²Ibn Tofail University, Kénitra, Morocco

*Correspondence: ✉ elmaqotrunnada@gmail.com
<https://doi.org/10.51214/biis.v5i1.2336>

ABSTRACT

The spread of AI-generated deepfakes has produced a form of cybercrime that targets human biometric identity and injures victims' honor, property, and psychological security. This study asks how Islamic law can respond. It is a qualitative doctrinal library study with a conceptual and *Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah* design. Its primary data are the Qur'an, read through thematic exegesis with al-Tabari, Ibn Kathir, al-Qurtubi, and Ibn Ashur; the Six Books and the Muwatta'; *mu'tabar* works of the four schools on *qadhf*, *ta'zīr*, *gaṣb*, and evidence; and the *uṣūl*, *Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah*, and *qawa'id* works of al-Ghazali, al-Shatibi, al-Qarafi, Ibn Ashur, al-Suyuti, and Ibn al-Qayyim. Contemporary scholarship, statutes, and five documented incidents (Hong Kong 2024, Indonesia 2025 and 2026, South Korea 2024, Grok 2026) serve as factual material and not as authority for rulings. The texts were analyzed by content coding, *taḥqīq al-manāṭ* and *Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah* weighing, and validity was pursued through edition-based source criticism, hadith grading, cross-school triangulation, and two-source verification of facts. The findings show that classical fiqh is not silent, since *ghibah* by imitation, *ta'ridh*, *gaṣb*, and a broad notion of *bayyinah* supply building blocks, but it lacks a category joining act, proof, and sanction for synthetic imputation, an articulated interest in one's own likeness, and rules of proof that account for fabricated sight and sound. Biometric Fiqh rests on three pillars: the person's right to biometric identity; a two-level *Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah* analysis drawing on Ibn Ashur and Auda; and maxims on harm and blocking means, with graded rulings that prefer *ta'zīr*, restitution, and removal. The study contributes to *fiqh al-nawāzil* by supplying a category for synthetic imputation where none existed; it contributes to *uṣūl* and *Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah* methodology by joining *taḥqīq al-manāṭ* on a new fact to a two-level *Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah* analysis in which *hifz al-'irdh* is treated as a distinct necessity; and in practice it offers fatwa councils a graded set of rulings, gives courts and law-enforcement bodies a protocol that treats recordings as circumstantial indications subject to expert authentication, and gives regulators and platforms a ground for labelling and notice-and-takedown duties. Its alignment with SDGs 3, 5, 9, 10 and 16 is normative, not demonstrated.

ARTICLE INFO

Article History

Received: 22-09-2026

Revised: 15-10-2026

Accepted: 20-10-2026

Keywords:

Biometric Fiqh;
Deepfake;
Karāmah Al-Insān;
Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah;
Sustainable Development Goals.

© 2026 Elma Qotrunnada Hanin, Muhammad Mu'tamid Ihsanillah



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/).

A. INTRODUCTION

Deepfakes are synthetic audio, image, and video produced by deep-learning models, chiefly generative adversarial networks (GANs) and, more recently, diffusion models, that can portray a real person saying or doing what that person never said or did.¹ Chesney and Citron

¹ Mika Westerlund, "The Emergence of Deepfake Technology: A Review," *Technology Innovation Management Review* 9, no. 11 (2019): 39–52, <https://doi.org/10.22215/timreview/1282>; Emrah Altuncu,

warned early that the technology threatens privacy, democracy and national security, and that it also gives wrongdoers a "liar's dividend": once fabrication is believable, genuine recordings can be dismissed as fake.² What makes the phenomenon a problem for fiqh, and not only for technology law, is the raw material of the fabrication: a person's face, voice and bodily manner, which are the features by which a community recognizes, trusts and holds that person accountable.

The harms documented in recent years fall into three patterns. The first is sexual abuse through fabricated imagery. A 2023 industry report counted 95,820 deepfake videos online, of which about 98 percent were pornographic and in which 99 percent of the people targeted were women; the report comes from a vendor of identity-protection services and rests on a limited sample, so its figures indicate direction rather than precise prevalence.³ In South Korea, a police crackdown that ended in March 2025 detained 506 suspects in seven months, 411 of them aged 10 to 19, and in September 2024 the National Assembly made watching or possessing sexual deepfakes punishable by up to three years' imprisonment and raised the maximum for producing or distributing them from five to seven years.⁴ In January 2026 Indonesia's Ministry of Communication and Digital Affairs (Komdigi) temporarily blocked access to the Grok chatbot, and Malaysia did the same, after it was used to generate sexualised images of real people; the minister said the measure aimed to protect women, children and the public from fake pornographic content.⁵

The second pattern is financial deception. In January 2024, an employee of the Hong Kong office of the engineering firm Arup transferred about HK\$200 million (roughly US\$25.7 million) in more than a dozen payments after a video conference whose other participants, including the supposed chief financial officer, were deepfakes built from public video and a cloned voice; Hong Kong police described it as the first local case in which several deepfake characters were used against one victim.⁶ In Indonesia, the Criminal Investigation Agency (Bareskrim) announced in February 2025 the arrest of a 25-year-old suspect who circulated edited videos of President Prabowo Subianto and Finance Minister Sri Mulyani appearing to offer cash aid through an Instagram account with 9,399 followers; about 100 victims in 20 provinces were asked to pay "administration fees," and the suspect gained roughly IDR 65 million.⁷ The same modus returned in June 2026, when a fabricated video showed Finance Minister Purbaya Yudhi Sadewa seeking "the 700 fastest" aid recipients and the Ministry of Finance publicly declared it a deepfake hoax.⁸

The third pattern is the erosion of trust in public communication: when officials' faces and voices can be borrowed to solicit money, citizens can no longer treat the recognizable person as evidence of the genuine statement. These cases share one feature. A single act of synthesis injures several protected interests at once, namely honour, property and the

Virginia N. L. Franqueira, and Shujun Li, "Deepfake: Definitions, Performance Metrics and Standards, Datasets, and a Meta-Review," *Frontiers in Big Data* 7 (2024): 1400024, <https://doi.org/10.3389/fdata.2024.1400024>.

² Robert Chesney and Danielle Keats Citron, "Deep Fakes: A Looming Challenge for Privacy, Democracy, and National Security," *California Law Review* 107 (2019): 1753–1820, <https://doi.org/10.15779/Z38RV0D15J>.

³ Security Hero, *2023 State of Deepfakes*, accessed October 2026, [Google](#)

⁴ Newsajax "South Korea Fights Deepfake Porn with Tougher Punishment and Regulation," News4JAX, November 6, 2024. [Google](#)

⁵ CNN. "Musk's Grok Blocked by Indonesia, Malaysia over Sexualized Images in World First," CNN Business, republished by KEYT, January 11, 2026. [Google](#).

⁶ China daily. "Hong Kong Police: AI Deepfake Scam Cost Firm HK\$200m," *China Daily Hong Kong*, August 16, 2024. [Google](#)

⁷ Kata Data. "Penipuan Bansos Pakai AI Wajah Prabowo, Ratusan Korban Rugi Puluhan Juta," *Katadata*, February 7, 2025, [Google](#); Bidtik, Bidang Teknologi Informasi Polda Kepulauan Riau, "Deep Fake Scammers with Profit of IDR 65 Million Arrested by the Police," [Google](#)

⁸ Kontan "Kemenkeu: Video Menteri Purbaya Cari 700 Penerima Bantuan adalah Hoaks Deepfake," *Kontan*, June 10, 2026. [Google](#)

reliability of speech, and the victim is not only the person depicted but also the people deceived by the depiction.

Positive law has begun to respond. Indonesia's Electronic Information and Transactions Law (ITE Law), as amended in 2024, penalizes manipulating electronic information to make it appear authentic, and the Personal Data Protection Law (PDP Law) classifies biometric data as specific personal data.⁹ Yet a study of deepfakes and biometric data security in Indonesia concludes that the PDP Law does not address biometric data specifically and calls for a dedicated regulation.¹⁰ More importantly for this article, statutes answer what the state will punish. They do not answer what a Muslim community needs to know: whether making, forwarding, believing, or merely viewing such content is lawful before God; how the classical categories of *qadhf*, *ghibah*, *ghasb* and *bayyinah* apply to a fabricated face or voice; and how a fatwa body or a religious judge should reason about it. The Indonesian Ulema Council's Fatwa No. 24 of 2017 on conduct on social media forbids *ghibah*, *fitnah*, *namimah*, the spreading of hoaxes even with good intentions, and the circulation of pornographic material, and it requires verification (*tabayyun*) before sharing.¹¹ That guidance is sound and remains valid, but it was issued before generative deepfakes were widespread and it addresses content, not the identity features from which synthetic content is made.

This urgency drives the present study. The incidents above are recent, repeated, and transnational; the harm is hard to reverse once a file circulates, and the religious-legal instruments available to Indonesian fatwa councils and religious courts were not built for cases where evidence of a person's words is itself manufactured. The article therefore proposes "Biometric Fiqh" as a bounded framework of *ijtihad*. It is not a new source of law. It organizes how established sources (the Qur'an, the Sunnah, the works of the four schools, and the literature of *usul al-fiqh*, *Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah* and *qawa'id*) are applied to the protection of a person's face, voice, and bodily manner. Its guiding principle is human dignity (*Karāmah al-Insān*), and it is read alongside contemporary Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah scholarship and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) as a normative horizon.

Existing work can be grouped into three clusters, which are used here as discussion partners for the findings and not as authority for any ruling. The first cluster is technical. Westerlund and Altuncu, Franqueira and Li define deepfakes, review their generation methods and compare detection metrics and datasets.¹² This work clarifies the object of regulation but does not address normative questions. The second cluster is legal. Chesney and Citron analyze harms and legal remedies in American law; Palindria and colleagues assess the PDP Law in relation to biometric data; and the European Union's Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 (the AI Act) imposes transparency duties on synthetic content in Article 50.¹³ These studies are strong on enforcement but do not integrate Islamic legal reasoning.

The third cluster begins to connect deepfakes with Islamic law. Ramadhani, Rachmawati and Kurnikova argue that Islamic principles of human dignity support the erasure of non-consensual deepfake pornography under a right to be forgotten, and they locate the legal

⁹ Law No. 1 of 2024 on the Second Amendment to Law No. 11 of 2008 on Electronic Information and Transactions, Arts. 35 and 51(1); Law No. 27 of 2022 on Personal Data Protection, Art. 4(2)(b).

¹⁰ Arvi Erawan Palindria, Muhammad Sulthan Thufail, and Muhammad Rieval Febrian, "Ancaman Deepfake Buatan AI dan Implikasinya terhadap Keamanan Data Biometrik di Indonesia," *Spektrum Hukum* 21, no. 2 (2024): 110-121, <https://doi.org/10.56444/sh.v21i2.5319>.

¹¹ Majelis Ulama Indonesia, *Fatwa Nomor 24 Tahun 2017 tentang Hukum dan Pedoman Bermuamalah melalui Media Sosial*, issued May 13, 2017 (16 Sya'ban 1438 H). [Google](#) The full text is reproduced in Detik Net. "Fatwa Lengkap MUI soal Medsos," *detikNet*, June 5, 2017. [Google](#)

¹² Westerlund, "Emergence of Deepfake Technology"; Altuncu, Franqueira, and Li, "Deepfake." <https://doi.org/10.3389/fdata.2024.1400024>

¹³ Chesney and Citron, "Deep Fakes" <https://doi.org/10.15779/Z38RV0D15J>; Palindria, Thufail, and Febrian, "Ancaman Deepfake" <https://doi.org/10.56444/sh.v21i2.5319>; Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence, *Official Journal of the European Union* L, 2024/1689, Art. 50. [Google](#)

basis in the PDP and ITE Laws.¹⁴ Zalsabila and Haddade survey defamation in the four schools, concluding that false accusations of adultery carry a fixed penalty and that other forms fall under *ta'zir*.¹⁵ These contributions are valuable, but they are either regulatory proposals with an ethical justification or surveys of classical defamation law that do not ask what changes when the defamatory representation is synthetic. Another body of work shows that *Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah* and the SDGs share objectives, but it focuses on Islamic economics and finance.¹⁶

Against this background, the study makes three contributions, stated with the caution that they reflect the literature the authors could identify. First, it draws on the texts of the schools and of *usul* and *Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah* rather than secondary surveys, and it asks how the classical categories handle a fabricated representation of a person, yielding a more qualified claim than "classical fiqh is silent." Second, it treats biometric identity as a distinct interest to be protected and pairs two *Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah* approaches, the general objectives (*al-maqasid al-'ammah*) of Ibn Ashur and the systems approach of Jasser Auda, to read harm involving many actors. Third, it states the relation of this framework to the SDGs as a normative alignment and does not claim a demonstrated causal contribution.

These contributions are theoretical and practical. Theoretically, the study addresses a gap in *fiqh al-nawazil*. Contemporary work on deepfakes either labels the conduct as falsehood, defamation or a modern form of *qadhif*, or proposes regulation with an ethical justification, but it does not specify what the classical categories can and cannot carry when the representation of a person is synthetic. This article specifies that boundary and, on that basis, formulates a bounded framework of *ijtihad*. For the methodology of *usul* and *Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah*, it shows how *taḥqīq al-manāṭ* can be applied to a new fact without extending fixed penalties by analogy, how honor (*hifz al-'irdh*) can be treated as a distinct necessity and combined with Ibn Ashur's general objectives and Auda's systems approach in a two-level analysis, and how the doctrine of *bayyinah* and *qara'in* answers the problem of evidence that is itself manufactured. Practically, the study gives fatwa councils a graded set of rulings that can be turned into a thematic fatwa; it gives judges and law-enforcement bodies a basis for treating recordings as circumstantial indications that require expert authentication; and it gives regulators and platforms a religious-ethical ground for labeling, provenance, and prompt-takedown duties that complements, and does not replace, positive law.

The study asks three questions. First, it asks what the form and structure of deepfake-based biometric crime are, as shown by documented cases. Second, it asks what the classical texts of fiqh provide for the protection of honor, evidence, and ownership, and where they reach their limits when a person's representation is synthetic. It asks third how a framework of Biometric Fiqh, grounded in *Karāmah al-Insān* and *Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah*, can be formulated to yield graded, defensible rulings, and what relation it bears to the SDGs.

The main aim is to formulate Biometric Fiqh as an *ijtihad* framework derived from the tradition's primary texts and tested against concrete cases. To reach it, the study analyses the structure of deepfake-based biometric crime from verified incidents; re-reads the classical rules on *qadhif*, *ghibah*, *ghasb*, *bayyinah* and *ta'zir* to separate what they already cover from what they leave open; builds the framework on the principle of human dignity, the *Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah*, and the maxims on harm and the blocking of means; and states the framework's relation to positive law and to the SDGs. Academically, the study aims to contribute to *fiqh al-*

¹⁴ Evyta Rosiyanti Ramadhani, Ayudya Rizqi Rachmawati, and Roro Hera Kurnikova, "Integrating Islamic Values with the Right to Be Forgotten: A Legal Approach to Addressing Deepfake Pornography in Indonesia," *De Jure: Jurnal Hukum dan Syar'iah* 17, no. 1 (2025): 112–31, <https://doi.org/10.18860/j-fsh.v17i1.28880>.

¹⁵ Putri Aulia Zalsabila and Abdul Wahid Haddade, "Pencemaran Nama Baik dalam Tinjauan Mazhab Fikih," *Shautuna: Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Perbandingan Mazhab* 4, no. 1 (2023): 42–58, <https://doi.org/10.24252/shautuna.vi.30062>.

¹⁶ Tareq Al-Ansari, Mohammed Kharseh, and Mohammed Khalfan, "Integrating Maqasid al-Shariah into Sustainable Development Goals: A Comprehensive Review," *Sustainability* 14, no. 3 (2022): 1235, <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14031235>.

nawazil, the jurisprudence of new issues. Practically, it aims to give fatwa councils, regulators, platform providers, and educators a reasoned basis for policy.

B. METHODS

This qualitative doctrinal study relies on library research, with a conceptual design and a *maqasidi* approach. It is doctrinal in that its object is the content and reasoning of authoritative legal texts, and it is not an empirical study of behavior. The conceptual approach builds the framework from the concepts of *Karāmah al-Insān*, *'irdh*, *amanah*, and *darar*. The statutory approach is used only to establish what positive law currently provides, so that the framework can be positioned relative to it. The *maqasidi* approach treats the objectives of the Shari'ah as the instrument for reasoning about a case the classical authors did not face.¹⁷

The study distinguishes three kinds of material according to their weight in argument. Primary sources carry the argument. These are, first, the Qur'an, read with the classical commentaries of al-Tabari, Ibn Kathir, and al-Qurtubi, and with Ibn Ashur's *al-Tahrir wa al-Tanwir*, which is chosen because its author is also the principal modern theorist of the *Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah*. Second is the hadith literature, taken from the Six Books and the *Muwatta'* of Malik. Third are the *mu'tabar* works of the four schools on the relevant chapters: for the Hanafi school al-Kasani's *Bada'i' al-Sana'i'*; for the Maliki school Malik's *Muwatta'* and Ibn Rushd's *Bidayat al-Mujtahid*, which also records the disagreements among the schools; for the Shafi'i school al-Mawardi's *al-Hawi al-Kabir*; and for the Hanbali school Ibn Qudamah's *al-Mughni*. Fourth are foundational works on *usul* and *maqasid*, and collections of legal maxims: al-Ghazali's *al-Mustasfa*, al-Shatibi's *al-Muwafaqat*, al-Qarafi's *al-Furuq*, Ibn al-Qayyim's *I'lam al-Muwaqqi'in* and al-Turuq al-Hukmiyyah, Ibn Ashur's *Maqasid al-Shari'ah al-Islamiyyah*, and al-Suyuti's and Ibn Nujaym's *al-Ashbah wa al-Naza'ir*. Secondary sources are used to interpret and to engage in discussion, and not to establish a rule. They are contemporary books of fiqh and *usul* (al-Zuhayli, 'Audah, al-Qaradawi, al-Raysuni, Auda) and peer-reviewed articles. The third kind is factual material: statutes and regulations, official announcements, court or police statements, and reporting by established media, used only to establish what happened and what the law provides, never what Islamic law holds.

Collection proceeded in four steps. In the first, a concept lexicon was fixed in Arabic and Indonesian (*qadhf*, *ta'ridh*, *ghibah*, *namimah*, *buhtan*, *tazwir*, *ghashb*, *'irdh*, *karamah*, *bayyinah*, *qarinah*, *darar*, *dhari'ah*). In the second, the chapters of each primary work that treat these concepts were located through the table of contents and indices of the cited critical editions, and the passages were read in full in their chapter context. Third, the Qur'anic material was gathered through thematic exegesis (*tafsir mawdu'i*) following al-Farmawi's steps: the verses on each theme were collected, ordered, and read in light of their context and the classical commentaries.¹⁸ The verses used are those on human honour and form (17:70; 40:64; 95:4), on false accusation and slander (4:112; 24:4, 24:15–19, 24:23; 33:58; 49:11–12; 104:1), on verification and testimony (17:36; 49:6; 24:13; 12:18, 12:26–28), and on trust and consent (4:29, 4:58; 33:72). Hadith were traced to the Six Books and the *Muwatta'*, and their grading was taken from the commentators named in the notes. In the fourth step, the study collected factual material on cases and legislation from official and primary announcements wherever accessible, and admitted it into the analysis only when at least two independent sources agreed on the core facts. As the principal example of the textual evidence (*dalil*), the study takes Qur'an 17:70, the verse on which the principle of human dignity rests, */Wa-laqqad karramnā banī Ādama wa-ḥamalnāhum fī al-barri wa-al-baḥri wa-razaqnāhum mina al-tayyibāti wa-faḍḍalnāhum 'alā kathīrin mimman khalaqnā tafḍilā/* 'We have honoured the

¹⁷ Jasser Auda, *Maqasid al-Shariah as Philosophy of Islamic Law: A Systems Approach* (London: International Institute of Islamic Thought, 2008). [Google](#)

¹⁸ 'Abd al-Hayy al-Farmawi, *al-Bidayah fi al-Tafsir al-Mawdu'i* (Cairo: al-Hadarah al-'Arabiyyah, 1977). [Google](#)

children of Adam, carried them on land and sea, provided them with good things, and favoured them over many of those We created'.¹⁹

The texts were analyzed by content analysis: each relevant passage was coded for the object protected, the form of the act, the required proof, and the consequence or sanction, and the codes were compared across schools. The cases were then analyzed through three steps drawn from *usul al-fiqh*. The first is a description of the classical rule and its stated ground ('illah). The second is *tahqīq al-manāt*: verifying whether the ground is present in the new case, for example, whether a fabricated video of a person injures honor in the same way an accusation does.²⁰ The third is a *maqasidi* weighing, in which the proposed ruling is tested against the five necessities and their tiers, and against Auda's six features of a systems analysis: cognition, wholeness, openness, interrelated hierarchy, multidimensionality and purposefulness.

Validity was handled in four ways. First, source criticism: every primary work is cited in a named critical edition, and every hadith is cited to its collection and chapter, with its grading where grading is disputed. Second, triangulation across schools and genres: a proposition about qadhf or ghasb is accepted only if it is consistent across the schools' texts, or if the difference is stated and then checked against the *usul* and *maqasid* literature and the maxims. The third is two-source verification of facts, as described above. The fourth is a test of internal coherence: each pillar of the framework is checked against the others and against the Qur'anic principle of human dignity to confirm that no ruling contradicts a text or a settled maxim. The limitations of these safeguards are stated in the conclusion.

C. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Classical commentators do not speak of deepfakes, but in their commentary on 17:70, they explain what the honor (*karamah*) of the children of Adam consists of. Three commentaries serve as the framework's textual starting point; each passage appears in the original, in transliteration, and in translation. Al-Tabari, in his commentary on 17:70, *Wa-faḍḍalnāhum fī al-yadayn ya'kulu bihimā wa-ya'malu bihimā, wa-mā siwā al-ins ya'kulu bi-ghayri dhālika* 'And We favored them': in the two hands, with which the human eats and works, whereas all else besides humankind eats by other means'.²¹ Ibn Kathir, in his commentary on 17:70, *Wa-qad istudilla bi-hādhihi al-āyah 'alā afḍaliyyat jins al-bashar 'alā jins al-malā'ikah* 'This verse has been taken as evidence for the superiority of the human kind over the angelic kind'.²² Al-Qurtubi, in his commentary on 17:70, *Karramnā taḍ'if karam; ay ja'alnā lahum karaman ay sharafan wa-faḍlan*: 'Karramnā' is the intensive form of "karam"; that is, We gave them nobility (*karam*), meaning honor and excellence'.²³

Three points follow for Biometric Fiqh. First, al-Qurtubi glosses *karramnā* as *sharaf* and *faḍl*, nobility and excellence, making dignity a person's status rather than a reward for conduct or wealth; this is the ground on which the study treats dignity as a guiding principle. Second, the view that al-Tabari records counts the hands that eat and work among the ways in which the children of Adam were favored, so the physical form and its characteristic use

¹⁹ Qur'an 17:70 (reading of Hafs from 'Asim). The author provides the transliteration and English translation.

²⁰ Abu Hamid al-Ghazali, *al-Mustasfa min 'Ilm al-Usul*, ed. Muhammad 'Abd al-Salam 'Abd al-Shafi (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1993) [Google](#), discussion of *al-qiyas* and its grounds; Abu Ishaq al-Shatibi, *al-Muwafaqat fī Usul al-Shari'ah*, ed. Mashhur Hasan Al Salman (Dar Ibn 'Affan, 1997), discussion of *tahqiq al-manat* in *Kitab al-Ijtihad*. [Google](#)

²¹ Abu Ja'far Muhammad ibn Jarir al-Tabari, *Jami' al-Bayan 'an Ta'wil Ay al-Qur'an*, ed. 'Abd Allah ibn 'Abd al-Muhsin al-Turki (Cairo: Hajr, 2001), commentary on Qur'an 17:70. [Google](#)

²² Isma'il ibn 'Umar Ibn Kathir, *Tafsir al-Qur'an al-'Azim*, ed. Sami ibn Muhammad Salamah (Riyadh: Dar Taybah, 1999), commentary on Qur'an 17:70. [Google](#)

²³ Muhammad ibn Ahmad al-Qurtubi, *al-Jami' li Ahkam al-Qur'an*, ed. 'Abd Allah al-Turki (Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risalah, 2006), commentary on Qur'an 17:70. [Google](#)

belong to the honor and are not merely its carriers; from this premise the first pillar extends inviolability to face, voice and bodily manner. Third, Ibn Kathir reports that the verse has been used to argue the superiority of the human kind as a kind, supporting the claim that honor attaches to every person, not to a class, and thus supports the protective measures for the least protected discussed under SDG 10. The commentaries stop where the classical texts stop: they say nothing of likeness or representation. The step from the honor of the body to control over one's own likeness is therefore an act of *ijtihad*, and it is argued, not quoted, in sections 4 and 5.

1. Anatomy of Deepfake-Based Biometric Crime

a. Biometric identity and the mechanism of synthesis

Indonesia's PDP Law lists biometric data among specific personal data, which are to receive stricter protection than general data.²⁴ In this article, "biometric identity" means the physical, physiological, and behavioral characteristics that identify a person uniquely, namely the face, the voice, and the characteristic movement of the body, together with the recordings that capture them. A generative model is trained on samples of these features, usually taken from social media or public video without the person's consent, and it then produces new output that matches the person closely enough to pass for the original.²⁵ The decisive moral and legal fact is that the output carries the person's identity into situations the person did not choose.

b. Analyzing Documented Cases of Biometric Cybercrime

Table 1 sets out the cases discussed in the Introduction by mode, by the interest harmed and by the legal response, so that the Islamic-legal analysis that follows can be tied to them.

Table 1. Documented Cases Analysed in This Study

Case	Mode of harm	Interests harmed	Legal response
Hong Kong, Arup, January 2024	Multi-person deepfake video call with cloned voice induced payment of about HK\$200 million	Property; trust in verification by sight and sound	Police investigation; no completed prosecution reported in the sources consulted
Indonesia, "Indonesia Berbagi 2025," announced February 2025	Edited videos of the President and the Finance Minister offering cash aid; fees collected from about 100 victims	Property; honour of the officials; public trust	Charges under ITE Law Arts. 51(1) in conjunction with 35, and Art. 378 of the former Criminal Code
Indonesia, fake video of the Finance Minister, June 2026	Fabricated statement soliciting aid applicants	Honour of the official; public trust	Public denial by the Ministry of Finance
South Korea, 2024–2025	Sexual deepfakes of students and others circulated in messaging channels	Honour; psychological security; the dignity of minors	New offences for possession and viewing; higher maximum penalties; crackdown of 506 detentions
Indonesia and Malaysia, Grok, January 2026	Chatbot used to produce sexualised images of real people	Honor; psychological security	Administrative blocking by Komdigi and its Malaysian counterpart

²⁴ Law No. 27 of 2022 on Personal Data Protection, Art. 4(2)(b) and its Elucidation.

²⁵ Altuncu, Franqueira, and Li, "Deepfake," on the generation architectures and the datasets used. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fdata.2024.1400024>

Three structural observations follow. The first concerns actors. In each case the chain includes people who gather material, a tool or platform that makes synthesis cheap, the person who produces and publishes, intermediaries who forward, and an audience that believes or consumes. The Korean crackdown, in which most suspects were teenagers, shows that producers need no expertise, and the Grok episode shows that the tool provider itself can become the object of regulatory action. The second concerns the act. The wrong lies in presenting a fabricated representation as if it were the person, combining misappropriation of identity with deception of the audience. The third concerns proof. In the Hong Kong case, the victim's own senses were the instrument of deception; in the Indonesian cases, the officials' recognizable faces were the instrument, meaning the usual indicators of authenticity, recognition by sight and hearing, have lost reliability. These three observations organize the fiqh analysis in section 2.

2. Examining Classical Legal Provisions and Their Jurisprudential Limits

a. Honor ('irdh)

The Qur'an explicitly protects honor against false accusation. It prescribes a fixed penalty for those who accuse chaste persons and then fail to produce four witnesses, and it declares them unreliable witnesses and transgressors (24:4); it curses those who accuse chaste, unsuspecting believing women (24:23); it declares that those who harm believing men and women "for what they have not earned" bear the burden of *buhtan* and manifest sin (33:58); and it condemns those who accuse an innocent person of a fault they themselves have committed (4:112).²⁶ The Prophet's farewell sermon states that believers' blood, property, and honor (a'radh) are sacred to one another, and a saying in Muslim's collection states that a Muslim's blood, property, and honor are inviolable to another Muslim.²⁷

The jurists built the law of *qadhaf* on these verses. The schools define it as accusing someone who meets the condition of *ihsan* of unlawful intercourse, or denying their lineage, and they treat the fixed penalty as available only when the elements are complete.²⁸ The schools differ on an important point for the present study: the accusation made by implication (*ta'ridh*). Malik's *Muwatta'* records a chapter on the penalty for *qadhaf*, denial of lineage and *ta'ridh*, and Ibn Rushd's comparative work reports that the Maliki school applies the fixed penalty to *ta'ridh* in some circumstances, while the other schools limit it to explicit accusation and treat implication as a matter for discretionary punishment.²⁹ Classical literature defines the discretionary penalty, *ta'zir*, as punishment for a prohibited act with no fixed penalty, left to the ruler and judge according to the harm and the offender.³⁰

²⁶ Qur'an 24:4, 24:23, 33:58, 4:112. On 33:58 see Abu Ja'far Muhammad ibn Jarir al-Tabari, *Jami' al-Bayan 'an Ta'wil Ay al-Qur'an*, ed. 'Abd Allah ibn 'Abd al-Muhsin al-Turki (Cairo: Hajr, 2001), commentary on Surah al-Ahzab 33:58. [Google](#)

²⁷ Muhammad ibn Isma'il al-Bukhari, *Sahih al-Bukhari*, Kitab al-'Ilm, Bab Qawl al-Nabi "Rubba Muballigh Awa'a min Sami'" (no. 67) [Google](#); Muslim ibn al-Hajjaj, *Sahih Muslim*, Kitab al-Birr wa al-Silah wa al-Adab, Bab Tahrim Zulm al-Muslim wa Khadhlihi wa Ihtiqarihi wa Damihi wa 'Irdihi wa Malihi (no. 2564). [Google](#)

²⁸ Ala' al-Din al-Kasani, *Bada'i' al-Sana'i' fi Tartib al-Shara'i'*, 2nd ed. (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1986) [Google](#), Kitab al-Hudud, Fasl on *hadd al-qadhaf*; 'Ali ibn Muhammad al-Mawardi, *al-Hawi al-Kabir* (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1999) [Google](#), Kitab al-Hudud, Bab *hadd al-qadhaf*; Muwaffaq al-Din Ibn Qudamah, *al-Mughni*, ed. 'Abd Allah al-Turki and 'Abd al-Fattah al-Hulw, 3rd ed. (Riyadh: Dar 'Alam al-Kutub, 1997), Kitab al-Hudud, Bab *hadd al-qadhaf*. [Google](#)

²⁹ Malik ibn Anas, *al-Muwatta'*, ed. Muhammad Fu'ad 'Abd al-Baqi (Beirut: Dar Ihya' al-Turath al-'Arabi, 1985), Kitab al-Hudud, Bab al-Hadd fi al-Qadhaf wa al-Nafy wa al-Ta'ridh [Google](#); Ibn Rushd al-Hafid, *Bidayat al-Mujtahid wa Nihayat al-Muqtasid* (Cairo: Dar al-Hadith, 2004), Kitab al-Hudud, discussion of *hadd al-qadhaf*. [Google](#)

³⁰ Abu al-Hasan al-Mawardi, *al-Ahkam al-Sultaniyyah* (Cairo: Dar al-Hadith, n.d.), the chapter on *al-jara'im* and *al-hudud*, where offences are defined as acts forbidden by the Shari'ah which God has deterred by a fixed or discretionary penalty. [Google](#)

The classical texts also show that the tradition did not confine wrongful speech about persons to literal words. Al-Ghazali, discussing the afflictions of the tongue in the *Ihya'*, treats *ghibah* as extending beyond speech to gesture, writing, and the imitation (*muhakah*) of a person's gait or manner, and the Prophet's disapproval of mimicking a person is reported in the *Sunan* of Abu Dawud.³¹ Some commentators on Surah al-Humazah likewise distinguish *hamz*, derision by gesture or deed, from *lamz*, derision by words.³² This qualifies the common assumption that classical protection of honour is confined to physical and verbal violations. A more accurate statement is that the tradition recognized non-verbal and representational wrongs as sinful and punishable by *ta'zir*, but it never assembled them into a category with settled elements, proof and penalty comparable to *qadhf*, because the technology that makes a lifelike fabricated representation possible did not exist.

Applying *tahqiq al-manat* to a fabricated sexual video of a real person, the ground of the prohibition of *qadhf*, the injury to honor through a false imputation of a shameful act, is plainly present, and the injury is arguably greater than that of a spoken accusation because the imputation is depicted. At the same time the definition of *qadhf* is tied to words, and most jurists confine the fixed penalties to what the text provides and do not extend them by analogy.³³ The proposition that follows is therefore this. Producing a sexualised deepfake of a real person without consent is a serious prohibited act punishable by *ta'zir*, and the strongest *ta'zir* is warranted for anyone who circulates it as genuine, since that person makes the imputation of *zina* in effect. The Maliki treatment of *ta'ridh* is an internal precedent for taking implied imputation very seriously, but it is not adopted here as a basis for the fixed penalty, because the majority position on the limits of analogy in fixed penalties is the more cautious and better supported one.

b. Evidence (*Bayyinah*)

Classical evidence law for accusing someone of *zina* requires four eyewitnesses (24:4, 24:13), and each witness must testify to what he saw. It follows that no video, genuine or synthetic, can by itself found a fixed penalty against the person it appears to show, since a recording is not testimony of four eyewitnesses; the rule thus already protects a depicted person against being punished on a fabrication. The converse risk is the liar's dividend, in which a person who really did something claims that the recording is synthetic. Here the classical law is richer than the narrow form of testimony suggests. Ibn al-Qayyim argued that *bayyinah* in the Qur'an and the Sunnah is whatever makes the truth plain, and he collected the Companions' and judges' use of circumstantial indications (*qara'in*).³⁴ The Qur'an itself presents the reasoning from physical traces: Jacob's sons brought his shirt stained with false blood (12:18), and the intact shirt exposed the lie, while the shirt torn from behind was the sign that settled Joseph's innocence (12:26–28). Al-Qurtubi's commentary on Surah Yusuf

³¹ Abu Hamid al-Ghazali, *Ihya' 'Ulum al-Din* (Beirut: Dar al-Ma'rifah, n.d.), Kitab Afat al-Lisan, the discussion of *al-ghibah* [Google](#); Sulayman ibn al-Ash'ath Abu Dawud, *Sunan Abi Dawud*, Kitab al-Adab, Bab fi al-Ghibah (no. 4875) [Google](#). On the definition of *ghibah*: Muslim, *Sahih Muslim*, Kitab al-Birr wa al-Silah wa al-Adab, Bab Tahrim al-Ghibah (no. 2589).

³² Isma'il ibn 'Umar Ibn Kathir, *Tafsir al-Qur'an al-'Azim*, ed. Sami ibn Muhammad Salamah (Riyadh: Dar Taybah, 1999), commentary on Surah al-Humazah 104:1 [Google](#); al-Tabari, *Jami' al-Bayan*, commentary on 104:1. [Google](#)

³³ Wahbah al-Zuhayli, *al-Fiqh al-Islami wa Adillatuhu* (Damascus: Dar al-Fikr, 1985), the chapters on *al-hudud* and *al-ta'zir* [Google](#); on the limits of analogy in fixed penalties see also al-Ghazali, *al-Mustasfa*, discussion of *al-qiyas*. [Google](#)

³⁴ Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyyah, *I'lam al-Muwaqqi'in 'an Rabb al-'Alamin*, ed. Mashhur Hasan Al Salman (Dammam: Dar Ibn al-Jawzi, 2002), the sections on the judge's reasoning and on *al-bayyinah*; Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyyah, *al-Turuq al-Hukmiyyah fi al-Siyasah al-Shar'iyyah*, ed. Nayif ibn Ahmad al-Hamad (Mecca: Dar 'Alam al-Fawa'id, 2007), the opening discussion of *al-bayyinah* and *al-qara'in*. [Google](#)

draws from these verses the lawfulness of relying on signs and indications in judgment.³⁵ The Qur'an also directs lay persons to those with knowledge (16:43; 25:59), which supplies the basis for treating digital forensic analysts as *khubara'* whose findings assist the judge.

The second proposition is accordingly that digital recordings are admissible as circumstantial indications, subject to authentication by qualified experts, and are never sufficient alone for a fixed penalty. The same reasoning answers the person who claims "it is AI": the claim does not defeat the recording but sends it to forensic examination, together with corroborating circumstances. Doubt about authenticity (*shubhah*) also weighs in favour of the accused wherever a fixed penalty is in issue.

c. Ownership, Consent and Fraud

Jurists define *ghasb* as unlawfully seizing another's right and treat it in a dedicated chapter; they differ on whether the seizure of usufruct, as distinct from the thing itself, is guaranteed: the majority hold that it is, while the Hanafi school generally does not.³⁶ It is tempting to equate the unauthorized use of a face or voice with *ghasb*, but that equation needs qualification. The classical *ghasb* concerns property that has value, and a face or voice is not a thing in that sense. A closer fit is the wrongful interference with another's right (*ta'addi*) coupled with *darar*. Contemporary fiqh has meanwhile recognized intangible rights such as names and authorship as protected interests with value, which supports treating the commercial or deceptive use of identity as the violation of a recognized right.³⁷ The Qur'an grounds consent in property and exchange (4:29: "except that it be trade by mutual consent") and forbids taking property by falsehood (2:188), and the Sunnah treats confidences shared in a gathering as a trust (*amanah*).³⁸

Where deepfakes are used to obtain money, the case is plainer. The Prophet said of the seller who concealed defective grain, "whoever deceives is not one of us," and the jurists treat deceit in dealing as unlawful and as grounds for restitution and, where the harm is public, for discretionary punishment.³⁹ The third proposition is therefore that the unauthorized use of a person's face, voice or manner to deceive for gain is prohibited, that the victims of the deception are entitled to restitution from the wrongdoer, and that *ta'zir* applies in proportion to the harm.

Reading the texts closely yields three limits, each more precise than a general claim that classical fiqh is silent. First, the classical law has no settled category for non-verbal, representational imputation that combines the object, the act, the proof and the sanction, although it contains the pieces. Second, the tradition protects reputation (*'irdh*) but does not articulate a person's control over his or her own likeness as an interest in its own right. Third, the classical rules of proof presuppose that sight and hearing are generally reliable guides to authenticity, whereas the technology now makes that presupposition unsafe. Biometric Fiqh is a proposal to close these three gaps by *ijtihad* while remaining within the established methods.

³⁵ Muhammad ibn Ahmad al-Qurtubi, *al-Jami' li Ahkam al-Qur'an*, ed. 'Abd Allah al-Turki (Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risalah, 2006), commentary on Surah Yusuf 12:18 and 12:26–28. [Google](#)

³⁶ Al-Kasani, *Bada'i' al-Sana'i'*, Kitab al-Ghasb [Google](#); Ibn Qudamah, *al-Mughni*, Kitab al-Ghasb; Ibn Rushd, *Bidayat al-Mujtahid*, Kitab al-Ghasb. [Google](#)

³⁷ International Islamic Fiqh Academy (Majma' al-Fiqh al-Islami al-Duwali), Resolution No. 43 (5/5) of 1988 on trade names, trademarks and authorship rights. [Google](#)

³⁸ Qur'an 4:29, 2:188, 4:58, 33:72; Abu Dawud, *Sunan Abi Dawud*, Kitab al-Adab, Bab fi Naql al-Hadith (nos. 4868–4869). [Google](#)

³⁹ Muslim, *Sahih Muslim*, Kitab al-Iman, Bab Qawl al-Nabi "Man Ghashshana Falaysa Minna"; Ibn Qudamah, *al-Mughni*, the chapters on sales and on *ta'zir*. [Google](#)

3. Deepfake Harm and the Maqasid al-Shari'ah

Al-Ghazali identifies the preservation of religion, life, intellect, lineage, and property as the objectives that every revealed law has protected, and al-Shatibi organizes the objectives in three tiers: the necessities (*daruriyyat*), the needs (*hajiyyat*), and the refinements (*tahsiniyyat*).⁴⁰ Some later *usul* scholars, including al-Qarafi and al-Subki, added the preservation of honor (*hifz al-'irdh*) as a sixth necessity, and this article follows that position because it corresponds to the Qur'anic and prophetic texts cited above.⁴¹ Listing lineage and honor as a single necessity would conflate two distinct interests.

Mapped to these objectives, a deepfake harm is typically plural. A fabricated sexual video injures honor and, through its psychological effects, the preservation of life (*hifz al-nafs*), which includes protection from serious non-physical harm under the prohibition of *darar*. A voice-cloned fraud injures property. A fabricated sermon or fatwa attributed to a scholar injures religion, since the Qur'an condemns those who ascribe falsehood to God's religion by what their tongues describe (16:116), and the Prophet warned severely against attributing false statements to himself; while the latter warning concerns the Prophet specifically and is not extended by analogy to scholars, it indicates how gravely the tradition treats false attribution of religious speech.⁴² The flooding of public communication with believable falsehood injures the intellect (*hifz al-'aql*), since it defeats the duty to verify news before acting (49:6) and the command not to pursue what one has no knowledge of (17:36). The convergence of several necessities in one act is the ground for treating deepfake abuse as a serious category, and not as an ordinary offense.

Ibn Ashur's *Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah* theory supplies the macro view. He distinguishes the general objectives of legislation, including the preservation of the order of the community (*hifz nizam al-ummah*), the primacy of the original human disposition (*fitrah*), and equality and freedom, from the particular objectives of each chapter.⁴³ Read in this way, harm done by mass fabrication is more than an injury to individuals: it attacks the shared conditions of trust on which communal order depends. Auda's systems approach offers a micro view because it directs attention to the whole chain of actors, the problem's openness to new technology, the hierarchical relations among the interests at play, and the purpose rules are meant to serve.

The maqasid analysis also requires restraint. The ordinary rule in matters of dealing and technology is permissibility unless a text or a clear harm prohibits, and a prohibition of the technology itself would damage legitimate uses such as accessibility tools, education, and clearly labelled satire or art done with consent.⁴⁴ The framework therefore targets harmful and deceptive non-consensual uses and the means that exist chiefly for them, and it does not condemn synthetic media as such.

4. Karāmah al-Insān as the Guiding Principle

The textual basis is the verse "We have honoured the children of Adam, carried them on land and sea, provided them with good things, and favoured them over many of those We created" (17:70). Classical commentators explain the honour in terms of reason, speech and

⁴⁰ Al-Ghazali, *al-Mustasfa*, the discussion of *al-maslahah al-mursalah (al-istislah)* [Google](#); al-Shatibi, *al-Muwafaqat, Kitab al-Maqasid*, the discussion of the three categories of *maqasid*. [Google](#)

⁴¹ Shihab al-Din al-Qarafi, *Sharh Tanqih al-Fusul* and *al-Furuq*, in the discussions of the necessities [Google](#); Taj al-Din al-Subki, *Jam' al-Jawami'*, in the discussion of the necessities [Google](#).

⁴² Qur'an 16:116; al-Bukhari, *Sahih al-Bukhari*, Kitab al-'Ilm, Bab Ithm man Kadhaba 'ala al-Nabi (no. 107). [Google](#)

⁴³ Muhammad al-Tahir Ibn Ashur, *Maqasid al-Shari'ah al-Islamiyyah*, ed. Muhammad al-Habib Ibn al-Khoja (Doha: Ministry of Endowments and Islamic Affairs, 2004), Part 2 on the general objectives of legislation. [Google](#)

⁴⁴ Jalal al-Din al-Suyuti, *al-Ashbah wa al-Naza'ir fi Qawa'id wa Furu' Fiqh al-Shafi'iyyah* (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1990) [Google](#), the discussion of the presumption of permissibility in things; on truthful humour see Muhammad ibn 'Isa al-Tirmidhi, *Sunan al-Tirmidhi*, Kitab al-Birr wa al-Silah, Bab ma ja'a fi al-Mizah (no. 1990). [Google](#)

the upright, well-proportioned form of the human being, including the use of the hands in eating, which indicates that the physical form is itself part of the honour.⁴⁵ Other verses point in the same direction: God shaped human beings and perfected their forms (40:64) and created them in the best proportion (95:4). The Prophet prohibited striking the face, which indicates a special sanctity of the face in the law.⁴⁶

These texts do not themselves enact a rule on deepfakes, and the study does not claim that they do. *Karāmah al-Insān* functions as a guiding principle: it directs how the specific texts are read, how interests are weighed, and which rulings are preferred when the law is open. The same value is found at the centre of UNESCO's *Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence* (2021), which places respect, protection and promotion of human rights, fundamental freedoms and human dignity first among its values.⁴⁷ The convergence is useful for cooperation, but the grounds differ: for the Recommendation dignity rests on a universal human-rights framework, whereas in the Islamic tradition it rests on God's gift and on the trust placed in the human being, and the two should not be treated as identical.

5. The Formulation of Biometric Fiqh

Biometric Fiqh is formulated here as the branch of contemporary Islamic legal reasoning that governs the protection, ownership and use of a person's face, voice, bodily manner and the recordings that capture them against theft, cloning and deceptive manipulation. Its aim is to protect *Karāmah al-Insān*. It stands on three pillars.

a. First Pillar: The Person's Right Over Biometric Identity

The first pillar recognises that a person holds an inviolable interest (*hurmah*) in the face, voice and manner by which he or she is known, and that the interest is violated when others take, copy or manipulate them without consent. Three elements make up this right. The first is inviolability: the sanctity of honour and of the face, supported by the texts cited in sections 2 and 4. The second is consent (*rida*): consent to capture and use identity must be specific, informed, and revocable, following from the principle of mutual consent in 4:29 and from treating confidences as a trust. Covert collection of personal features for later use is further restrained by the prohibition of spying (*tajassus*) in 49:12. The third is responsibility for derivative works: whoever creates a synthetic derivative bears the burden of showing consent and of marking it as synthetic where deception is possible. The body and its representation are held in trust, and a person's liberty over it does not extend to harming himself or others, consistent with 2:195 and 4:29. Legitimate exceptions exist for public-interest reporting, lawful investigation, and satire that does not deceive.

b. Second Pillar: A Two-Level Maqasid Analysis

The second pillar combines Ibn Ashur and Auda in a two-level method. At the macro level, following Ibn Ashur, the question is whether a given act of fabrication threatens the order and trust on which the community depends, which makes the response a matter of public policy and not only of private remedy. At the micro level, following Auda, the question is who stands in the chain of causation, with what knowledge and benefit, so that responsibility is allocated in proportion to each actor's role. The framework thus asks the producer to answer for production, the distributor for dissemination with knowledge or

⁴⁵ Qur'an 17:70; al-Tabari, *Jami' al-Bayan*, and Ibn Kathir, *Tafsir*, commentary on 17:70 [Google](#); Muhammad al-Tahir Ibn Ashur, *al-Tahrir wa al-Tanwir* (Tunis: al-Dar al-Tunisiyyah, 1984), commentary on 17:70. [Google](#)

⁴⁶ Qur'an 40:64, 95:4; Muslim, *Sahih Muslim*, Kitab al-Birr wa al-Silah wa al-Adab, Bab al-Nahy 'an Darb al-Wajh.

⁴⁷ UNESCO, *Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence* (Paris: UNESCO, 2021), [Google](#)

suspicion of falsity, the platform for failing to act on notice, and the provider of a tool for the foreseeable misuse of a tool built for deception.

c. Third Pillar: The Maxims on Harm and the Blocking of Means

The maxim "there is to be no harm and no reciprocal harm" derives from a hadith reported by Ibn Majah on the authority of 'Ubadah ibn al-Samit, among others, and by Malik in the *Muwatta'* as a *mursal* report.⁴⁸ Individual chains of the report are weak, and some graders classify the 'Ubadah chain as weak, but the report is strengthened by its several channels, which is why al-Nawawi included it in his *Forty Hadith* and Ibn Rajab discussed its chains and meaning at length.⁴⁹ The maxim is codified in the Ottoman *Majallat al-Ahkam al-'Adliyyah* (Art. 19).⁵⁰ It grounds the prohibition of producing and spreading manipulated content that injures another's honour. The related maxim "harm is to be removed" is placed fourth among the five great maxims in both al-Suyuti's and Ibn Nujaym's books, and it supports the duties of removal, correction and restoration of the victim's name, including prompt takedown.⁵¹

The blocking of means (*sadd al-dhara'i'*) is developed by al-Shatibi, al-Qarafi and Ibn al-Qayyim.⁵² Its application to deepfakes requires the distinction al-Qarafi draws between means that must be closed, those that must be opened, and those left neutral. A tool built chiefly for deceptive impersonation falls in the first category and may be prohibited. A general-purpose generative model does not and is better handled by regulation of misuse: labelling, provenance, access controls and prompt takedown. Where the state acts, it does so within the principle that the ruler's authority over the subjects is conditioned by public interest (*maslahah*), and the penalties it sets must be proportionate and may not be used to restrain legitimate speech.⁵³

d. A Graded Set of Rulings

Table 2 collects the propositions reached above into a graded set of rulings, each tied to its ground.

Table 2. Graded Rulings Proposed Under Biometric Fiqh

Conduct	Proposed ruling	Principal ground	Consequence
Producing a sexualised deepfake of a real person without consent	Prohibited, a grave wrong	Honour (33:58; 24:23); <i>darar</i>	<i>Ta'zir</i> at the severe end; removal; compensation for harm
Circulating such content as genuine	Prohibited, graver than mere production	Imputation of a shameful act without proof (24:4, 24:13)	Strongest <i>ta'zir</i> ; no fixed penalty, because fixed penalties are not extended by analogy
Using a cloned face or voice to obtain money	Prohibited	Deceit; taking property by falsehood (2:188)	Restitution; <i>ta'zir</i> proportionate to the harm

⁴⁸ Muhammad ibn Yazid Ibn Majah, *Sunan Ibn Majah*, ed. Muhammad Fu'ad 'Abd al-Baqi (Beirut: Dar Ihya' al-Kutub al-'Arabiyyah, n.d.), Kitab al-Ahkam, Bab Man Bana fi Haqqihi ma Yadurru bi Jarihi (no. 2340) [Google](#); Malik, *al-Muwatta'*, Kitab al-Aqdiyah, Bab al-Qada' fi al-Mirfaq.

⁴⁹ Ibn Rajab al-Hanbali, *Jami' al-'Ulum wa al-Hikam*, ed. Shu'ayb al-Arna'ut (Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risalah, 2001), commentary on the thirty-second hadith. [Google](#)

⁵⁰ *Majallat al-Ahkam al-'Adliyyah*, Arts. 19–20. [Google](#)

⁵¹ Al-Suyuti, *al-Ashbah wa al-Naza'ir*, the fourth major maxim [Google](#); Zayn al-'Abidin Ibn Nujaym, *al-Ashbah wa al-Naza'ir 'ala Madhhab Abi Hanifah al-Nu'man* (Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1999), the fourth maxim. [Google](#)

⁵² Al-Shatibi, *al-Muwafaqat*, the discussion of means in *Kitab al-Ahkam* and *Kitab al-Ijtihad* [Google](#); Shihab al-Din al-Qarafi, *al-Furuq*, the distinction between means that must be blocked, those that must be opened, and those that are neutral [Google](#); Ibn Qayyim, *I'lam al-Muwaqqi'in*, the section on blocking means. [Google](#)

⁵³ Al-Suyuti, *al-Ashbah wa al-Naza'ir*, the maxim that the ruler's conduct towards his subjects depends on the public interest [Google](#); *Majallat al-Ahkam al-'Adliyyah*, Art. 58. [Google](#)

Conduct	Proposed ruling	Principal ground	Consequence
Fabricating the speech of a scholar or religious authority	Prohibited	False attribution (16:116); harm to religion	<i>Ta'zir</i> ; public correction
Forwarding unverified content that may be fabricated	Prohibited if the falsity is known or suspected	Verification (49:6); the Prophet's warning against reporting everything one hears	Repentance and removal; <i>ta'zir</i> for repeated or malicious cases
Consensual, labelled and non-deceptive synthetic media	Permissible	Presumption of permissibility; consent	Subject to the general rules on harm
Using a recording as evidence	Admissible as an indication after expert authentication	<i>Bayyinah</i> as whatever clarifies the truth; reliance on experts (16:43)	Never alone for a fixed penalty

The forwarding rule rests on the Prophet's statement that a man is responsible for what he relays, and on the MUI's requirement to verify before sharing.⁵⁴

6. Biometric Fiqh and Positive Law

Biometric Fiqh is designed to work with positive law, not replace it. In Indonesia, the PDP Law classifies biometric data as specific personal data (Art. 4(2)(b)) and sets criminal penalties for the unlawful acquisition or collection of another person's data (Art. 67(1): up to five years' imprisonment and a fine of up to IDR 5 billion), for its unlawful use (Art. 67(3): the same maxima), and for creating false personal data for gain (Art. 68: up to six years and IDR 6 billion).⁵⁵ The ITE Law, as amended in 2024, penalizes the manipulation, creation or alteration of electronic information so that it appears to be authentic data (Art. 35, with the penalty in Art. 51(1) of up to twelve years and IDR 12 billion), and it penalizes defamation by accusations made public through electronic means (Art. 27A, with the penalty in Art. 45(4) of up to two years and IDR 400 million).⁵⁶ The new Criminal Code (Law No. 1 of 2023), which took effect on 2 January 2026, now addresses fraud, and the 2025 case was prosecuted under Art. 378 of the former code.⁵⁷ The Sexual Violence Crimes Law (Law No. 12 of 2022) also contains provisions on electronically-based sexual violence that may reach some deepfake cases.⁵⁸

At the international level, Article 50 of the EU AI Act applies from 2 August 2026: providers of systems that generate synthetic content must mark outputs in a machine-readable way (Art. 50(2)), deployers of emotion-recognition and biometric-categorization systems must inform the persons exposed (Art. 50(3)), and deployers must disclose deepfakes depicting real persons, places or events (Art. 50(4)). Under the AI Omnibus, providers of generative systems already on the market before 2 August 2026 have until 2 December 2026 to comply with the marking duty.⁵⁹ Labeling and provenance requirements correspond to the Islamic concern for verification and for blocking the means of mass deception, though the two systems rest on different foundations.

⁵⁴ Muslim, *Sahih Muslim*, Muqaddimah, Bab al-Nahy 'an al-Hadith bi Kulli ma Sami'a; MUI, Fatwa No. 24/2017.

⁵⁵ Law No. 27 of 2022, Arts. 4(2)(b), 67, and 68.

⁵⁶ Law No. 1 of 2024, Arts. 27A, 35, 45(4), and 51(1); on Art. 27A see "Perubahan Penting soal Pencemaran Nama Baik di UU ITE Baru," *Hukumonline*, 2024. [Google](#)

⁵⁷ Law No. 1 of 2023 on the Criminal Code, Art. 492 on fraud; the former Criminal Code, Art. 378.

⁵⁸ Law No. 12 of 2022 on Sexual Violence Crimes, Art. 14.

⁵⁹ Goodwinlaw. "Not Delayed, Not Deferred: EU AI Act Transparency Obligations Are Now in Force," Goodwin, August 2026. [Google](#)

The relation between the two is complementary. Positive law supplies definition, enforcement and procedure. Biometric Fiqh supplies a religious-ethical ground, an internal restraint (*wazi' diniy*) that operates where enforcement does not, and a language in which fatwa councils and religious judges can address cases and communities that positive law does not reach, such as the duty not to forward doubtful content even when no statute forbids it. The framework also has a limit that should be stated plainly: it is a tool for protecting persons, and it must not be used to widen the criminalisation of speech beyond what *darar* and proportionality justify.

The framework is tested here against fourteen studies that bear on its findings, grouped by the question each one answers. The position of this study toward each is stated explicitly and is summarised in Table 3. The first group asks whether deepfake imputation is a form of *qadhf* and what sanction follows. Meylani and Iwan argue by *qiyas awlawi* and *Maqāsid al-Sharī'ah* that a deepfake carrying an imputation of *zina* shares the 'illah of *qadhf* and is therefore a modern *qadhf*, but they hold that the fixed penalty cannot be imposed automatically because digital proof is open to manipulation (*shubhah*), so that a heavier *ta'zir* applies.⁶⁰ This study corroborates the outcome, a graded *ta'zir* anchored in doubt over authenticity, and the finding that the ground of the prohibition is present. It qualifies the route, because it does not classify the act as *qadhf* by analogy: the definition of *qadhf* is tied to words, most jurists do not extend fixed penalties by analogy, and the Maliki treatment of implication shows that even a spoken allusion is disputed ground for the fixed penalty. Maulana and Abbas go further and conclude that producing sexual deepfakes fulfils the elements of *qadhf*, so that the fixed penalty of eighty lashes may be imposed, with *ta'zir* only where an element is missing.⁶¹ This study refutes that conclusion. The authors themselves record that Ibn Hazm, Abu Hanifah, al-Shafi'i and others deny the fixed penalty for implied accusation because of *shubhah*, and a synthetic video is at best an implied and mediated accusation whose authenticity is by its nature contestable, so the maxim that fixed penalties are averted by doubt weighs against the fixed penalty and is not displaced by it. Zalsabila and Haddade, who survey defamation in the four schools and conclude that the false accusation of adultery carries the fixed penalty while other forms fall under *ta'zir*, supply the classical baseline that this study shares; they do not ask what changes when the representation is synthetic, which is the question addressed in section 2.⁶²

The second group concerns the objective that is injured. Hamim and Supriadi credit al-Subki with introducing *hifz al-'irdh* alongside the five accepted necessities, treat the defence of honour as closely tied to the preservation of lineage in the discussion of *qadhf*, and compare the spread of hoaxes with *qadhf*.⁶³ This study corroborates the recognition of honour as an objective in its own right and the extension of its protection to digital falsehood, and it carries that analysis from false reports to the synthetic appropriation of a person's face and voice. It qualifies the assimilation of honour to lineage: as argued in section 3, collapsing the two would conflate distinct interests, and it is the distinctness of honour that allows a fabricated image to be treated as an injury to honour even where no allegation about parentage is made. It also takes note of their claim that al-Subki initiated the concept, which is a reason to cite his formulation first and al-Qarafi's discussions alongside it. Ahmed and colleagues adapt the

⁶⁰ Meylani Juhri and Iwan, "Deepfake Sebagai Bentuk Fitnah Qadzaf Modern dalam Perspektif Hukum Pidana Islam," *Maqasid: Jurnal Studi Hukum Islam* 15, no. 2 (2026): 470–84, <https://doi.org/10.30651/mqsd.v15i2.33421>.

⁶¹ Faisal Maulana and Sudirman Abbas, "Deepfake Pornography as Qadzaf: Legal Status and Hudud Implications," *Al-Risalah: Jurnal Ilmu Syariah dan Hukum* 25, no. 2 (2025), <https://doi.org/10.24252/al-risalah.vi.62018>.

⁶² Zalsabila and Haddade, "Pencemaran Nama Baik," 42–58. <https://doi.org/10.24252/shautuna.vi.30062>.

⁶³ Khairul Hamim and Lalu Supriadi, "The Contextualization of Hifz al-'Ird on Hoax News (A Study on Imam Tājuddīn al-Subkī's Maqāsid al-Sharī'a)," *Ulumuna* 24, no. 2 (2020): 348–66, <https://doi.org/10.20414/ujs.v24i2.405>.

principles of *qadhaf*, *ghibah*, *buhtan*, and *namimah* to social-media misuse and propose a hybrid model that joins *shari'ah* values to digital governance.⁶⁴ This study corroborates the hybrid design and the view that the classical offenses remain relevant, but it differs in object: their offenses concern speech about a person, whereas the framework here adds the person's interest in face, voice and manner and the rules of proof for fabricated sight and sound, which speech-based categories do not reach.

The third group compares positive law with Islamic law. Hafiduddin and colleagues find that Indonesian provisions reach deepfakes only through dispersed, consequence-oriented offenses that respond poorly to synthetic identity manipulation, rapid removal, victim restoration, attribution and platform accountability; they classify harmful deepfake conduct as *jarimah ta'zir* and propose a complementary model of precise definition, tiered criminalization, victim-centered remedies, digital-evidence standards and *tabayyun*.⁶⁵ This study corroborates these findings, and its graded rulings (Table 2) align with the model. It adds two things the model does not supply: an articulated interest in one's own likeness as the ground of the first pillar, and a doctrinal account of why fixed penalties are not extended and how the liar's dividend is met by expert authentication. Palindria and colleagues conclude that the PDP Law does not address biometric data specifically and call for a dedicated regulation.⁶⁶ This study corroborates the call but qualifies the diagnosis: the PDP Law names biometric data as specific personal data (Art. 4(2)(b)) and penalizes unlawful acquisition and use (Arts. 67 and 68), so the gap lies less in the absence of any protection than in the absence of a rule for synthetic derivatives made from such data, which is where Biometric Fiqh supplies its ground. Ramadhani, Rachmawati and Kurnikova argue that the right to be forgotten, limited as it is by Article 15 of the PDP Law, should be strengthened and integrated with Islamic values to justify the erasure of non-consensual deepfake content.⁶⁷ This study corroborates the removal remedy and gives it a juristic ground in the maxim that harm is to be removed, which operates as a duty of takedown and correction and not only as an ethical aspiration; it differs in treating removal as one remedy among several, alongside restitution and *ta'zir*, and not as the centre of the framework.

The fourth group comes from technology and general legal scholarship. Chesney and Citron identify the liar's dividend and survey remedies in American law.⁶⁸ This study corroborates the diagnosis and adds that the classical doctrine of *bayyinah* and *qara'in* answers it: the claim that a recording is synthetic does not defeat the recording but sends it to forensic examination. Vaccari and Chadwick found in an experiment that deepfake videos were more likely to produce uncertainty than outright deception, and that this uncertainty lowered trust in news on social media.⁶⁹ This study corroborates the link between synthetic media and eroded trust but qualifies its own third observation in section 1: the loss of reliability of sight and hearing as indicators is better stated as a loss of confidence than as a general success of deception, and the rulings on forwarding unverified content (Table 2) rest on that weaker claim. Mirsky and Lee review the creation and the detection of deepfakes and

⁶⁴ Omar Saad Ahmed et al., "Fitnah in the Digital Age: Regulating Social Media Misuse through Islamic Criminal Principles," *Al-Istinbath: Jurnal Hukum Islam* 10, no. 2 (2025): 535–62, <https://doi.org/10.29240/jhi.v10i2.13369>.

⁶⁵ Muhammad Hafiduddin et al., "Hukum Siber di Era Digital: Rekonstruksi Penanggulangan Kejahatan Deepfake dalam Perspektif Hukum Pidana Indonesia dan Maqāṣid al-Syarī'ah," *SEIKAT: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial, Politik dan Hukum* 5, no. 4 (2026): 1325–36, <https://doi.org/10.55681/seikat.v5i4.3370>.

⁶⁶ Palindria, Thufail, and Febrian, "Ancaman Deepfake," 110–21. <https://doi.org/10.56444/sh.v21i2.5319>.

⁶⁷ Ramadhani, Rachmawati, and Kurnikova, "Integrating Islamic Values," 112–31. <https://doi.org/10.18860/j-fsh.v17i1.28880>

⁶⁸ Chesney and Citron, "Deep Fakes," 1753–1820. <https://doi.org/10.15779/Z38RV0D15J>

⁶⁹ Cristian Vaccari and Andrew Chadwick, "Deepfakes and Disinformation: Exploring the Impact of Synthetic Political Video on Deception, Uncertainty, and Trust in News," *Social Media + Society* 6, no. 1 (2020): 1–13, <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305120903408>.

the continuing contest between them,⁷⁰ which corroborates the position that detectors cannot serve as sole proof and that expert findings are circumstantial indications. Kietzmann and colleagues propose a framework for organisations that combines recording of original content, early exposure of fakes, advocacy for legal protection and the leverage of trust;⁷¹ this study corroborates their call for protection and verification and supplies what a managerial framework does not, a religious-ethical ground and a graded set of consequences. Van der Sloot and Wagenveld examine how existing legal regimes respond to deepfakes and the regulatory difficulties that follow,⁷² and this study corroborates the view that responses are piecemeal and that a coherent normative ground is needed. Romero Moreno proposes a human-rights approach to harmful content produced with generative AI,⁷³ which corroborates the dignity-based orientation of this study and its insistence that criminalisation remain proportionate and not reach legitimate speech.

The principal departures of this study from earlier work are therefore three: the refusal to extend fixed penalties by analogy to synthetic imputation, the insistence that honour remains distinct from lineage, and the restatement of the trust claim in the weaker form that the evidence supports.

Table 3. Position of This Study Relative to Prior Research

Study	Main finding	Position of this study
Meylani and Iwan (2026)	Deepfake imputing zina is a modern qadhf by qiyas; fixed penalty not automatic; ta'zir	Corroborates the outcome; qualifies the route
Maulana and Abbas (2025)	Sexual deepfakes fulfil the elements of qadhf; fixed penalty may be imposed	Refutes
Zalsabila and Haddade (2023)	Four-school survey: fixed penalty for accusing adultery, ta'zir for other defamation	Corroborates the baseline; extends it to synthetic representation
Hamim and Supriadi (2020)	Al-Subki's hifz al-'irdh; honour close to lineage; hoax compared with qadhf	Corroborates the objective; qualifies the tie to lineage
Ahmed et al. (2025)	Qadhf, ghibah, buhtan and namimah adapted to social media; hybrid model	Corroborates; adds the likeness interest and rules of proof
Hafiduddin et al. (2026)	Indonesian law dispersed; deepfake as jarimah ta'zir; complementary model	Corroborates; adds the likeness interest and the doctrine on fixed penalties
Palindria et al. (2024)	PDP Law not specific on biometric data; dedicated regulation needed	Corroborates the call; qualifies the diagnosis
Ramadhani et al. (2025)	Right to be forgotten with Islamic values against deepfake pornography	Corroborates; places removal among several remedies
Chesney and Citron (2019)	Liar's dividend; remedies in American law	Corroborates; adds the bayyinah answer
Vaccari and Chadwick (2020)	Deepfakes produce uncertainty more than deception; trust in news falls	Corroborates the trust link; qualifies its own claim
Mirsky and Lee (2021)	Survey of deepfake creation and detection and the contest between them	Corroborates the caution on detectors as proof
Kietzmann et al. (2020)	Framework for organisations facing deepfakes	Corroborates; supplies a normative ground

⁷⁰ Yisroel Mirsky and Wenke Lee, "The Creation and Detection of Deepfakes: A Survey," *ACM Computing Surveys* 54, no. 1 (2021): article 7, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3425780>.

⁷¹ Jan Kietzmann et al., "Deepfakes: Trick or Treat?," *Business Horizons* 63, no. 2 (2020): 135–46, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2019.11.006>.

⁷² Bart van der Sloot and Yvette Wagenveld, "Deepfakes: Regulatory Challenges for the Synthetic Society," *Computer Law & Security Review* 46 (2022): 105716, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2022.105716>.

⁷³ Felipe Romero Moreno, "Generative AI and Deepfakes: A Human Rights Approach to Tackling Harmful Content," *International Review of Law, Computers & Technology* (2024), <https://doi.org/10.1080/13600869.2024.2324540>.

Study	Main finding	Position of this study
Van der Sloot and Wagenveld (2022)	Regulatory challenges of deepfakes	Corroborates
Romero Moreno (2024)	Human-rights approach to harmful generative-AI content	Corroborates the dignity orientation and proportionality

7. Relation to the Sustainable Development Goals

The framework's relation to the SDGs is presented as normative alignment. The study has not measured the effects of any policy, and it therefore does not claim that Biometric Fiqh has caused or will cause progress on any target. Previous studies indicate overlap between *Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah* and the SDGs, though mostly in economics and finance, and this study extends the comparison to digital protection.⁷⁴

The alignment with SDG 3 (good health and well-being) lies in protecting psychological security, which the framework treats as part of preserving life and links to target 3.4 on mental health and well-being. The alignment with SDG 5 (gender equality) is the most direct, because the industry data and the Korean and Grok episodes show that sexual deepfakes target women overwhelmingly; the prohibition of non-consensual sexual deepfakes and the strong liability of those who circulate them correspond to target 5.2 on eliminating violence against women and girls in public and private spheres. SDG 9 (industry, innovation and infrastructure) is addressed by the distinction between means that must be blocked and means that are regulated, which gives developers an ethical basis for provenance and labeling without prohibiting the technology. SDG 10 (reduced inequalities) is addressed by the principle that dignity belongs to all human beings and not to a class, which supports protective measures for those least able to protect themselves, including children and persons with low digital literacy. SDG 16 (peace, justice and strong institutions) is addressed by the treatment of evidence and the allocation of responsibility among actors, which relate to target 16.3 on the rule of law and access to justice and target 16.6 on effective, accountable institutions.

For fatwa institutions such as the Indonesian Ulema Council and the fatwa bodies of the major organizations, the first recommendation is a thematic fatwa that applies the graded rulings in Table 2 to the production, circulation, forwarding and use of synthetic media, and that updates Fatwa No. 24 of 2017 for generative technology. Such a fatwa should state the standard of verification expected of an ordinary believer and should distinguish ordinary users from producers and platforms. For religious and general courts, the recommendation is to adopt a protocol for digital evidence in which recordings are treated as circumstantial indications and are authenticated by qualified experts before they are relied on, and in which a bare claim that evidence is synthetic is sent to forensic examination and not accepted as a defense. For legislators and regulators, the recommendation is to harmonize the PDP Law, the ITE Law, and sectoral rules, to consider a specific provision on biometric identity in line with the findings of the Indonesian studies, and to adopt labeling and provenance duties on the model of Article 50 of the EU AI Act, applying the distinction between tools built for deception and general-purpose models. For platforms, the recommendation is a rapid notice-and-takedown process and the preservation of evidence for victims. For educators and religious teachers, the recommendation is to include verification (*tabayyun*) and digital ethics in religious education so that the believers' own restraint complements enforcement.

⁷⁴ Al-Ansari, Kharseh, and Khalfan, "Integrating Maqasid al-Shariah into Sustainable Development Goals."

D. CONCLUSION

The study set out to answer three questions, and its answers are as follows. First, deepfake-based biometric crime, as documented in the cases analyzed, is a chain of actions in which a person's face, voice or manner is taken, synthesized, and presented as genuine to a real audience, and a single act typically injures honor, property, psychological security, and the reliability of public speech together. Second, a close reading of the classical texts shows that the tradition is not silent: the law of *qadhf* with its treatment of implication, the recognition of imitation and gesture as *ghibah*, the law of *ghashb*, the broad conception of *bayyinah*, and the doctrine of *ta'zir* supply the building blocks. Its limits are three and are precise: there is no settled category for representational imputation that combines act, proof and sanction, there is no articulated interest in control over one's own likeness, and the rules of proof assume that sight and hearing are reliable. Third, Biometric Fiqh can be formulated as a framework of *ijtihad* on three pillars, namely the person's right over biometric identity, a two-level *Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah* analysis drawing on Ibn Ashur and Auda, and the maxims on harm and the blocking of means, with human dignity as its guiding principle and with graded rulings that prefer discretionary punishment, restitution and removal to extending fixed penalties by analogy.

These findings should be read in light of the study's limits. The study is doctrinal and conceptual. It has not tested the framework with fatwa scholars, judges, victims, or forensic experts, and it relies on a small number of documented cases. The reading of the classical works followed a defined set of chapters and editions, and specialists in each school can correct the interpretation of those passages. The alignment with the SDGs is normative, not demonstrated. Further research should test the framework in deliberation with fatwa bodies and religious courts, for example through *bahtsul masail* or council deliberations, should develop draft fatwa texts and judicial guidelines based on the graded rulings, and should work with forensic specialists to define authentication standards that courts can apply.

E. DECLARATIONS

1. Author Contribution

Elma Qotrunnada Hanin: Conceptualization, methodology, investigation, data collection, formal analysis, interpretation of findings, writing the original draft, visualization, and reviewing and editing the manuscript. **Muhammad Mu'tamid Ihsanillah:** Methodology, investigation, data collection, formal analysis, interpretation of findings, validation, and manuscript review and editing. All authors contributed to the study's intellectual development, reviewed the manuscript, and approved the final version for publication. All authors agree to be accountable for their respective contributions and for the integrity of the published work.

2. Funding Statement

This research received no external funding from government agencies, commercial organizations, private institutions, or other funding bodies. The authors conducted the study using their own institutional and research resources.

3. Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no financial, professional, personal, or institutional conflicts of interest that could have influenced the study's design, conduct, analysis, interpretation, or reporting.

4. Declaration of AI Use

The authors used ChatGPT in a limited supporting role during manuscript preparation, primarily for language refinement, improved academic expression, editorial assistance, and

initial identification of potentially relevant literature. The authors independently verified all references, arguments, interpretations, and factual information included in the manuscript. Artificial intelligence was not used to generate research data, replace field observations or interviews, autonomously interpret participants' accounts, or make research decisions. The authors take full responsibility for the manuscript's accuracy, originality, academic integrity, analysis, interpretation, and final content.

5. Additional Information

Not applicable.

REFERENCES

- Abu Dawud, Sulayman ibn al-Ash'ath. *Sunan Abi Dawud*. Kitab al-Adab. [Google](#)
- Ahmed, Omar Saad, Hussein Ajlan Hasan, Sameer Dawood Salman Bazool, Aigul Mirzaeva, and Oudha Yousif Salman Al-Musawi. "Fitnah in the Digital Age: Regulating Social Media Misuse through Islamic Criminal Principles." *Al-Istinbath: Jurnal Hukum Islam* 10, no. 2 (2025): 535–62. <https://doi.org/10.29240/jhi.v10i2.13369>.
- Al-Ansari, Tareq, Mohammed Kharseh, and Mohammed Khalfan. "Integrating Maqasid al-Shariah into Sustainable Development Goals: A Comprehensive Review." *Sustainability* 14, no. 3 (2022): 1235. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14031235>.
- Al-Bukhari, Muhammad ibn Isma'il. *Sahih al-Bukhari*. Kitab al-'Ilm. [Google](#)
- Al-Farmawi, 'Abd al-Hayy. *al-Bidayah fi al-Tafsir al-Mawdhu'i*. Cairo: al-Hadarah al-'Arabiyyah, 1977. [Google](#)
- Al-Ghazali, Abu Hamid. *Ihya' 'Ulum al-Din*. Beirut: Dar al-Ma'rifah, n.d. [Google](#)
- Al-Ghazali, Abu Hamid. *al-Mustasfa min 'Ilm al-Usul*. Edited by Muhammad 'Abd al-Salam 'Abd al-Shafi. Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1993. [Google](#)
- Al-Kasani, 'Ala' al-Din. *Bada'i' al-Sana'i' fi Tartib al-Shara'i'*. 2nd ed. Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1986. [Google](#)
- Al-Mawardi, 'Ali ibn Muhammad. *al-Ahkam al-Sultaniyyah*. Cairo: Dar al-Hadith, n.d. [Google](#)
- Al-Mawardi, 'Ali ibn Muhammad. *al-Hawi al-Kabir*. Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1999. [Google](#)
- Al-Qarafi, Shihab al-Din. *al-Furuq*. Beirut: 'Alam al-Kutub, n.d. [Google](#)
- Al-Qarafi, Shihab al-Din. *Sharh Tanqih al-Fusul*. [Google](#)
- Al-Qurtubi, Muhammad ibn Ahmad. *al-Jami' li Ahkam al-Qur'an*. Edited by 'Abd Allah al-Turki. Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risalah, 2006. [Google](#)
- Al-Shatibi, Abu Ishaq. *al-Muwafaqat fi Usul al-Shari'ah*. Edited by Mashhur Hasan Al Salman. Dar Ibn 'Affan, 1997. [Google](#)
- Al-Subki, Taj al-Din. *Jam' al-Jawami'*. [Google](#)
- Al-Suyuti, Jalal al-Din. *al-Ashbah wa al-Naza'ir fi Qawa'id wa Furu' Fiqh al-Shafi'iyyah*. Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1990. [Google](#)
- Al-Tabari, Abu Ja'far Muhammad ibn Jarir. *Jami' al-Bayan 'an Ta'wil Ay al-Qur'an*. Edited by 'Abd Allah ibn 'Abd al-Muhsin al-Turki. Cairo: Hajr, 2001. [Google](#)
- Al-Tirmidhi, Muhammad ibn 'Isa. *Sunan al-Tirmidhi*. Kitab al-Birr wa al-Silah. [Google](#)
- Altuncu, Emrah, Virginia N. L. Franqueira, and Shujun Li. "Deepfake: Definitions, Performance Metrics and Standards, Datasets, and a Meta-Review." *Frontiers in Big Data* 7 (2024): 1400024. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fdata.2024.1400024>.
- Al-Zuhayli, Wahbah. *al-Fiqh al-Islami wa Adillatuhu*. Damascus: Dar al-Fikr, 1985. [Google](#)
- Auda, Jasser. *Maqasid al-Shariah as Philosophy of Islamic Law: A Systems Approach*. London: International Institute of Islamic Thought, 2008. [Google](#)
- Bidtik. Polda Kepulauan Riau, Bidang Teknologi Informasi. "Deep Fake Scammers with Profit of IDR 65 Million Arrested by the Police." [Google](#)

- Chesney, Robert, and Danielle Keats Citron. "Deep Fakes: A Looming Challenge for Privacy, Democracy, and National Security." *California Law Review* 107 (2019): 1753–1820. <https://doi.org/10.15779/Z38RV0D15J>.
- China daily. "Hong Kong Police: AI Deepfake Scam Cost Firm HK\$200m." *China Daily Hong Kong*, August 16, 2024. [Google](#)
- CNN. "Musk's Grok Blocked by Indonesia, Malaysia over Sexualized Images in World First." *CNN Business*, republished by KEYT, January 11, 2026. [Google](#)
- Detik Net. "Fatwa Lengkap MUI soal Medsos." *detikNet*, June 5, 2017. [Google](#)
- Goodwinlaw. "Not Delayed, Not Deferred: EU AI Act Transparency Obligations Are Now in Force." *Goodwin*, August 2026. [Google](#)
- Hafiduddin, Muhammad, Afif Hasbullah, Ahmad Munir, Ahmad Zeeya Ulya Eldavi, and Desi Lusawati. "Hukum Siber di Era Digital: Rekonstruksi Penanggulangan Kejahatan Deepfake dalam Perspektif Hukum Pidana Indonesia dan Maqāṣid al-Syarī'ah." *SEIKAT: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial, Politik dan Hukum* 5, no. 4 (2026): 1325–36. <https://doi.org/10.55681/seikat.v5i4.3370>.
- Hamim, Khairul, and Lalu Supriadi. "The Contextualization of Ḥifẓ al-ʿIrḍ on Hoax News (A Study on Imam Tājuddīn al-Subkī's Maqāṣid al-Sharī'a)." *Ulumuna* 24, no. 2 (2020): 348–66. <https://doi.org/10.20414/ujis.v24i2.405>.
- Hukumonline. "Perubahan Penting soal Pencemaran Nama Baik di UU ITE Baru." *Hukumonline*, 2024. [Google](#)
- Ibn Ashur, Muhammad al-Tahir. *al-Tahrir wa al-Tanwir*. Tunis: al-Dar al-Tunisiyyah, 1984. [Google](#)
- Ibn Ashur, Muhammad al-Tahir. *Maqasid al-Shari'ah al-Islamiyyah*. Edited by Muhammad al-Habib Ibn al-Khoja. Doha: Ministry of Endowments and Islamic Affairs, 2004. [Google](#)
- Ibn Kathir, Isma'il ibn 'Umar. *Tafsir al-Qur'an al-'Azim*. Edited by Sami ibn Muhammad Salamah. Riyadh: Dar Taybah, 1999. [Google](#)
- Ibn Majah, Muhammad ibn Yazid. *Sunan Ibn Majah*. Edited by Muhammad Fu'ad 'Abd al-Baqi. Beirut: Dar Ihya' al-Kutub al-'Arabiyyah, n.d. [Google](#)
- Ibn Nujaym, Zayn al-'Abidin. *al-Ashbah wa al-Naza'ir 'ala Madhhab Abi Hanifah al-Nu'man*. Beirut: Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1999. [Google](#)
- Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyyah. *al-Turuq al-Hukmiyyah fi al-Siyasah al-Shar'iyyah*. Edited by Nayif ibn Ahmad al-Hamad. Mecca: Dar 'Alam al-Fawa'id, 2007. [Google](#)
- Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyyah. *I'lam al-Muwaqqi'in 'an Rabb al-'Alamin*. Edited by Mashhur Hasan Al Salman. Dammam: Dar Ibn al-Jawzi, 2002. [Google](#)
- Ibn Qudamah, Muwaffaq al-Din. *al-Mughni*. Edited by 'Abd Allah al-Turki and 'Abd al-Fattah al-Hulw. 3rd ed. Riyadh: Dar 'Alam al-Kutub, 1997. [Google](#)
- Ibn Rajab al-Hanbali. *Jami' al-'Ulum wa al-Hikam*. Edited by Shu'ayb al-Arna'ut. Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risalah, 2001. [Google](#)
- Ibn Rushd al-Hafid. *Bidayat al-Mujtahid wa Nihayat al-Muqtasid*. Cairo: Dar al-Hadith, 2004. [Google](#)
- Indonesia. Undang-Undang Nomor 1 Tahun 2023 tentang Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana. [Google](#)
- Indonesia. Undang-Undang Nomor 1 Tahun 2024 tentang Perubahan Kedua atas Undang-Undang Nomor 11 Tahun 2008 tentang Informasi dan Transaksi Elektronik. [Google](#)
- Indonesia. Undang-Undang Nomor 12 Tahun 2022 tentang Tindak Pidana Kekerasan Seksual. [Google](#)
- Indonesia. Undang-Undang Nomor 27 Tahun 2022 tentang Pelindungan Data Pribadi. [Google](#)
- International Islamic Fiqh Academy (Majma' al-Fiqh al-Islami al-Duwali). Resolution No. 43 (5/5), 1988. [Google](#)

- Juhri, Meylani, and Iwan. "Deepfake Sebagai Bentuk Fitnah Qadzaf Modern dalam Perspektif Hukum Pidana Islam." *Maqasid: Jurnal Studi Hukum Islam* 15, no. 2 (2026): 470–84. <https://doi.org/10.30651/mqsd.v15i2.33421>.
- Kata Data. "Penipuan Bansos Pakai AI Wajah Prabowo, Ratusan Korban Rugi Puluhan Juta." *Katadata*, February 7, 2025. [Google](#)
- Kietzmann, Jan, Linda W. Lee, Ian P. McCarthy, and Tim C. Kietzmann. "Deepfakes: Trick or Treat?" *Business Horizons* 63, no. 2 (2020): 135–46. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2019.11.006>.
- Kontan. "Kemenkeu: Video Menteri Purbaya Cari 700 Penerima Bantuan adalah Hoaks Deepfake." *Kontan*, June 10, 2026. [Google](#)
- Majallat al-Ahkam al-'Adliyyah. [Google](#)
- Majelis Ulama Indonesia. Fatwa Nomor 24 Tahun 2017 tentang Hukum dan Pedoman Bermuamalah melalui Media Sosial. Jakarta, 2017. [Google](#)
- Malik ibn Anas. *al-Muwatta'*. Edited by Muhammad Fu'ad 'Abd al-Baqi. Beirut: Dar Ihya' al-Turath al-'Arabi, 1985. [Google](#)
- Maulana, Faisal, and Sudirman Abbas. "Deepfake Pornography as Qadzaf: Legal Status and Hudud Implications." *Al-Risalah: Jurnal Ilmu Syariah dan Hukum* 25, no. 2 (2025). <https://doi.org/10.24252/al-risalah.vi.62018>.
- Mirsky, Yisroel, and Wenke Lee. "The Creation and Detection of Deepfakes: A Survey." *ACM Computing Surveys* 54, no. 1 (2021): article 7. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3425780>.
- Muslim ibn al-Hajjaj. *Sahih Muslim*. Edited by Muhammad Fu'ad 'Abd al-Baqi. Beirut: Dar Ihya' al-Turath al-'Arabi, n.d. [Google](#)
- Newsjax. "South Korea Fights Deepfake Porn with Tougher Punishment and Regulation." *News4JAX*, November 6, 2024. [Google](#)
- Palindria, Arvi Erawan, Muhammad Sulthan Thufail, and Muhammad Rieval Febrian. "Ancaman Deepfake Buatan AI dan Implikasinya terhadap Keamanan Data Biometrik di Indonesia." *Spektrum Hukum* 21, no. 2 (2024): 110–21. <https://doi.org/10.56444/sh.v21i2.5319>.
- Ramadhani, Evyta Rosiyanti, Ayudya Rizqi Rachmawati, and Roro Hera Kurnikova. "Integrating Islamic Values with the Right to Be Forgotten: A Legal Approach to Addressing Deepfake Pornography in Indonesia." *De Jure: Jurnal Hukum dan Syar'iah* 17, no. 1 (2025): 112–31. <https://doi.org/10.18860/j-fsh.v17i1.28880>.
- Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act). *Official Journal of the European Union*, L, 2024/1689. [Google](#)
- Romero Moreno, Felipe. "Generative AI and Deepfakes: A Human Rights Approach to Tackling Harmful Content." *International Review of Law, Computers & Technology* (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1080/13600869.2024.2324540>.
- Security Hero. 2023 State of Deepfakes. [Google](#)
- Sloot, Bart van der, and Yvette Wagenveld. "Deepfakes: Regulatory Challenges for the Synthetic Society." *Computer Law & Security Review* 46 (2022): 105716. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2022.105716>.
- UNESCO. *Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence*. Paris: UNESCO, 2021. [Google](#)
- Vaccari, Cristian, and Andrew Chadwick. "Deepfakes and Disinformation: Exploring the Impact of Synthetic Political Video on Deception, Uncertainty, and Trust in News." *Social Media + Society* 6, no. 1 (2020): 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305120903408>.
- Westerlund, Mika. "The Emergence of Deepfake Technology: A Review." *Technology Innovation Management Review* 9, no. 11 (2019): 39–52. <https://doi.org/10.22215/timreview/1282>.

Zalsabila, Putri Aulia, and Abdul Wahid Haddade. "Pencemaran Nama Baik dalam Tinjauan Mazhab Fikih." *Shautuna: Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Perbandingan Mazhab* 4, no. 1 (2023): 42–58. <https://doi.org/10.24252/shautuna.vi.30062>.