

**COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION**  
**(FIFTEENTH LOK SABHA)**  
**(2012-2013)**

**THIRTIETH REPORT**

**(PRESENTED ON 12.3.2013)**

**S**

**E**

**A**

**L**

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT**

**NEW DELHI**

**March, 2013/Phalgun,1934 (Saka)**

**COSL No. 39**

**PRICE: Rs.**

**(C) 2013 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT**

Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Fourteenth Edition) and printed by the Manager, Government of India Press, Minto Road, New Delhi.

## CONTENTS

	<u>Para No.</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE		(iii)
INTRODUCTION		(v)
REPORT		
I. Infirmity in the Kolkata Port Trust Employees' (Pension) Second Amendment Regulations, 2009 (GSR 198-E of 2009).		
II. Insufficient time given to the Public for Eliciting Comments on the Draft of the Central Motor Vehicles (Amendment) Rules, 2010 (GSR 386-E of 2010).		
III. The Kerala Administrative (Procedure) Rules, 2010 (GSR 758-E of 2010).		

## APPENDICES

- I. Summary of main recommendations/observations made by the Committee
- II. Extracts from the Minutes of the Fifth Sitting of the Committee (2011-12) held on 8.5.2012, Extracts from the Minutes of the Second Sitting of the Committee (2012-13) held on 9.11.2012 and Minutes of the Fourth sitting of the Committee (2012-13) held on 28.1.2013.

**COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION**  
**(2012-2013)**

1. Shri P. Karunakaran Chairman
2. Shri Praveen Singh Aron
3. Shri Ramen Deka
4. Shri K. Jayaprakash Hegde
5. Dr. Mahesh Joshi
6. Shri Virender Kashyap
7. Dr. Ajay Kumar
8. Shri Narahari Mahto
9. Dr. Thokchom Meinya
10. Shri Gajendra Singh Rajukhedi
11. Dr. Bhola Singh
12. Shri R. Thamaraiselvan
13. Shri Manohar Tirkey
14. Shri Dharmendra Yadav
15. Vacant

**SECRETARIAT**

1. Shri A. Louis Martin - Joint Secretary
2. Shri S.C. Chaudhary - Director
3. Shri Sirinivasulu Gunda - Addl. Director
4. Shri Krishendra Kumar - Under Secretary

## INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman, Committee on Subordinate Legislation having been authorized by the Committee to submit the report on their behalf, present this Thirtieth Report.

2. The matters covered by this Report were considered by the Committee on Subordinate Legislation at their sittings held on 8.5.2012 and 9.11.2012.
3. The Committee considered and adopted this Report at their sitting held on 28.1.2013.
4. For facility of reference and convenience, recommendations/observations of the Committee have been printed in thick type in the body of the Report and have also been reproduced in Appendix-I of the Report.
5. Extracts from the Minutes of the Fifth Sitting of the Committee (2011-12) held on 8.5.2012, Extracts from the Minutes of the Second Sitting of the Committee (2012-13) held on 9.11.2012 and Minutes of the Fourth sitting of the Committee (2012-13) held on 28.1.2013 relevant to this Report are included in Appendix-II.

New Delhi;  
28 January, 2013  
08 Magha, 1934 (Saka)

**P. KARUNAKARAN**  
*Chairman,*  
**Committee on Subordinate Legislation**

## REPORT

### I

#### **Infirmity in the Kolkata Port Trust Employees' (Pension) Second Amendment Regulations, 2009 [GSR 198-E of 2009]**

The Kolkata Port Trust Employees' (Pension) Second Amendment Regulations, 2009 (GSR 198-E of 2009) were published in the Gazette of India, Extraordinary, Part-II, Section 3 (i) on 25 March, 2009.

1.2 On scrutiny of the aforementioned regulations, the Ministry of Shipping (Ports Wing) were requested to furnish their comments on the following observations :-

- (1) The construction of sub-regulation 37 (1A) (g) viz., "... Family Pension shall be sanctioned and paid one year after date of lodging the FIR, will accrue..." appears to be incomplete; and
- (2) Sub-regulation 37(1A)(d), *inter-alia* provides for fixing of responsibility for avoidance of delay in disbursement of death/retirement Gratuity would be meaningful if clubbed with sub-regulation (g).

1.3 The Ministry of Shipping (Ports Wing) with reference to the aforesaid observations stated that the necessary amendments have been carried out and Kolkata Port Trust Employees' (Pension) Third Amendment Regulations, 2010 have been notified vide GSR No. 1026 (E) dated 29<sup>th</sup> December, 2010.

1.4 In the aforesaid amendment the Ministry of Shipping (Ports wing) deleted Regulation 37(1A)(g) and inserted the provision therein in Regulation 37(1A)(d) which reads as follows:

"The family shall apply to the concerned Head of Department/Division at Haldia Dock Complex for grant of Family Pension and Gratuity, after one year from the date of disappearance of the employee, in accordance with the prescribed procedure for sanction of Family Pension and Death/Retirement Gratuity. Family Pension will accrue from the

date of lodging FIR or expiry of leave of the employee who has disappeared, whichever is later. The sanction of Family Pension and Death/Retirement Gratuity and payment thereof may be done after one year of the date of lodging FIR. In case the disbursement of the Death/Retirement Gratuity and Family Pension are not effected within three months from the date of application, the interest shall be paid at the rate applicable and responsibility fixed.”

1.5 The Committee note that on scrutiny of the Kolkata Port Trust Employees' (Pension) Second Amendment Regulations, 2009 (GSR 198-E of 2009), it was observed that there was no provision in the amended regulations for fixing of responsibility in the event of delay in disbursement of Death/Retirement Gratuity. On the shortcoming being pointed out, the Ministry of Shipping, Road Transport and Highways (Department of Shipping) has made specific provision in Regulation 37(1A)(d) for fixing of responsibility in case the disbursements of the Death/Retirement Gratuity and Family Pension are not effected within three months from the date of application. The provision also enables payment of interest, if the time limit of three months is not adhered to. The Committee note with satisfaction that this specific provision would obviate scope for delay and undue harassment to pensioners and beneficiaries of Death/Retirement Gratuity. While appreciating the prompt action taken by the Ministry of Shipping, Road Transport and Highways (Department of Shipping), the Committee desire that the Ministry should keep in mind that while framing rules and regulations in future, sufficient safeguards should be built into the rules to protect the interests of stakeholders.

(Recommendation No. 1)

**Insufficient time given to the Public for Eliciting Comments on the Draft of the Central Motor Vehicles (Amendment) Rules, 2010 (GSR 386-E of 2010).**

The Central Motor Vehicles (Amendment) Rules, 2010 (GSR 386-E of 2010) were published in the Gazette of India, Extraordinary, Part-II, Section 3(i) on 7 May, 2010. On the scrutiny of the rules, it had been noticed that the draft rules were published on 4 May, 2010 inviting objections or suggestions thereon. However, no time limit was prescribed to the public for sending their objections/suggestions. The rules in final form were notified within three days after publication of the draft rules without giving sufficient time for the public to send their objections/suggestions.

The Ministry of Road Transport and Highways were, therefore, requested to furnish their comments in this regard.

2.2. The Ministry of Road Transport and Highways vide their OM dated 8 March, 2011 have stated as under:-

“(1) At the outset, it may be mentioned that under Section 212 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, the Central Government has the powers to make rules subject to the condition of the rules being made after previous publication. Though the Motor Vehicles Act does not mention the time limit required to be given to the public for offering their comments/views, as per the General Clauses Act, a time limit of 30 days is generally required. The facts and the background of the case, necessitating the finalization of the rules at a very short interval is given in the succeeding paras.

(2) As per Section 88 of the Motor Vehicles, Act 1988 (extract enclosed), National Permit means a permit granted to goods carriages to operate throughout the country or in such contiguous States, not less than four in number, including the home State. As per rule 87 of the Central Motor Vehicles Rules, 1989 (extracts enclosed), prior to the said amendment, National Permit with regard to goods transport vehicle was being given by the Home State (where the vehicle has been registered) against an authorization fee of Rs. 500/- per annum and on payment of composite fee (through bank draft), levied by the concerned States in which the vehicle is proposed to be operated. The bank drafts for the composite fee, deposited in the Home State were forwarded subsequently to the respective states.

(3) The intention of National Permit is to facilitate long distance inter-state movement of goods. However, for quite a long time it had been felt that the present system was not at all working well and rather hampering inter-state movement of goods vehicles instead of providing seamless movement through out the country. There was often delay in sending bank drafts to the concerned States in time, thus making the instrument invalid. Drafts were lost in transit as well. Accounts were not reconciled in time, resulting in detention of the vehicle at border check post for a long time which again leads to wastage of time and efficiency of road transport sector. Moreover, there were cases of frauds also causing loss of revenue to the States.

(4) In pursuance of the agreement signed with All India Motor Transport Congress (AIMTC), an apex organisation of truck operators in the country on 12.01.2009 during their nation-wide strike, a Committee under the Chairman ship of Secretary (Road Transport & Highways) was set up to look into the issue of streamlining National Permit system and rationalisation of motor vehicle taxation. The Committee after detailed deliberations, recommended that an amount of Rs. 15,000/- per annum per truck may be fixed as Composite Fee for National Permit authorising the permit holders to operate throughout the country. The Composite Fee so collected could be distributed among the States/UTs on the basis of transparent, workable and acceptable formula.

(5) The recommendations of the Committee were placed before the Transport Development Council (an apex body under the chairmanship of Minister, Road Transport & Highways with State Transport Ministers as its members to advise the Government on matters relating to road transport), in its 32<sup>nd</sup> meeting held on 5.2.2010 for consideration. The TDC endorsed the recommendations in-principle and as per the decision taken, an Empowered Committee of Transport Ministers was set up under the Chairmanship of Hon'ble Transport Minister, Government of Rajasthan to work out a viable formula for distribution of composite fee among the States/UTs on introduction of new Composite Fee regime and also to suggest a methodology for collection of such Composite Fee.

(6) The Empowered Committee of State Transport Ministers recommended requisite amendments in the Central Motor Vehicle Rules, 1989 to provide the authority for levy of the composite fee at the rate of Rs. 15000/- per annum per vehicle for national permit and also to increase the authorization fee for national permit to Rs. 1000/- instead of the existing rate of Rs. 500/. It further recommended that the Government of India, Ministry of Road Transport and Highways may create / maintain a common national permit account with State Bank of India for the purpose of collection of composite fee for national permit. The State Governments shall have to authorize the Central Government to work in this direction. The Ministry of Road Transport and Highways may lay down the detailed mechanism for maintaining such an account including reconciliation/audit of such an account etc. The Committee also devised a formula for distribution of the composite fee among the States/UTs.

(7) A special meeting of Transport Development Council under the chairmanship of Minister, Road Transport & Highways was convened again on 16 April, 2010 for consideration of this issue by the Council. The Council passed a unanimous resolution, accepting the recommendations of the Empowered Committee.

(8) Based on the above, a draft notification to amend the rules was issued on 4 May, 2010 with the concurrence of Ministry of Law & Justice. In this case, no time limit was given, keeping in view the urgency to finalize the amendments proposed at the earliest, in the wake of constant pressure from the transporters. The draft notification was, however, hosted on the website of this Ministry, inviting comments from general public.

(9) As far as the new national permit system is concerned, the two major stakeholders are States/UTs and Truck operators/transporters. State Transport Ministers, in a special meeting of TDC held on 16 April, 2010, already endorsed the new scheme and authorized the Central Government to take necessary action in this regard. This Ministry had received representations from AIMTC and a large number of transport operators / organizations / associations across the country, requesting for issuance of the national permit from 1 May, 2010. As per the information being received in this Ministry, lakhs of truck were stranded in different parts of the country without any work as a large number of truck operators were anxiously waiting for the implementation of the new system. In fact, the work relating to issuing of new National Permit / renewal of permit had come to standstill.

(10) This genuine demand of the transporters was pending for quite a long time and any delay in finalization of the draft could have agitated the transporters further and led to another strike. Amendment in the Central Motor Vehicles Rules, 1989 was necessary to give legal support to the States who had to amend their own taxation laws. As such, a conscious decision was taken at the level of Hon'ble Minister, Road Transport & Highways, not to wait further and process the file for issuing the final Notification. These circumstances were also brought to the notice of Ministry of Law & Justice and with their concurrence, the final notification was issued on 7 May, 2010 vide GSR 386-E.

(11) It may therefore, be appreciated that the rules were made in larger public interest. The new national Permit system has smoothed the movement of goods across the country and no opposition to this rule has been received by the Government from any quarter."

2.3. The draft Rules relating to the Central Motor Vehicles (Amendment) Rules, 2010 had been published on 4 May, 2010 without giving public any time period for inviting objections/suggestions from the public. Further, the haste with which rules were published in final form on 7 May, 2010 after a gap of only 2 days makes it practically impossible to elicit any serious public opinion on the subject, thereby, defeating the very purpose of publication of draft rules. As per Section 212 (1) of the Motor

Vehicles Act, 1988 under which these rules were framed, it has been expressly provided that the power to make rules under this Act is subject to the condition of the rules being made after previous publication. Thus, the publication of draft rules, in the extant case appears to be a mere formality. The Committee on Subordinate Legislation have time and again emphasized that whenever the Acts give a right to the public to send their comments on certain draft rules then it is imperative that sufficient time is given to them to study the draft rules and send their comments before they are finalized. The Committee had accordingly recommended that a period of not less than 30 clear days, exclusive of the time taken in publishing of the draft rules in the Gazette and the despatching the Gazette copies to various parts of the country, should be given to the public to send their comments on such draft rules. In certain draft rules, the Executive have been giving 45-60 days for eliciting public opinion on draft rules.

**2.4. The Committee note that the Central Motor Vehicles (Amendment) Rules, 2010 (GSR 386-E of 2010) were published in the final form on 7 May, 2010 within three days after publishing the draft rules, without waiting for objections/suggestions from the public under the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988. The Committee have time and again emphasised that a period of not less than 30 clear days should be given to the public to send their comments on draft rules. This stipulation has also been incorporated in the Manual of Parliamentary Procedures in the Government of India. The aforesaid draft rules published on 4 May, 2010 had not stipulated any time limit for seeking objections and suggestions from the public. The view of the Ministry of Road Transport and Highways that the urgent notification of the rules was in the larger public interest, and as such sufficient period was not given for inviting public objections/suggestions due to urgency of matter is not convincing. The matter had been under consideration of the Ministry for nearly one and half years. Nothing would have been lost had the Ministry of Road Transport and Highways planned the proposal well in advance and adhered to the procedure of giving sufficient time for the public to respond to the draft rules. The Committee desire that the instant case should be treated as an exception and the Ministry should not resort to similar practice in future.**

(Recommendation No. 2)

### III

#### **The Kerala Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 2010 (GSR 758-E of 2010).**

On scrutiny of the Rules it was observed that the provisions in Rule 5(3) gives the power to the Registrar to give such time to an applicant to rectify the defects in application which are not formal in nature. The provision in Rule 5(4) further gives power to the Registrar to decline to register the application if the defect is not rectified within the time allowed. It is therefore felt that a reasonable time period may be allowed to rectify the defect. The rules may be made specific so as to obviate scope for abuse of power. The Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions (Department of Personnel and Training) were requested to furnish their comments in this regard.

3.2 The Ministry vide their OM dated 23 June, 2011 have furnished the following reply:

"The power of Registrar to give such time to any applicant to rectify the defects in application which are not formal in nature as per the provisions of Rule 5(3) of the Kerala Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, are the same as those of Procedure Rules of the Central Administrative Tribunal and other State Administrative Tribunals. This provision is in practice in Central Administrative Tribunal and other State Administrative Tribunals since their inception. No complaint has been received in this Department regarding the power of Registrar to fix the time to rectify the applications which are not formal in nature from any petitioner so far. The observation of the Committee to amend the Procedure Rules of the Central Administrative Tribunal and applicant to rectify the defects in application which are not formal in nature has been noted. In case the same is recommended by the Committee then it will be examined in consultation with the Chairman of Central Administrative Tribunal and State Administrative Tribunals and Ministry of Law & Justice."

3.3 In the Kerala Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 2010, the provisions in Rule 5(3) gives the power to the Registrar to give such time to an applicant to rectify the defects in application which are not formal in nature. The provision in Rule 5(4) further gives power to the Registrar to decline to register the application if the defect is not rectified within the time allowed. But no specific time limit has been prescribed thus leaving it to the discretion of the Registrar to decline an application. Thus, there lies the danger of misusing the discretionary powers. The Ministry have stated that the provision is in practice in Central Administrative Tribunal and other State Administrative Tribunals. Further, the Ministry have also stated that no complaints have

been received from any petitioner so far regarding the power of the Registrar to fix the time to rectify the applications which are informal in nature.

**3.4 Rule 5 (3) of the Kerala Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 2010 vests the Registrar with the power to give such time as he deems fit to an applicant to rectify the defects in the application which are not formal in nature.** The Committee note that despite the contention of the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions (Department of Personnel and Training) that no complaint has been received so far from any petitioner regarding the power of the Registrar to fix the time to rectify the applications, the Rule leaves scope for discretionary use of power by the Registrar. The plea that no complaints have been received in this regard is no reason to continue with the shortcoming in the rule. The Committee, therefore, desire that the rules should provide for a time limit to an applicant for rectifying defect, if any, in the application instead of allowing the Registrar to exercise his discretion in this regard. The Committee also desire that the proposed amendment be made not only in the rules of Kerala Administrative Tribunal but also in the rules of Central Administrative Tribunals and other State Tribunals. The Committee would await action taken in this regard.

(Recommendation No. 3)

New Delhi;  
28 January, 2013  
08 Magha, 1934 (Saka)

**P. KARUNAKARAN**  
Chairman,  
*Committee on Subordinate Legislation*

APPENDIX –I  
(Vide Para 4 of the Introduction of the Report)

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS MADE IN THE THIRTIETH REPORT OF THE  
 COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION**

**(FIFTEENTH LOK SABHA)**

<b>Sl. No.</b>	<b>Reference to          Para No. in the          Report</b>	<b>Summary of Recommendations</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
1.	1.5	<p><b><u>Infirmitiy in the Kolkata Port Trust Employees' (Pension) Second Amendment Regulations, 2009 [GSR 198-E of 2009]</u></b></p> <p>The Committee note that on scrutiny of the Kolkata Port Trust Employees' (Pension) Second Amendment Regulations, 2009 (GSR 198-E of 2009), it was observed that there was no provision in the amended regulations for fixing of responsibility in the event of delay in disbursement of Death/Retirement Gratuity. On the shortcoming being pointed out, the Ministry of Shipping, Road Transport and Highways (Department of Shipping) has made specific provision in Regulation 37(1A)(d) for fixing of responsibility in case the disbursements of the Death/Retirement Gratuity and Family Pension are not effected within three months from the date of application. The provision also enables payment of interest, if the time limit of three months is not adhered to. The Committee note with satisfaction that this specific provision would obviate scope for delay and undue harassment to pensioners and beneficiaries of Death/Retirement Gratuity. While appreciating the prompt action taken by the Ministry of Shipping, Road Transport and Highways (Department of Shipping), the Committee desire that the Ministry should keep in mind that while framing rules and regulations in future, sufficient safeguards should be built into the rules to protect the interests of stakeholders.</p>
2.	2.4	<p><b><u>Insufficient time given to the Public for Eliciting Comments on the Draft of the Central Motor Vehicles (Amendment) Rules, 2010 (GSR 386-E of 2010).</u></b></p> <p>The Committee note that the Central Motor Vehicles (Amendment) Rules, 2010 (GSR 386-E of 2010) were published in the final form on 7 May, 2010 within three days after publishing the draft rules,</p>

		<p>without waiting for objections/suggestions from the public under the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988. The Committee have time and again emphasised that a period of not less than 30 clear days should be given to the public to send their comments on draft rules. This stipulation has also been incorporated in the Manual of Parliamentary Procedures in the Government of India. The aforesaid draft rules published on 4 May, 2010 had not stipulated any time limit for seeking objections and suggestions from the public. The view of the Ministry of Road Transport and Highways that the urgent notification of the rules was in the larger public interest, and as such sufficient period was not given for inviting public objections/suggestions due to urgency of matter is not convincing. The matter had been under consideration of the Ministry for nearly one and half years. Nothing would have been lost had the Ministry of Road Transport and Highways planned the proposal well in advance and adhered to the procedure of giving sufficient time for the public to respond to the draft rules. The Committee desire that the instant case should be treated as an exception and the Ministry should not resort to similar practice in future.</p>
3.	3.4	<p><u><a href="#">The Kerala Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 2010 (GSR 758-E of 2010).</a></u></p> <p>Rule 5 (3) of the Kerala Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 2010 vests the Registrar with the power to give such time as he deems fit to an applicant to rectify the defects in the application which are not formal in nature. The Committee note that despite the contention of the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions (Department of Personnel and Training) that no complaint has been received so far from any petitioner regarding the power of the Registrar to fix the time to rectify the applications, the Rule leaves scope for discretionary use of power by the Registrar. The plea that no complaints have been received in this regard is no reason to continue with the shortcoming in the rule. The Committee, therefore, desire that the rules should provide for a time limit to an applicant for rectifying defect, if any, in the application instead of allowing the Registrar to exercise his discretion in this regard. The Committee also desire that the proposed amendment be made not only in the rules of Kerala Administrative Tribunal but also in the rules of Central Administrative Tribunals and other State Tribunals. The Committee would await action taken in this regard.</p>

**APPENDIX -II**  
**(Vide Para 5 of the Introduction of the Report)**

**EXTRACTS FROM THE MINUTES OF THE FIFTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON  
SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION (2011-2012)**

---

The Fifth sitting of the Committee held on Tuesday, 8 May, 2012 from 1500 to 1540 hours in Chairman's Room No. 143, Parliament House, New Delhi.

**PRESENT**

1. Shri P. Karunakaran Chairman

**MEMBERS**

2. Shri Kalyan Banerjee
3. Shri E.T. Mohammed Basheer
4. Shri Ramen Deka
5. Shri Mahesh Joshi
6. Shri Virender Kashyap
7. Dr. Thokchom Meinya
8. Shri Gajendra Singh Rajukhedi
9. Dr. Bhola Singh
10. Shri Vijay Bahadur Singh
11. Shri A.K.S. Vijayan

**SECRETARIAT**

1. Shri A. Louis Martin - Joint Secretary
2. Shri S.C. Chaudhary - Director
3. Shri Srinivasulu Gunda - Additional Director
4. Shri Krishendra Kumar - Under Secretary

2. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the members to the sitting of the Committee (2011-12).

3. xx xx xx

4. The Committee also considered the following memoranda:

(i) **Memorandum No. 36** – regarding infirmity in the Kolkata Port Trust Employees' (Pension) Second Amendment Regulations, 2009 (GSR 198-E of 2009).

(ii) xx xx xx

(iii) **Memorandum No. 38** – regarding the Kerala Administrative Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 2010 (GSR 758-E of 2010).

5. After deliberations, the Committee decided to incorporate the points raised in the Memoranda Nos. 36 to 38 in their Report slated to be prepared in this regard.

6. xx xx xx

The Committee then adjourned.

---

xx Omitted portion of the Minutes are not relevant to this Report.

## **EXTRACTS FROM THE MINUTES OF THE SECOND SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION (2012-2013)**

---

The Second sitting of the Committee was held on Friday, the 9<sup>th</sup> November, 2012 from 1400 to 1430 hours in Chairman's Room No. 143, Parliament House, New Delhi.

### **PRESENT**

1. Shri P. Karunakaran Chairman

### **MEMBERS**

2. Dr. Mahesh Joshi

3. Shri Virender Kashyap

4. Dr. Ajay Kumar

5. Shri Narahari Mahto

6. Dr. Thokchom Meinya

7. Shri R. Thamaraiselvan

### **SECRETARIAT**

1. Shri A Louis Martin - Joint Secretary

2. Shri S.C. Chaudhary - Director

3. Shri Srinivasulu Gunda - Additional Director

4. Shri Krishendra Kumar - Under Secretary

2. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the members to the sitting of the Committee (2012-13).

3. The Committee, then, considered the following memoranda:

- (i) **Memorandum No. 46** – regarding Insufficient time given to the Public for Eliciting Comments on the Draft of the Central Motor Vehicles (Amendment) Rules, 2010 (GSR 386-E).
- (ii) xx xx xx
- (iii) xx xx xx

4. Regarding Memoranda No. 46 and 47, the Committee decided to incorporate the points raised therein in the Report slated to be prepared in this regard. However, regarding the case dealt with in Memorandum No. 46, the Committee emphasized that the instant case should be treated as an exception and not to be quoted as a precedent by the Ministry.

5. xx xx xx

6. xx xx xx

The Committee then adjourned.

---

xx Omitted portion of the Minutes are not relevant to this Report.

## MINUTES OF THE FOURTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION (2012-2013)

---

The Fourth sitting of the Committee was held on Monday, the 28<sup>th</sup> January, 2013 from 1400 to 1430 hours in Chairman's Room No. 143, Parliament House, New Delhi.

### PRESENT

1. Dr. Thokchom Meinya - In the Chair
2. Shri K. Jayaprakash Hegde
3. Dr. Mahesh Joshi
4. Shri Virender Kashyap
5. Shri Narahari Mahto
6. Shri Gajendra Singh Rajukhedi
7. Dr Bhola Singh
8. Shri R. Thamaraiselvan
9. Shri Manohar Tirkey

### SECRETARIAT

1. Shri A Louis Martin - Joint Secretary
2. Shri S.C. Chaudhary - Director
3. Shri Srinivasulu Gunda - Additional Director
4. Shri Krishendra Kumar - Under Secretary

2. In the absence of Chairman, members of the Committee chose Dr. Thokchom Meinya, MP, to act as Chairman for the sitting of the Committee in terms of Rule 258(3) of Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha.

3. The Committee, thereafter, considered and adopted the draft Report of the Committee without any modification. The Committee also authorized the Chairman to present the same to the House.

The Committee then adjourned.