

COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION  
(FIFTEENTH LOK SABHA)  
(2009-2010)

FIFTH REPORT

(PRESENTED ON 27.4.2010)

S

E

A

L

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

NEW DELHI

April, 2010/ Vaisakha, 1932

COSL BRANCH No.-14

PRICE: Rs.

(C) 2010 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Twelfth 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. Infirmities in the Ministry of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises, Office of the Development Commissioner (Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises), Group 'A' Gazetted Posts (Electronics and Electrical Disciplines) Recruitment Rules, 2008 (GSR 185 of 2008).	1-1.8	1-6
II. The Civilians in Defence Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2008 (SRO 21-E of 2008).	2-2.5	7-8
III. Infirmary in the Ministry of Urban Development Joint Adviser (Public Health and Environmental Engineering) Recruitment Rules, 2008 (GSR 530-E of 2008).	3-3.4	9-10

## APPENDICES

- I. Summary of main recommendations/observations made by the Committee.
- II. Extracts from the Minutes of the fifth sitting of the Committee (2009-10) held on 3.3.2010 and extracts from Minutes of the Sixth sitting of the Committee (2009-10) held on 12.4.2010.

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION  
(2009-2010)

1. Shri P. Karunakaran Chairman
2. Shri Paban Singh Ghatowar
3. Shri Rajen Gohain
4. Shri D.B. Chandre Gowda
5. Shrimati Paramjit Kaur Gulshan
6. Shri Jitender Singh Malik
7. Shri Mangani Lal Mandal
8. Shri Pinaki Misra
9. Dr. Sanjeev Ganesh Naik
10. Shri Rajaram Pal
11. Shri Anantha Venkatarami Reddy
12. Shri Hamdullah Sayeed
13. Shri Adhalrao Patil Shivaji
14. Dr. Rajan Sushant
15. Shri Madhu Goud Yaskhi

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri P.K. Misra - Joint Secretary
2. Shri J.S. Chauhan - Director
3. Smt. Hema Joshi - Committee Officer

## INTRODUCTION

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

2. The matters covered by this Report were considered by the Committee on Subordinate Legislation at their sitting held on 3.3.2010.

3. The Committee considered and adopted this Report at their sitting held on 12.4.2010.

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 (2009-10) held on 3.3.2010 and the extracts from Minutes of the Sixth sitting of the Committee (2009-10) held on 12.4.2010 relevant to this Report are included in Appendix-II.

New Delhi;  
April, 2010/Vaisakha, 1932

P. KARUNAKARAN,  
CHAIRMAN,  
COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION

Infirmities in the Ministry of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises, Office of the Development Commissioner (Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises), Group 'A' Gazetted Posts (Electronics and Electrical Disciplines) Recruitment Rules, 2008 (GSR 185 of 2008).

-----

The Ministry of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises, Office of the Development Commissioner (Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises), Group 'A' Gazetted Posts (Electronics and Electrical Disciplines) Recruitment Rules, 2008 (GSR 185 of 2008) were published in Gazette of India, Part-II, Section 3(i) dated 4<sup>th</sup> October, 2008. On scrutiny of the aforesaid recruitment rules, it was observed that (i) there were discrepancies in the period of deputation for posts at Sl. Nos. 3,4,6 & 7 in Col. 12 of the Schedule; (ii) there were discrepancies in the 'Note' for the posts at Sl. Nos. 5 & 8 in Col. 7 of the Schedule; and (iii) vague expressions were used for post at Sl. No. 5 in Col. 8 (ii) of the Schedule. These points were referred to the Ministry of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises for their comments in the matter. The points raised and replies of the Ministry thereto are brought out below :-

A. Discrepancies in the period of deputation

In Column 12 of the Schedule, there are different period(s) of deputation for the following post(s):-

Post	Scale of pay	Period of deputation
Director (Electronics) [post at Sl. No. 3]	Rs. 12000-16500	4 years
Director (Electrical) [post at Sl.No. 6]	Rs. 12000-16500	5 years
Deputy Director (Electronics) [post at Sl.No. 4]	Rs. 10000-15200	3 years
Deputy Director (Electrical) [post at Sl.No. 7]	Rs. 10000-15200	4 years

Since, the posts at Sl. No(s) 3 & 6 and at Sl. No(s) 4 & 7 respectively carry same scale of pay, there should be uniform period of deputation.

The Ministry in their reply vide OM dated 8 June, 2009 stated that : -

- (a) *As per the guidelines issued by DOPT (Handbook of RRs, 1993), the period of deputation for a particular grade or cadre is dependent upon the pay scale of the post to which deputation is being made. For the top level i.e. for posts having a pay scale the maximum of which is Rs. 5700/- or above (i.e. scale of pay Rs.12000--375-18000 or above as per 5<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission's recommendations), the period prescribed is '5 years'. For the Middle Management Level i.e. for posts having a pay scale with a maximum of Rs.4500/- or above but below Rs.5700/- (i.e. posts having scale of pay from Rs.10000-325-15200 but below to scale of pay Rs. 12000-375-18000 as per 5<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission's recommendations), the period is '4 years' and for all other lower levels it is normally '3 years'. However, the Ministries/Departments, depending upon their requirements, the field of availability and the qualifications prescribed, should decide the period of deputation in consultation with the Department of Personnel and Training and the Union Public Service Commission.*
- (b) *The method of recruitment prescribed for the post of Director (Electronics) is 'Promotion failing which by deputation (including short-term contract)' and for the post of Director (Electrical) is '66.67 per cent promotion failing which deputation (including short-term contract) and 33.33 per cent by deputation (including short-term contract)'. It is evident from above that in case of Director (Electronics) the deputation method is to be resorted only under failing which clause whereas in case of Director (Electrical), a definite quota is earmarked for 'deputation'. Thus, after consultation with Deptt. of Personnel & Training and Union Public Service Commission, 4 years and 5 years deputation tenure has been prescribed in the RRs for the posts of Director (Electronics) and Director (Electrical), respectively.*
- (c) *The deputation tenure for the post of Dy. Director (Electronics) is 4 years. However, it has been printed as 3 years in the Gazette of India due to printing error. This has already been taken into notice and this office is in process of issuing amendment notification to suitably modify above discrepancy. Presently, the amendment notification in this regard has been sent for Hindi translation to Office Language Wing. After getting the Hindi translation, the same would be sent to Government of India Press for publication in Gazette".*

1.2 The Committee observe that while clarifying the position for retaining different period(s) of deputation for the post(s) of Director (Electronics) and Director (Electrical), the Ministry have *inter*

*alia* stressed that for filling up the post of Director (Electronics), the mode of deputation is to be resorted to only under "failing which clause", whereas, a definite deputation quota of 33.33% has been prescribed for filling up the post of Director (Electrical). They have also relied upon para 3.13.4 of guidelines issued by DOPT which stipulates that the Ministries/ Departments, depending upon their requirements, the field of availability and qualifications prescribed, should decide the period of deputation in consultation with the DOPT and the UPSC.

1.3 The Committee also observe that Column 11 of the Schedule which prescribes the percentage of vacancies to be filled up by various methods, it is evident that "failing which clause" is available for filling up both the posts on deputation basis. The only exception is that specific deputation quota has been prescribed for filling up the post of Director (Electrical). In other words, at a given point of time, all the vacancies of Director (Electronics) can be filled up by promotion, whereas, 33.33% of the vacancies of Director (Electrical) are compulsorily to be filled up by deputation. Therefore, the argument put forward by the Ministry that since deputation method for filling up the post of Director (Electronics) is to be resorted to only under "failing which clause", the period of deputation has been prescribed as 4 years is not tenable.

1.4 The Committee desire that when there is no specific deputation quota for the post of Director (Electronics) and in case, any incumbent is appointed on deputation due to non-filling of vacancy by the mode of promotion, in order to avoid frequent replacements which could affect continuity in the organisation as well as render the accumulative wealth of experience redundant, the period of deputation in such cases should necessarily be prescribed as 5 years. In addition to this, since both the post(s) have identical pay scales and in terms of DOPT guidelines on Recruitment Rules as quoted by the Ministry, the period of deputation needs to be 5 years.

(Recommendation No. 1)

1.5 The Committee also observe that while clarifying the position of deputation for the post(s) of Deputy Director (Electronics) and Deputy Director (Electrical), the Ministry have stated that the deputation tenure for the post of Dy. Director (Electronics) (SI.No. 4) is 4



years and that it had been printed as 3 years in the Gazette of India due to printing error. The Ministry have informed that they are in the process of issuing amendment in the notification to suitably rectify the discrepancy. The Committee desire that a copy of the notification carrying out the amendment may be supplied to them at the earliest. The Committee urge the Ministry to be more careful in future while framing the Recruitment Rules.

(Recommendation No. 2)

B. Discrepancies in the 'Note'

- (1) For post at Sl. No. 5, in Column 7 of the Schedule, while mentioning the closing date for receipt of application, Andaman and Nicobar Islands and Lakshadweep have been mentioned, whereas, in terms of DOPT guidelines, it should be Andaman and Nicobar Islands or Lakshadweep.
- (2) For post at Sl. No. 8, in Column 7 of the Schedule, while mentioning the closing date for receipt of application, Andaman and Nicobar Islands and Lakshadweep have been mentioned, whereas, in terms of DOPT guidelines, it should be Andaman and Nicobar Islands or Lakshadweep.

The attention of the Ministry of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises was accordingly drawn to the specific guidelines issued by DOPT in this regard. On being pointed out, the Ministry in their reply vide OM dated 8 June, 2009 stated that :-

*"The discrepancies for the posts at Sl. No. 5 & 8, in Column 7 of the Schedule have been noted. This office is taking necessary action for amending the RRs by inserting the word "or" in place of "and".*

1.6 The Committee note that the entry under posts at Sl. No(s). 5 & 8 in Column 7 of the Schedule was not in accordance with the relevant guidelines issued by DOPT in this regard. The Committee note with satisfaction that the Ministry have noted the lacunae as pointed out by the Committee. The Ministry had also stated that they are taking necessary action for amending the RRs by inserting the word "or" in place of "and". The Committee urge the Ministry to be more careful in future and adhere to the guidelines issued by DOPT while framing the Recruitment Rules.

(Recommendation No. 3)

C. Vague expressions

For post at Sl. No. 5, in Column 8 (ii) of the Schedule, three years experience in a supervisory capacity has been prescribed. However, the terminology 'experience' has not been defined properly due to which experience gained by the candidates from sundry organisations will also have to be reckoned for filling up the post.

The Ministry in their reply vide OM dated 8 June, 2009 stated that :-

*'Electronics' is a very wide subject having a number of other branches like 'Electronics & Communication', 'Electronics & Telecommunication', 'Power Electronics' etc. and sometimes also very closely relatable to 'Electrical' discipline. The duties attached to the post of Asstt. Director (Gr-I) (Electronics) are enclosed as Annexure-III. It may be inferred from the same that in so far as this office is concerned, the officer who is being appointed as AD (Gr-I) (Electronics) should have core knowledge of the subject viz. 'Electronics' to discharge his duties effectively i.e. preparation of model schemes, promotion, development and establishment of Electronics industries in small scale sector. As such, no specific knowledge in particular field of 'Electronics' is required for the post of AD (Gr-I) (Electronics). Further, it would also not be feasible to incorporate each and every minute details of 'Electronics' for the reasons stated above as essential qualifications for the said post. The essential qualifications for the post of Asstt. Director (Gr-I) (Electronics) in the RRs are prescribed after due consultation with Deptt. of Personnel & Training and Union Public Service Commission.*

*In view of above, there appears to be no need to amend RRs in question, as these are in accordance with requirements of this organization".*

1.7 The Committee had recommended time and again that vague expressions should not be used in the rules and the terms and expressions should be clearly specified to avoid any scope for ambiguity and obviate the possibility of being interpreted differently by different persons. Stipulations for requirement of experience for direct recruits in the Recruitment Rules, being an important condition, have a significant bearing on the fate of the candidates seeking appointment to the post as well as their fitness for the job in a government organisation. Such provisions should, therefore, be precise, specific and free from any ambiguity.

1.8 The Committee note that the entry under essential qualification for direct recruitment to the post of Assistant Director (Grade-I) (Electronics) includes 'Three years experience in a supervisory capacity'. In the absence of the type of organisations from where such experience is to be considered, the entry appears to be susceptible to the risk of being interpreted variedly by different persons and therefore the experience gained by the candidates from sundry organizations will also have to be reckoned for filling up the post. On being pointed out, the Ministry of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises had simply made an attempt to define the term "Electronics" in all its dimensions. However, the Ministry had not clarified on the point that the term 'experience' needs to be defined properly so that experience gained by the candidates from sundry organisations may not be reckoned for filling up the post of Assistant Director Grade-I (Electronics) on direct recruitment basis. Thus, the ambiguity in the rules leaves open the scope for misuse of delegated legislation and harms the interest of general public at large. The Committee desire the Ministry to incorporate an in-built provision in the rules for filtering the component of experience gained by candidates from sundry organisations. The Committee also desire the Ministry to amend the rules to make the entry more precise and specific, thereby obviating any scope for ambiguity in the recruitment rules.

(Recommendation No. 4)

## II

The Civilians in Defence Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2008 (SRO 21-E of 2008).

.....

The Civilians in Defence Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2008 (SRO 21- E of 2008) were published in the Gazette of India, Extraordinary, Part-II, Section(iv) dated 9 September, 2008. On scrutiny, it was noticed that the extant Rules were published in the Gazette on 9.9.2008 and given retrospective effect from 1.1.2006. In terms of the recommendation made by the Committee on Subordinate Legislation, if in any particular case, the "Orders" have to be given retrospective effect in view of any unavoidable circumstances, the retrospection having otherwise legal validity, a clarification is required to be given, either by way of an explanation or in the form of a foot-note in the relevant "Orders" to the effect that no one will be adversely affected as a result of 'retrospective effect' being given to such "Orders".

2.2 The Ministry of Defence were, therefore, asked to furnish their comments on the above point and also to state whether they have any objection by incorporating such explanatory note/foot-note in the Rules in terms of the recommendations made by the Committee. The Ministry vide their reply dated 29.5.2009 inter-alia stated as under :-

*".... Civilians in Defence Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2008 were framed on the basis of Central Civil Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2008 issued by the Ministry of Finance, Department of Expenditure and also issued accordingly. As no case has come to our notice about adverse effect of the Rules on account of their retrospective application, this Ministry has no comments to offer. In case, such eventuality (adverse impact) arises during the course of execution of the Rules, existing mechanism like Anomaly Committees, redressal of grievances etc. can take care of the situation".*

2.3 The Civilians in Defence Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2008(SRO 21-E of 2008) were published in the Gazette of India, Extraordinary, Part – II, Section (iv) dated 9 September, 2008 but

given retrospective effect from 1.1.2006. As per the recommendations of the Committee on Subordinate Legislation, in case retrospective effect has to be given to any Rules, a clarification in the form of an explanation or foot-note should be given in the relevant rules specifying that no person would be adversely affected as a result of retrospective effect being given to such Rules. However, such a note was not appended to the said rules. On being pointed out, the Ministry of Defence stated that no case has come to their notice about adverse affect of the Rules on account of their retrospective application. The Ministry further stated that in case such eventuality (adverse impact) arises during the course of execution of the Rules, existing mechanism like Anomaly Committees, redressal of grievances etc., will take care of the situation.

2.4 The Committee have been informed by the Ministry of Defence that no case has come to the notice of the Ministry about adverse affect of the Rules on account of their retrospective application. However, it is disheartening to note the statement made by the Ministry to the effect that in case such eventuality (adverse impact) arises during the course of execution of Rules, the existing mechanism like Anomaly Committees, redressal of grievances, etc. will take care of the situation. It clearly indicates that the Ministry have not paid the desired level of attention to the recommendation made by the Committee on Subordinate Legislation in their 9<sup>th</sup> Report, Para 102, 5<sup>th</sup> Lok Sabha which says as under:-

“102. The Committee had recommended avoidance of giving retrospective effect to the rules and giving explanatory note that no one would be affected adversely, not because of legal necessity but because of propriety and check on abuse of power. The Committee feel that once the propriety of not issuing the Rules retrospectively is accepted, it does seem necessary to indicate in the explanatory note that the interests of no one are prejudicially affected by retrospective effect. There should also be no objection to publication of the explanatory note in the Gazette as it would go to prove that there is no mala fide.”

2.5 The Committee therefore, do not approve of the response of the Ministry in this regard. The Committee urge the Ministry of Defence to scrupulously follow the recommendations of the Committee on Subordinate Legislation while framing such rules in future and accordingly apprise them of the precise action taken in this regard.

(Recommendation No. 5)

### III

Infirmity in the Ministry of Urban Development Joint Adviser (Public Health and Environmental Engineering) Recruitment Rules, 2008 (GSR 530-E of 2008).

-----

The Ministry of Urban Development Joint Adviser (Public Health and Environmental Engineering) Recruitment Rules, 2008 (GSR 530-E of 2008) were published in Gazette of India, Extraordinary, Part-II, Section 3(i) dated 16.7.2008. On scrutiny of the rules, it was observed that in Column 12 (1)(b)(iii) of the Schedule, ten years experience in Public Health Engineering has been prescribed. However, the terminology 'experience' had not been defined properly to the extent that the type of organization from where such experience is to be considered had not been amplified. In the absence of clarity in the Rules, experience gained by the candidates from various sundry organizations will also have to be reckoned for filling up a senior-level position. The Ministry of Urban Development were requested to furnish their comments on the above infirmity.

3.2 The Ministry vide their OM dated 26 May, 2009 have furnished the following reply:-

"As regarding not defining the terminology 'Experience' in column 12(1)(b)(iii) of the Schedule in GSR 530-E, it is submitted that the relevant clause reads as under:-

'Ten years experience in Public Health Engineering including investigation, design, constructions and operation of water supply and sewerage installations'

The said clause is quite exhaustive for considering any case of appointment to the post of Joint Adviser (PHEE). The clause required experience from any organization which has all relevant aspects such as investigation, design, constructions and operation of water supply and sewerage installations and therefore no person from any sundry organization can become eligible for appointment in the said post of Joint Adviser (PHEE). An organization with the above stated aspects may not be termed as sundry organization. Further, the said rules have been promulgated in consultation with DOPT, UPSC and Ministry of Law."

3.3 The experience given in the recruitment rules did not specify the organizations from which such experience will be considered. As a result, the field is open to all candidates even those from

sundry organizations. In the absence of specification regarding the organization from where experience is to be considered, there lies the possibility of candidates being considered from organizations which may of sundry in nature. Therefore, the intention of such insertion is primarily aimed at weeding out of applications of those candidates who have enclosed experience certificates obtained from sundry organizations/non-functional organizations and thus may not be suitable for appointment to the said post.

3.4 The Committee had recommended time and again that the provisions in the rules should be clearly specified to avoid any scope for ambiguity and minimise the possibility of being interpreted differently by different officials/persons. The Committee note that in the instant case, the experience required in Column 12(1)(b)(iii) of the Schedule to the Rules do not specify the nature of organizations from where experience would be considered. Thus, the lack of clarity in the rules vitiates the purpose of delegated legislation. Therefore, the Committee desire that such provisions, wherever prescribed in the rules, should be well defined and meet the requirements of the job.

(Recommendation No. 6)

New Delhi;  
April, 2010/ Vaisakha, 1932

P. KARUNAKARAN,  
CHAIRMAN,  
COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION

APPENDIX –I

(Vide Para 4 of the Introduction of the Report)

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS MADE IN THE FIFTH REPORT OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION

(FIFTEENTH LOK SABHA)

Sl. No.	Reference to Para No. in the Report	<u>Summary of Recommendations</u>
1	2	3
1.	<p>1.4</p> <p>1.5</p>	<p><u>Infirmities in the Ministry of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises, Office of the Development Commissioner (Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises), Group 'A' Gazetted Posts (Electronics and Electrical Disciplines) Recruitment Rules, 2008 (GSR 185 of 2008).</u></p> <p>The Committee desire that when there is no specific deputation quota for the post of Director (Electronics) and in case, any incumbent is appointed on deputation due to non-filling of vacancy by the mode of promotion, in order to avoid frequent replacements which could affect continuity in the organisation as well as render the accumulative wealth of experience redundant, the period of deputation in such cases should necessarily be prescribed as 5 years. In addition to this, since both the post(s) have identical pay scales and in terms of DOPT guidelines on Recruitment Rules as quoted by the Ministry, the period of deputation needs to be 5 years.</p> <p>The Committee also observe that while clarifying the position of deputation for the post(s) of Deputy Director (Electronics) and Deputy Director (Electrical), the Ministry have stated that the deputation tenure for the post of Dy. Director (Electronics) (Sl.No. 4) is 4 years and that it had been printed as 3 years in the Gazette of India due to printing error. The Ministry have informed that they are in the process of issuing amendment in the notification to suitably rectify the discrepancy. The Committee desire that a copy of the notification carrying out the amendment may be supplied to them at the earliest. The Committee urge the Ministry to be more careful in future while framing the Recruitment Rules.</p>



2.	1.6	<p>The Committee note that the entry under posts at Sl. No(s). 5 &amp; 8 in Column 7 of the Schedule was not in accordance with the relevant guidelines issued by DOPT in this regard. The Committee note with satisfaction that the Ministry have noted the lacunae as pointed out by the Committee. The Ministry had also stated that they are taking necessary action for amending the RRs by inserting the word “or” in place of “and”. The Committee urge the Ministry to be more careful in future and adhere to the guidelines issued by DOPT while framing the Recruitment Rules.</p>
	1.8	<p>The Committee note that the entry under essential qualification for direct recruitment to the post of Assistant Director (Grade-I) (Electronics) includes ‘Three years experience in a supervisory capacity’. In the absence of the type of organisations from where such experience is to be considered, the entry appears to be susceptible to the risk of being interpreted variedly by different persons and therefore the experience gained by the candidates from sundry organizations will also have to be reckoned for filling up the post. On being pointed out, the Ministry of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises had simply made an attempt to define the term “Electronics’ in all its dimensions. However, the Ministry had not clarified on the point that the term ‘experience’ needs to be defined properly so that experience gained by the candidates from sundry organisations may not be reckoned for filling up the post of Assistant Director Grade-I (Electronics) on direct recruitment basis. Thus, the ambiguity in the rules leaves open the scope for misuse of delegated legislation and harms the interest of general public at large. The Committee desire the Ministry to incorporate an in-built provision in the rules for filtering the component of experience gained by candidates from sundry organisations. The Committee also desire the Ministry to amend the rules to make the entry more precise and specific, thereby obviating any scope for ambiguity in the recruitment rules.</p>
	2.5	<p><u>The Civilians in Defence Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2008 (SRO 21-E of 2008).</u></p> <p>The Committee therefore, do not approve of the response of the Ministry in this regard. The Committee urge the Ministry of Defence to scrupulously follow the recommendations of the Committee on Subordinate Legislation while framing such rules in future and accordingly apprise them of the precise action taken in this regard.</p>

3.	3.4	<p><u>Infirmity in the Ministry of Urban Development Joint Adviser (Public Health and Environmental Engineering) Recruitment Rules, 2008 (GSR 530-E of 2008).</u></p> <p>The Committee had recommended time and again that the provisions in the rules should be clearly specified to avoid any scope for ambiguity and minimise the possibility of being interpreted differently by different officials/persons. The Committee note that in the instant case, the experience required in Column 12(1)(b)(iii) of the Schedule to the Rules do not specify the nature of organizations from where experience would be considered. Thus, the lack of clarity in the rules vitiates the purpose of delegated legislation. Therefore, the Committee desire that such provisions, wherever prescribed in the rules, should be well defined and meet the requirements of the job.</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 (2009-2010)

---

The Committee sat on Wednesday, 3rd March from 1500 to 1545 hours in Chairman's Room No.143, Parliament House , New Delhi.

#### PRESENT

1. Shri P. Karunakaran Chairman

#### MEMBERS

#### LOK SABHA

2. Smt. Paramjit Kaur Gulshan
3. Shri Sanjeev Ganesh Naik
4. Shri Anantha Venkata Rami Reddy
5. Shri Hamdulla Sayeed

#### SECRETARIAT

1. Shri P.K. Misra - Joint Secretary
2. Shri J.S. Chauhan - Director
3. Shri Raju Srivastava - Deputy Secretary

2. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the members to the sitting of the Committee.

3. XX XX XX

4. Thereafter, the Committee took up for consideration the following memoranda:-

(1) Memorandum No. 10 - Infirmity in the Ministry of Urban Development Joint Adviser (Public Health and Environmental Engineering) Recruitment Rules, 2008 (GSR 530-E of 2008)

(2) Memorandum No. 11 - The Civilians in Defence Services (Revised Pay) Rules, 2008 (SRO 21-E of 2008)

(3) Memorandum No. 12 - Infirmities in the Ministry of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises, Office of the Development Commissioner (Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises), Group 'A' Gazetted Posts (Electronics and Electrical Disciplines) Recruitment Rules, 2008 (GSR 185 of 2008)

(4) XX XX XX

5. .... In regard to memoranda at Sl. No. (1), (2) and (3) above, the Committee decided to incorporate the points raised therein in the Report to be presented to the House.

The Committee then adjourned.

---

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

EXTRACTS FROM THE MINUTES OF THE SIXTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON  
SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION (2009-2010)

---

The Committee sat on Monday, 12 April from 1400 to 1500 hours in Chairman's Room  
No.143, Parliament House, New Delhi.

PRESENT

1. Shri P. Karunakaran Chairman

MEMBERS

LOK SABHA

2. Shri Rajen Gohain
3. Shri D.B. Chandre Gowda
4. Smt. Paramjit Kaur Gulshan
5. Shri Mangani Lal Mandal
6. Shri Pinaki Misra
7. Shri Rajaram Pal
8. Shri Madhu Goud Yaskhi

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri P.K. Misra - Joint Secretary
2. Shri Raju Srivastava - Deputy Secretary

2. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the members to the sitting of the Committee.

3. The Committee, then, took up for consideration the draft Fifth Report and adopted the same without any modifications. The Committee also authorized the Chairman to present the same to the House.

4. XX XX XX XX

5. XX XX XX XX

The Committee then adjourned.

---

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