

Term any law related  
to the powers

Law



TERM – PAPER PERMISSIBLE AND IMPERMISSIBLE LIMITS OF  
DELEGATED LEGISLATION.

(Administrative law and regulatory mechanism)

(Paper no.

YLM -117) Submitted to:

Submitted by: Dr.

Anu

Puru

Chandvanshi

LL.

M. 3 year (1sem.)

Roll no.

50825 INTRODUCTION When the function of legislation is entrusted to organs other than the legislature itself, the legislation made by such organs is called delegated legislation. Or we can also say that when the legislature delegates its power to the administrative and the administrative body makes any law related to the powers delegated to it then the law made in such case is said to be delegated legislation. There is a limit to the power of delegation which is a kind of restriction over the powers to delegate.

Based on this, the delegated powers can be said to have following limits on it:

1) Permissible limits 2) Impermissible limits. There is a doctrine which deals with the limits of delegated legislation and is known as 'The Doctrine of Permissible Limits'. This doctrine deals with the power of legislature which

can be delegated to the administrative authorities as well as the powers

which can't be delegated. DOCTRINE OF EXCESSIVE DELEGATION The

legislature can delegate its legislative powers subject to its laying down the

policy. the legislature must declare the policy of the law, lay down legal

principles and provide standards for the guidance of the delegate to

promulgate delegated legislation, otherwise the law will be bad on account

of “ excessive delegation”. So, this doctrine means that the legislature can’t delegate unrestrained, uncanalised and unqualified legislative powers on an administrative body. Delegation is valid only if it is confined to legislative policy and guidelines.

In *Sitaram Vishabhar Dayal*<sup>1</sup>, court held that whether the power delegated by legislature to the executive has exceeded the permissible limits in a given case depends upon the facts and circumstances. The question doesn’t admit of any general rule. POWER TO EXEMPT The legislature can exempt any person, institution or commodity from its purview. The reason to have an exemption clause is to:· Reduce work of legislature.· To remove the hardship to the persons this may materially affect the policy of the act. Atypical provision runs as follows:” Notwithstanding anything contained in this Act, the Government may, subject to such conditions as they deem fit, by notification, exempt any land or building or class of land or buildings from all or any of the provisions of this Act or rules of regulations made thereunder.

“ Section 113 of the Tamil Nadu Town and Country Planning Act, 1971 Such a provision may be held to be invalid if the Act contains no policy, guidelines or principles for the guidance of the government’s discretion to exempt under this clause. Ø In *Parasuraman*<sup>2</sup>, the exemption clause was characterized as “ uncanalised, unlimited and arbitrary” as the Act did not lay down any principle or policy for the guidance of the government’s discretion to exempt. Ø In *Jalan Trading Co. v.*

Mill Mazdoor Union<sup>3</sup>, the Supreme Court upheld s. 36 of the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965 authorizing the Government to exempt any establishment from the operation of the Act having regard to the financial position and other relevant circumstances, as Parliament had given adequate guidance and laid down the principles in the light of which the power of exemption is to be exercised. POWER TO MODIFY Sometimes, a statute confers on the executive the power to modify or amend the parent statute.

This power makes the executive supreme even over the Legislature, but the conferment of this power provides flexibility in the changing circumstances. For example, · When some complicated scheme is introduced, so to meet any unforeseen difficulty. · To prevent the delay in the making of necessary changes in the statute by the legislature. In Baburam Jagdish Kumar & Co. <sup>4</sup> it was held that power by the legislature to a local authority or to executive Government to vary or modify an existing law would not be unconstitutional so long as such delegation does not involve abdication of essential legislative power by the legislature i.

e. necessary guidelines are provided. In Rajnarain v. Chairman, Patna Administration Committee<sup>5</sup>, the relevant statutory provision provided that the State Government could extend to a particular area any section of the statute (The Bihar and Orissa Municipal Act, 1922) subject to “such restrictions and modifications as the Government may think fit”. The Supreme Court upheld the delegation of power but subject to what it had said in the Delhi case that the Government could not make a change in the essential policy of the Act.

The Court held that “ when a section of an Act is selected for application, whether it is modified or not, it must be done so as not to affect any change of policy, or any essential change in the Act regarded a whole.” In *Lachmi Narain*<sup>6</sup>, the Government was given power to modify the schedule by giving a three months notice. In addition, the Government was also given power to make such modifications as it “ thinks fit”. The Government sought to amend the Act by dropping the requirement of giving three months notice for amending the schedule. The Supreme Court declared this modification as ultra-vires on the ground that it changed the “ essential feature” and “ legislative policy” inherent in the Act.

The Court ruled that the requirement of three months notice to amend the schedule was a mandatory requirement, a matter of policy, because adequate notice to those affected was necessary so that they could make due representations against the proposed change. <sup>7</sup>Hence, it can be said that a delegation will be ultra vires if it contravenes the policy as policy can't be changed by the delegate even during modification of statute.

**Removal of Difficulties** Statutes usually contain a removal of difficulty clause, nicknamed in Britain as the Henry VIII clause because “ that king is regarded popularly as the impersonation of executive autocracy”. The provision is used usually when the Legislature passes a statute implementing a new socio-economic scheme. Not being sure of what difficulties may crop up in the future implementation of the provisions of the law, the Legislature introduces therein a “ removal of difficulty” clause envisaging that Government may make provisions to remove any difficulty that may arise in putting the law into operation.

There are two types of “removal of difficulty” clauses: (a) A narrow power under which “power to remove difficulties” has to be exercised consistent with the provisions of the parent Act. In such a case, the Government cannot modify any provision of the statute itself. Here, the resultant order made by the Executive to remove the difficulty should not change the basic policy of the parent Act. The removal of difficulty order cannot change any provision of the parent Act; the order is to give effect to the Act. (b) The other, a broader version, may authorize modification of the parent Act, or any other Act, in the name of removal of difficulties. Usually, such a power is limited in point of time, say two or three years. In principle, such a power is objectionable as it vests a vast arsenal of power in the Executive.

Requirements for application of Henry VIII clause: three requirements must be fulfilled for a removal of difficulty order to be made by the Executive, viz.:

- (1) that a difficulty has arisen in giving effect to the provisions of the scheme;
  - (2) that the order to be made is such as appears to the Government to be necessary or expedient for the purpose of removing the difficulty; and
  - (3) That the order is not inconsistent with any provision of the scheme.
- Important points related to Henry VIII clause: Here the modification of the parent Act is not permitted and the removal of difficulty order is not final and its validity can be tested in a court of law. If there is no difficulty, the power to remove the difficulty cannot be exercised.

The court can therefore go to the question whether any difficulty has in fact arisen. The essential provisions of the Act cannot be amended; only minor changes can be made in the parent Act. In *Jalan trading company v.*

*Mill Majdoor union*<sup>8</sup>, Supreme Court was called upon to decide the legality of <https://assignbuster.com/term-any-law-related-to-the-powers/>

section 37 of payment of bonus act, 1965. The court in this case by majority of 3: 2 held that sec 37 of the said act is ultra vires on the ground of excessive delegation. The court went on further and said that central government delegated such powers to the executive which was not permissible.

· Later in *Gammam India Ltd v. Union of India*<sup>9</sup>, the minority view of *Jalan* trading case was adopted by the court which says that functions exercised by the central govt. were not legislative functions, so their delegation was permissible. · After that in *Patna University v. Amita Tiwari*<sup>10</sup>, the court held that “removal of difficulty” clause had only limited application and cannot be applied in every situation having some difficulty. **FUNCTIONS WHICH CAN NOT BE DELEGATED (IMPERMISSIBLE DELEGATION)** The following functions can't be delegated by the legislature to the executive: · **Essential legislative functions** There is no bar in the constitution of India against the delegation of legislative power to the executive, but the essential legislative **FUNCTIONS** can't be delegated to the executive at all.

Thus laying down a legislative policy is the function of legislature only and by entrusting this power to other body, the legislature can't escape from its duty and create a parallel legislature. · **Repeal of law** Power to repeal a law is an essential legislative function. So, if legislature delegates this power to executive, it will be excessive delegation and will become ultra vires. · **Modification** Modifying the act in relation to its important aspects is essential legislative function. So, delegation of such power to modify the act without any limitation is not permissible. · **Exemption** Without laying down norms and policy for guidance delegation of power of exemption to executive

<https://assignbuster.com/term-any-law-related-to-the-powers/>

is not impermissible. · removal of difficulty Under the guise of removing difficulty, legislature cannot enact a Henry VIII clause and delegate a function or power which is essential in nature or which cannot be delegated normally. · Retrospective operation The power of law making in India vests in the legislature.

Parliament can pass a law retrospectively or prospectively subject to the provisions of the constitution. But this principle cannot be applied in the case of delegated legislation. Giving an act a retrospective operation is an essential legislative function which cannot be delegated by the legislature to the executive. SAFEGUARDS REGARDING DELEGATION OF POWERS TO THE EXECUTIVE: · Legislature should lay down guidelines for delegation or exercising the power of delegation. · To make delegate to act within the framework of the statute, legislature has to set a criteria or standard regarding delegation of powers. · Delegation should be reasonable. · Delegation should be limited not unlimited. · Delegate should not modify the basic legislation.

· Delegation of powers shouldn't be uncanalised and uncontrollable. · Legislature must set the limits of the power delegated by declaring the policy of the law. · Essential functions cannot be delegated. CONCLUSION: Delegation of powers is helpful but excessive delegation is harmful.

Delegation have various advantages like reduction of work load of the legislature etc. but what has to be done by the legislature has to be done by itself only. That is why there is a well defined arena of the delegated



legislature beyond which there will not be allowed any delegation of powers and that is known as impermissible limits of delegated legislation. Delegation of powers helps in division of excessive work load too but safeguards and proper control mechanisms should be present and implemented to have a proper canalized and controlled delegation of powers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY BOOKS: 1) C. K. Takwani, Lectures on Administrative Law, 4th edition, 2008.

2) M. P. Jain and S. N. Jain, Principles of Administrative Law, 6th edition, 2010. 3) Paras Diwan, Administrative Law, 3rd edition, 2004. 4) Takwani and Thakkar, Lectures on Administrative Law.

1 Sitaram Vishambhar Dayal v. State of U. P. AIR 1972 SC 1168, para 7, p. 1170 L1972)2SCR 141. 2 A.

N. Parsuraman v. State of Tamil Nadu, AIR 1990 SC 40. 3 AIR 1967 SC 691. 4 . Baburam Jagdish Kumar & co. v.

State of Punjab, (1979) 3 SCC 616 ; AIR 1979 SC 1475, PARA 30, P. 14845 AIR 1954 SC 569, para 32, 37 and 39. 6 AIR 1976 SC 714: (1976) 2 SCC 953 ; XII ASIL 475 (1976). 7 See ' principles of administrative law' by Jain and Jain.

Page no. 70. 8 . AIR 1967 SC 691 : (1967) 1 SCR 159 (1974) 1 SCC 598: AIR 1974 SC 960. 10 (1977) 7 SCC 198: AIR 1997 SC 3456.