HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

LEGAL REGULATION OF PETITIONS FROM INDIVIDUALS AND LEGAL ENTITIES IN THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN

Xamdamova Kamola Anvar qizi

First-year Master's Student, Faculty of Jurisprudence, Chirchik Branch of M. Auezov South Kazakhstan University, a Non-Profit Joint-Stock Company, under the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan.Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Innovation of the Republic of Uzbekistan.

Doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23421169

Abstract. This article examines the constitutional foundations, statutory guarantees, administrative procedures and practical challenges relating to petitions submitted by individuals and legal entities in Uzbekistan. A doctrinal, comparative and systems-based analysis of eight Uzbek normative legal sources distinguishes applications, proposals and complaints, describes reception and processing safeguards, and evaluates the interface between ordinary petitions and formal administrative and judicial review. Rather than inventing field survey results, the article identifies normative findings and a set of testable service-quality indicators. It proposes clearer routing of submissions, accessible digital channels, reasoned responses, effective supervision and a stronger link between administrative and judicial remedies.

Keywords: right to petition; individuals; legal entities; administrative law; applications; complaints; electronic government; Uzbekistan.

INTRODUCTION

The right to approach public authorities is simultaneously an individual liberty, an instrument for exercising other rights and an accountability mechanism. For an individual, a petition can initiate the correction of an error, the protection of a social entitlement or an explanation of official conduct. For a legal entity, it may address a licensing question, an administrative obstacle or a failure to provide a public service. When an authority registers a petition yet fails to resolve the substantive problem, formal accessibility does not necessarily translate into effective protection. This distinction between receiving and remedying a petition frames the research problem (1, 2).

Article 40 of the Constitution of the Republic of Uzbekistan recognizes the right of everyone, individually or jointly with others, to submit applications, proposals and complaints to public bodies and organizations, citizens' self-government bodies, officials and representatives of the people. It also requires them to be considered under procedures and time limits prescribed by law. Constitutional protection therefore covers both entry to the administrative system and legally regulated consideration of the matter (1).

The principal specialized statute is the Law "On Appeals of Individuals and Legal Entities" as revised by Law No. O'RQ-445 of 11 September 2017. The legal environment also includes the Law on

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

Administrative Procedures, the Code of Administrative Court Proceedings, open-government guarantees and legislation on e-government and personal data. These instruments should be applied according to their respective subject matter rather than treated as interchangeable appeal regimes (2–8).

The aim of this article is to systematize the legal regulation of submissions by individuals and legal entities, identify implementation risks in administrative practice, and formulate directions for improving promptness, transparency, accessibility and the practical effectiveness of protection.

LITERATURE AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORK REVIEW

The constitutional model sets a broad entitlement to petition, whereas sector-specific instruments operationalize it. The 2017 revised appeals legislation establishes concepts, reception procedures and review duties. In particular, applications and complaints addressed to a competent authority are normally considered within fifteen days; where additional study, verification or documents are necessary, review may take up to one month. An exceptional extension may be authorized under statutory conditions, with notice to the petitioner. Proposals are generally considered within one month, subject to specific rules for proposals requiring additional examination (2).

A distinction is essential between a general petition about an authority's activity and a challenge to an individual administrative act under formal administrative procedures. The Law "On Administrative Procedures" regulates relevant administrative proceedings and administrative complaints within its scope. The Administrative Court Proceedings Code provides judicial procedures for contesting unlawful acts, decisions or omissions of administrative bodies where jurisdictional requirements are satisfied (3, 4). A generalized claim that every petition is judicially appealable under one universal deadline would therefore be inaccurate.

The Law "On Openness of Activities of State Power and Administration Bodies" contributes a preventive dimension: public access to information can reduce unnecessary requests and help petitioners frame clear questions (5). The Law "On Electronic Government" supplies an enabling architecture for remote access to services and communications (6). Meanwhile, the Law "On Personal Data" requires attention to handling identifying and sensitive information in electronic registers and files (7). Finally, the earlier 2014 legal framework provides historical context for the institutional development of the appeals regime but should be read in conjunction with the later revision, not as a substitute for current rules (8).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This is a normative-legal, non-empirical study. The source base comprises eight Uzbek legal acts and official legal texts: the 2023 Constitution, the 2017 revision of the appeals law, legislation on administrative procedures and administrative court proceedings, openness, electronic government, personal data and the earlier appeals enactment (1–8). The material was selected for direct relevance to constitutional entitlement, administrative reception and processing, accountability, judicial protection and digital communication. The analysis does not report interviews, case statistics or a survey of citizens.

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

Three methods were applied. First, formal legal analysis identified the addressees, submission types, competent bodies, procedural steps and available safeguards in each instrument. Second, a comparative regulatory matrix contrasted ordinary petition review, formal administrative challenge and court proceedings. Third, a systems approach examined how filing, registration, routing, substantive examination, response and escalation should operate as one rights-protection cycle. Proposals in the Discussion section are recommendations inferred from this doctrinal comparison, not empirically validated reforms.

RESULTS

The normative analysis yields four findings. First, the Constitution protects access to competent bodies, while detailed legislation determines the manner of consideration. Second, the substantive classification of a submission matters: an application seeks assistance with rights or interests, a proposal recommends improvements and a complaint contests violations or improper acts. A petition's label alone should not obscure its actual legal purpose. Third, the appeals statute sets specific time limits and procedural obligations, but those limits must not be automatically extended to every administrative or judicial review proceeding (1–4).

Fourth, electronic reception changes the communication channel but does not eliminate the legal duties of registration, competent routing, confidentiality, substantive evaluation and response. Digital accessibility must be assessed alongside the ability of users with limited technical skills to file submissions and obtain meaningful outcomes (2, 6, 7).

Table 1. Comparison of legal mechanisms for protecting petitioners' interests

Mechanism	Primary function	Procedural safeguard
Ordinary application or complaint	Seek resolution of a problem by a competent body	Registration, substantive examination, statutory reply period (2)
Proposal	Suggest improvement of public administration	Consideration and notice under the appeals law (2)
Administrative complaint	Challenge an administrative/procedural act within the relevant legal scope	Administrative-review guarantees under a distinct statute (3)
Judicial application	Challenge unlawful administrative conduct in court	Independent judicial review, subject to jurisdiction and procedure (4)
Digital submission	Provide remote access to filing and communications	Secure processing, traceability and equal accessibility (6, 7)

Table 1 demonstrates why legal qualification at the moment of reception is important. A request for information, an individual administrative remedy and a court claim may originate from the same

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

conflict yet trigger different responsibilities. Authorities should therefore provide an accessible explanation of the appropriate route without assuming that an ordinary written answer necessarily disposes of all procedural rights (2–6).

DISCUSSION

A legally adequate response is more than confirmation that a letter has been read. It must address the issues within the authority's competence, give intelligible reasons, explain applicable facts and legal standards, and identify available subsequent remedies where appropriate. Without these features, a response may be timely in a formal sense but unsatisfactory in terms of protection. This problem is particularly important for repeated petitions, where a failure to address the underlying administrative cause can create unnecessary workload and reduce institutional confidence.

A practical improvement is a standardized reception-and-routing protocol that classifies submissions by legal nature, verifies the competent body, records the date received and informs the petitioner of procedural status. The protocol should distinguish statutory review deadlines for ordinary applications and complaints from special procedures in other legislation. For ordinary applications and complaints, the fifteen-day rule and the possibility of up to one month for additional examination must remain visible in workflow controls; exceptional extensions should not become a default administrative practice (2, 3).

A second direction is to assess quality through multiple indicators rather than registration volume alone: proportion of timely responses, proportion answered with reasons, share of referrals made to the competent authority, recurrence of the same problem, accessibility complaints, and the proportion of cases where decisions are actually executed. These are proposed management indicators; no national or institutional statistics are claimed in this article. The indicators are suitable for future empirical verification through anonymized register analysis and user experience surveys.

A third direction is to build inclusive electronic communication. Digital portals can facilitate remote filing and tracking, but alternative in-person and paper channels remain important for people lacking stable internet access, disabilities-compatible interfaces or digital literacy. Protection of personal data is indispensable: identifiable complaint details should be accessible only to authorized staff for legitimate functions, and publicly disclosed summaries should avoid needless identification of petitioners (6, 7).

Finally, the mechanism of accountability should encompass escalation. Where an administrative body's decision, action or omission violates a protected interest, a person may need formal administrative and/or judicial remedies depending on the dispute's legal characteristics. The relevant laws determine prerequisites, jurisdiction and time limits. Explanations supplied by an authority should not blur these distinctions or purport to foreclose legal avenues not within its competence (3, 4).

The study has limitations. It synthesizes normative texts and does not measure the effectiveness of administrative institutions. Interpretation of specific disputes requires checking the consolidated legal texts and sectoral provisions applicable on the date of the case. Future research could compare

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

complaint handling across institutions using de-identified records, verify whether reasons given are comprehensible, and analyze how administrative and judicial review affect actual compliance.

CONCLUSION

Uzbekistan's legal framework for petitions of individuals and legal entities rests on the constitutional right to address competent authorities, the specialized appeals statute, and related rules on administration, judicial control, openness and electronic communication. Its effectiveness depends on correct identification of the submission type, competent routing, observance of review deadlines, substantive and reasoned replies, lawful handling of personal data, and realistic access to remedies (1–7).

The study recommends coordinated digital and traditional filing, transparent status tracking, uniform quality criteria and continuing legal training of responsible officials. Further empirical studies are necessary to assess how far these measures reduce repeat submissions and improve actual restoration of rights. These conclusions are doctrinal recommendations rather than claims based on experimental observation.

REFERENCES:

1. Republic of Uzbekistan. (2023). Constitution of the Republic of Uzbekistan (Article 40). https://lex.uz/ru/docs/6451070
2. Republic of Uzbekistan. (2017). Law No. O'RQ-445: Amendments and additions to the Law "On Appeals of Individuals and Legal Entities" (11 September 2017). https://lex.uz/uz/acts/-3336169
3. Republic of Uzbekistan. (2018a). Law No. O'RQ-457 "On Administrative Procedures" (8 January 2018). https://lex.uz/uz/docs/6114000
4. Republic of Uzbekistan. (2018b). Code of Administrative Court Proceedings (25 January 2018). https://lex.uz/en/docs/5695786
5. Republic of Uzbekistan. (2014a). Law No. O'RQ-369 "On Openness of Activities of State Power and Administration Bodies" (5 May 2014). https://lex.uz/
6. Republic of Uzbekistan. (2015). Law No. O'RQ-395 "On Electronic Government" (9 December 2015). https://lex.uz/
7. Republic of Uzbekistan. (2019). Law No. O'RQ-547 "On Personal Data" (2 July 2019). https://lex.uz/
8. Republic of Uzbekistan. (2014b). Law No. O'RQ-378 "On Appeals of Individuals and Legal Entities" (3 December 2014; historical enactment). https://lex.uz/