International Journal of Agricultural, Food and Environmental Law
Volume 1 Issue 1, 2026

Water rights authority proceedings

Siddhartha[1], Y. Meena[2]
Department of Textile Chemistry Faculty of Technology and Engineering, The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda, Vadodara, India.

Article Info
Received: 15-11-2025 Revised: 22-12-2025 Accepted: 02-01-2026 Published: 10-01-2026

Abstract

Strong relationships may often be seen between the many specialized areas, which have developed as a consequence of overlaps occurring when completing various area-related duties. It is evident that even the administrative region that deals with water, a natural resource, would consist of a combination of many administrative units. The reason for this is because administrative responsibilities pertaining to water might be seen as particular problems associated with other administrative domains. Therefore, from the standpoint of administrative law, water rights may be defined as the whole body of laws whose administrative emphasis is on water as a public natural resource. However, this led to the development of a new regulatory domain, the regulations of which must be upheld via particular procedures.

Keywords: water law, water rights, water management, administrative law

Different management areas, also known as specialized administrative areas, are created during public administration activities in response to social and economic needs.1 Because each of these specialized administrative domains usually serves the fulfillment of several responsibilities requiring specialist expertise in addition to legal and administrative know-how, they need distinctive and characteristic administration and regulation. However, one of the characteristics of administrative operations is that, in spite of its definition, a particular region is seldom organizedly isolated from the other areas. Strong relationships may often be seen between the many specialized areas, which have developed as a consequence of overlaps occurring when completing various area-related duties. It is evident that even the administrative region that deals with water, a natural resource, would consist of a combination of many administrative units. The reason for this is because administrative responsibilities pertaining to water might be seen as particular problems associated with other administrative domains. If one looks at the activities that take place in the area of water management, it is evident that they often include transportation, healthcare, building, or nature preservation, all of which have a similar problem—in this instance, water.2 As a result, it may be said that when considering water rights from

Water as a national treasure management, water-related utility services, and the protection of water as a natural treasure are just a few of the various areas into which water rights can be separated from regulatory and administrative perspectives. The administrative subject of administrative law is the entire set of laws that focus on water as a public natural treasure. Water rights may, of course, be further subdivided into more

focused areas, such as the preservation of subterranean and above-surface waters, but this is not a major concern for this research. The objective of public administration during administrative activities is to Legislation, operational execution, and the application of the law in specific situations are used to carry out the contents of the relevant laws and regulations. The exercise of operative execution is another common characteristic of water administration. Legislative activities are also present in water-related administration because, in
addition to the contents of legislation, such general regulations must be adopted in order for the designated administrative area to be operated efficiently. The organizational system's structure logically gives birth to the managing and overseeing tasks. In order to organize the involvement of citizens, there are also other activities taking place, such as mass management operations during flood defense efforts. Additionally, material-type tasks like the so-called "dam goalkeeper" tasks performed by the organization's staff might also fall under this category. However, water rights administration also oversees a number of particular situations in which the relevant laws are implemented; in practical terms, this refers to the judgments made and the corresponding actions carried out in connection with specific cases, such as authority law enforcement. In practical terms, authority law enforcement may be defined as the decision-making process that determines an individual's rights and/or duties. Practically speaking, authority procedures may be discussed if a decision is reached in the particular situation. As a result, the decision is the main component of the procedure as it is essentially the basis for all the rules of proceedings and can only be interpreted in light of it.5 With regard to its topic, the judgment may, first, It is evident that its primary role is to administer health-related matters, including the right to safe drinking water. It also serves as a regulatory domain for commerce and consumer protection. Construction and (water) transportation-related issues are governed by Act LVII of 1995 on Water Management. Additionally, it is evident that the water resource tax and the agricultural water supply charge established in the same legislation have economic regulatory functions.

3 For this reason, the topic of water cannot be reduced to a single law and its corresponding decrees. Act LIII of 1995 on the General Rules of Environmental preservation is another Act that may be regarded as legislation on the issue. It has a distinct chapter on the preservation of waterways (Paras. 18 to 21), but its reach is considerably larger.

4 Gov. Decree No. 72/1996 (V.22.) or Gov. Decree No. 366/2015 specify the entities carrying out the administrative functions, among other requirements for water rights administration operations. (XI.2). Government-level regulation is required for certain partial responsibilities related to the management of water rights. Gov. Decree No. 220/2004 (VII.21) on surface water protection regulations. 5 The ability of the designated authority to make a decision that has the necessary legal impact and can be effectively implemented is a sign of the success of authority processes. proclaim a right; this usually applies to government-issued permissions. Second, decisions have the power to establish

duties, such as authority orders. Thirdly, there are rulings that impose penalties, such as authority rulings that impose administrative fines during legal procedures. In the management of water rights, decisions that resolve conflicts between two parties are uncommon. As a result, I would like to describe the authority processes that are taking place within the framework of water rights administrations in the system of decisions made over proceedings in the following.

I believe it is essential to look at a particularity of administrative procedures by giving information on the relevant laws before presenting the authority proceedings used in water rights administration. Administrative procedures may include a wide range of topics. This has a fairly straightforward explanation: the government is concerned in a variety of societal issues that are always changing. There will always be social and economic issues that call for government action. It may be said that public administration is always changing as such involvement is prone to change in both location and time. An example that directly relates to water rights is a great way to illustrate this point. Access to clean drinking water is a basic human necessity. In actuality, water access was only systematically established by the government in the 20th century. Large towns were the only places where administrative acts (of a pretty basic sort) could be found prior to that period. The right to clean drinking water has now become a basic right due to societal progress. As a consequence, it is now essential that this fundamental right be governed by laws. However, this led to the development of a new regulatory domain, the regulations of which must be upheld via particular procedures. Similar advancements in a number of other spheres of life were brought about by social, economic, and technological innovation, which expanded the scope of administrative laws. In the latter part of the 19th century, this phenomena gained considerable importance in Hungarian administrative law. Legislation pertaining to procedures therefore expanded dramatically. Attempts to streamline public administration toward the end of the 19th century reflected the increased need for streamlining and improving the efficiency of public administration activities. Creating universal authority proceeding rules is one technique to simplify administrative law.7 Is it possible to create general procedural rules that apply to all administrative cases? Throughout administrative procedural law's history, this query seen as the process's objective. The authority may proclaim this fact in a judgment that takes the form of an order ending the procedure if this clause is not fulfilled.
Article XX, Section 1 of the Hungarian Fundamental Law states that "Everyone has the right to physical and mental health." Section (2) Hungary will facilitate the implementation of the right outlined in Section (1) by ensuring that its agriculture is free of genetically modified organisms, guaranteeing access to wholesome food and drinking water, managing labor safety and healthcare services, encouraging sports and regular physical activity, and protecting the environment.

Has shown significant worth in every reforming era. The relationships between general and particular regulations made this clear. The development of administrative procedural

law shows that no such broad administrative procedural act has been passed to yet that might be widely applicable to the whole field of public administration. However, it has been shown that the use of a general proceeding law is still feasible based on customary procedures. It has recently been discovered that many legal institutions and regulations pertaining to the procedures may be utilized in most various forms of proceedings with the same degree of efficiency. If you look at the rules on limiting the duration of procedures, you may find a straightforward example. Based on a theoretical theory, you can deduce that the rules on the beginning and ending dates of proceedings can be implemented realistically in every case. However, it is hard to establish a single time restriction for conducting proceedings.8 As a result, the branches of public administration have a dual nature wherein laws pertaining to material law must simultaneously address procedural law concerns. In more fortunate circumstances, these procedural law restrictions only include essential departures from standard procedural standards.

As a result, the main responsibility of law enforcement in every specialized administrative domain is to make clear which legislative requirements apply in the particular procedure and which procedural law features they should be taken into consideration. The legislative background that applies to water rights administration proceedings is organized as follows: Act CL of 2016 on General Public Administration Procedures (GPAP Act) provisions must be applied in water rights administration proceedings, just like in the majority of other administrative proceedings. This practice results from the fact that water rights administration procedures (permits, orders, etc.) often exhibit traits that are comparable to those of other authority actions. Therefore, the use of legal institutions not covered by the GPAP Act is not necessary for these procedures. However, the implementation of region-specific regulations is also required due to the necessity for effective procedures. These restrictions may be found in specialized administrative laws that essentially do not govern procedural law matters; one such law is the legislative act on water management.

Legislators indicate in the water management act that written forms are preferred during the water rights implementation permit acquisition process, or they issue an order that disregards the application of decisions with suspended effect.9 In certain authority proceedings, a more thorough determination of the 8 As an example, Act CCIX of 2011 states that (2) The statute of limitations for actions is (a) 30 days for the Authority procedures outlined in Paras. 16 and 9(5), as well as (b) six months in relation to the procedures outlined in Para. 35. Regarding the instances listed in the paragraph. Government Decree No. 72/1996 (V.22) states in 11/C that "the limit period for water rights implementation permits is fifteen days." 9 paragraphs. Act LVII of 1995, Section 28/B, "During water right administrative processes a) requests, b) requests for corrections and supplements, and c) statements from impacted parties may only be filed in writing. 28/C "The exercise of the requested right is not required to be expressed during water right administrative proceedings, regarding decisions with suspended effects as defined in the law on general administrative proceedings."sphere of topics could also be required.

10 Rules on administrative actions are not limited to legislation; they may also be found in the sphere of water management. Decrees also control a number of procedural law matters. On the one hand, these regulations include more particular details or departures from general rules.11 On the other hand, there are certain problems in the authority or topic of public administration that cannot be governed in a general way. From the standpoint of procedural law, these instances often include the specification of the competent party of a power, which is a serious problem.

12 The cause for this difficulty is the enormous rise in the responsibilities that public administration must now handle. Only a bigger apparatus, which now requires a system of bodies, can do these activities well in terms of quantity and professional considerations. The issue of completing the duties is made more difficult by the fact that task performance in public administration is always evolving. Tasks in public administration are caused by a number of, usually external, variables. The cancelation of mandatory military duty, which has many social and economic roots, is another example that relates to the management of water rights. This choice has unanticipated repercussions, such as in the management of water rights and flood prevention, among other areas. A sizable pool of organized human resources was made available by young men doing their mandatory military duty, which was crucial for effective flood defense. Organizing human resources has become a new type of item on the list of administrative tasks, as evidenced by floods that occurred after mandatory military service was abolished.13 As a result, it is evident that competence cannot be determined in general procedural law rules, so such 10 Act LIII of 1995, Paragraph. 90 (2) states that "the owner, rightful user, and registered land right holder of the property affected by the environmental hazard or environmental damage will be the responsible party in the case of an environmental hazard or environmental damage." 98 (1) "Associations established by citizens to represent their environmental interests and other social organizations that are active in the impact area but do not meet the criteria for political parties or interest representations (henceforth: organizations) shall be entitled in their area to the legal status of being a party to the case in environmental protection state administration procedures."

11 Special responsible party-related regulations are included in Paragraph 1/A (1) of Government Decree No. 72/1996 (V.22.) "In water rights administration actions, without regard of Para. 10 (1) of the GPAP Act, an affected party is (a) the builder; (b) the appropriate competent water authority (henceforth referred to as the water directorate) if the water works, water use, or water facility affect waters, beds, or water structures in state ownership; (c) the relevant agricultural water utility supplier; (d) in the case of affected agricultural land, the registered land user of the land affected in water works, water use, or water facility; and (e) the provisions in Subpara. d) The registered land right holder, property manager, or owner of the land impacted by water works, water usage, or water facilities. 12 In contrast to administrative procedural law, competence may be more broadly controlled in judicial procedural law due to its smaller apparatus and limited scope. Section of Act CXXX of 2016 on Civil Procedures. 8, Criminal Proceedings Act

XC of 2017, Paragraph. 12.

13 Although flood protection is not always within the purview of police duties, the employment of police forces was mandated. Civil society engagement also became necessary, but organizing this element presents additional administrative obstacles. The particular area regulations control competences.14 The goal of this research is not to provide a thorough overview of all the laws pertaining to the management of water rights. This would already be a significant effort if one merely took into account special authority designations. It is clear from the aforementioned instances that multi-level regulation is another feature of the management of water rights. As a result, it is evident in a water-related authority action that judgments are usually based on a number of laws, necessitating greater, more focused attention from law enforcement agencies

1. Decisions made on entitlements and the respective proceedings

Through authority processes, members of the public and the government interact directly with law enforcement operations. Only in a subtle, "lurking" way can individuals of society have the rights and duties outlined in laws. Such real relationships are usually only realized during authority procedures, when judgments are made that impact our rights and duties and essentially serve to impose the legal consequences outlined in the statute. The responsible authority takes judgments about the exercise of constitutional rights in a large portion of administrative matters. These procedures are required because laws specify how certain rights may be exercised. Everyone is entitled to engage in construction-related activities. However, exercising this privilege requires fulfilling the requirements outlined by the relevant authorities. Everyone has the right to use water since it is a public natural resource, although the amount of usage is regulated and, in some situations, subject to certain requirements.15. There are often specific protected interests or interests with a particular priority in the context of restrictions on such exercising of rights. In this instance, protecting water as a natural resource or managing it responsibly is such a priority interest. It seems that restrictions on the exercise of rights occur for a purpose. Determining the conditions and circumstances under which the exercise of rights may be realized is so crucial. The relevant permission is sometimes used as a determining instrument in authority procedures. The framework for the lawful exercise of rights will be included in a permit as an authority decision. A permit may be seen as a tool of control in addition to its main function of enforcing the legal consequences it contains. In essence,

14 Government Decree No. 72/1996 (V.22.) on the application of authority powers in water management; Government Decree No. 223/2014 (IX.4.) on the appointment of public administration offices and authorities of water management and protection against water-related damages; Government Decree No. 366/2015 (XII.2.) designating the authorities responsible for water protection and amending specific governmental decrees pertaining to water management. While law-based restrictions only provide far slower reactions, government decrees that regulate competencies enable rapid

adaptation to possible changes.

15. See also the laws governing wells that serve irrigation or drinking water, Paras. Government Decree No. 72/1996 (V.22) on the application of authority powers in water management, sections 8/A to 8/E.

Whether or not an act constitutes a public administration concern depends on whether it requires a permission. The act is a matter of public administration if a permission is needed. The permitting process may be thought of as a preliminary authority inspection whether an activity needs a permit. The license applicant wants to understand the terms and restrictions on their ability to exercise their rights. Consequently, a permission is a response from a governmental body to the applicant. In this manner, the authority has completed the controlling activity before the rights are exercised since it established the legitimate scope of the exercise based on the evaluation of the license application, and a judgment is then made on the matter. Only after and in accordance with the permit's terms may the rights really be exercised. Preliminary authority oversight is insufficient in certain sorts of approved activity, nevertheless.

The examination of how the permit rules are being implemented is particularly important in these situations. Permitting is actually done in a multi-phase procedure in these kinds of situations. In addition to the need to file a permit application, the requesting party is liable to a number of implementation-related requirements. It will be the party's responsibility to inform the designated authority when the acts outlined in the permission are being carried out, as well as how they will be carried out. In actuality, this stage of the procedure might be seen of as a kind of posterior control over the exercise of rights. There are many reasons why this could be necessary. On the one hand, it is evident that the law enforcement party wants to prevent the other party from exercising their rights in a way that deviates from the terms of the permission. If you think about it, there's a chance that, in the absence of such worries, the license holder may seem to accept the ruling, but in reality, they might violate the license's terms and use their rights in a manner that benefits them. It is rather evident that if people could "quietly" use their rights in the manner of their choice, they wouldn't try to seek legal remedies for unfavorable rulings since they may no longer be in control of their actions.

However, these parties are sufficiently motivated to use their rights in a complying manner by the knowledge that their executed acts would undoubtedly be examined. Moreover, the multi-phase control of permission procedures is justified by more than simply the application party's possible bad faith. When it comes to certain actions, situations that could not be anticipated even with meticulous thought may arise throughout the implementation process. In certain situations, it is acceptable to look at how rights could be used in light of the deviation occurring or if they can be enjoyed at all. Even multi-phase authority processes sometimes fail to ensure adequate adherence to the relevant laws' requirements.

There are several situations when it is only possible to partially regulate the actions

occurring between the two permitting procedures. Such an issue usually arises when the result—abuilt building, for instance—seemingly conforms with the permit's requirements. However, it might be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to verify the actual materials used for building and if construction has been completed in accordance with the acceptable level of quality. It is unrealistic to expect authorities to be present at every stage of the activity outlined in the permission. For this reason, it is necessary to look for a system that offers enough assurance for appropriate, thorough monitoring between the two permitting stages, i.e., the two authority inspections. The most effective way to address this issue in authority procedures is to include outside parties. For such engagement, there are a number of possible alternatives. One way is for an outside party to be given some kind of authority, such as the position of Chief Technical Engineer, which allows them to practically supervise building activities by recording each one in a designated document, such a construction logbook. At the conclusion of the procedure, the engineer issues a statement on the legitimacy of the work done; this statement is particularly important during the second step of permitting.

The second alternative is when the person doing the construction is required by law to document the building operations in accordance with the applicable laws, so asserting the legitimacy of the construction projects.16. In both situations, only those designated by the law are permitted to perform such duties, and in practice, it is the assumption of obligations that may symbolize and justify the adherence to the law.17. The following conclusions about water rights implementation permitting processes might be drawn in light of the aforementioned: Activities pertaining to water as a valuable natural resource usually demand for licenses or reports. The statute specifies a very wide range of activities that need permits, including the execution of water-related projects, the building or renovation, commissioning, operation, or closure of water facilities, and the usage of water. The statute refers to all issuable permit categories under the collective phrase "water rights implementation permits" when discussing water management.18.

Given its topic and, on the other hand, its purpose, a water rights implementation permit might take many distinct forms. The two-phase permitting process mentioned above is used in processes pertaining to water constructions. Water constructions cannot be built or rebuilt without a water rights establishing permission. In order to commission and operate finished water infrastructure, the legislation requires obtaining a water rights operating permit. A termination permit is necessary for various topics, such as the dismantling of a water structure. The filing of applications initiates the permitting procedure and creates a procedural responsibility for the relevant authority. This might be a fascinating matter as a possible legal repercussion of an 16 Ministerial Decree No. 101/2007 (XII.23.) KvVM on the professional and technical requirements of the intervention into subsurface water supply and water well drilling, paragraph 7 (2) "The constructor must lead records documenting all the key work data and work conditions during the complete period of implementation." Notes on tests specified in the construction design, the water rights implementation permit, or, in the case of drilled wells, the daily drill reports, must be included in these documents. Additionally, a portion of the paperwork must include the construction logbook maintained in

accordance with the government decree on executed construction operations, with the exception of wells under local governments' permission authority.

17 Paragraphs 13 Subparas. Ministerial Decree No. 101/2007 (XII.23.) KvVM on the Professional and Technical Requirements of the Intervention into Subsurface Water Supply and of Water Well Drilling contains the professional tasks that are necessary to carry out the activities listed in the decree's title (2) to (4). 18 Water Management Act LVII of 1995, Paragraph 28/A. §.

An order is anything that is done without a permission. Additionally, the law may accept requests for posterior permissions and the associated legal ramifications. Even if a permission might still be granted, an order will be issued if the other party does not take advantage of this chance. Additionally, there are instances when parties apply for actions that don't need permissions. Nonetheless, the authority must continue carry out the procedure and notify the person making the request that a license is not needed for the intended activity. In contrast to the usual restrictions, the law in this instance requires a written form for the application. This is inevitably related to the fact that an application for a water rights permit usually requires the submission of technical and professional paperwork that cannot be given informally.19. Generally speaking, the norms of judgments with suspended effect do not need to be applied in water-related authority procedures. When a layman makes the request, these choices might have a big impact. In these situations, a judgment with suspended effect essentially provides information about the parties' rights in the event that the authority engaged in misbehavior.

It is quite uncommon for a completely non-professional party to make an application during water rights administrative processes. Professionals with knowledge of the permitting process develop the technical paperwork included in the application. In the process of water rights administrative actions, it is also necessary to notify known impacted parties. The basic principles provide relatively ambiguous guidelines for determining the impacted party status. Such a conclusion is sometimes subject to rigorous review based on the degree of engagement of the rights or the legitimate interests, which may result in disagreements or occasionally cause the procedures to be delayed. The legislature exercises its authority to establish objective impacted party statuses in order to prevent such situations.Twenty Naturally, this does not imply that the general principles cannot be used to determine a party's status; rather, it means that the existence of participation has no effect on the sorts of affected parties listed in the law.

People 19 Government Decree No. 72/1996 (V.22.) on the implementation of authority powers in water management, Paragraph 1/B (1) "The water rights implementation permit contains—further to Paragraph 36 (1) of the GPAP Act, (if relevant) to ministerial decrees on intervention with subsurface waters and on the service fees of water rights administrative proceedings, as well as the contents of Paras." (3) to (5) herein: the licence documentation specified in the ministerial decree on the

documentation needed for the water rights implementation permitting procedure (henceforth referred to as the Min. Decree); or, in the case of procedures for conceptual water right permits, the documentation containing the technical details. 20 Refer to Government Decree No. 72/1996 (V.22.) on the implementation of authority powers in water management, Paragraph 1/A. (1) "In water rights administration proceedings, without consideration of Paragraph 10(1) of the GPAP Act, an affected party will be (a) the constructor; (b) if the water works, water use, or water facility affects waters, beds, or water structures in state ownership, the respective competent water authority (hence, water directorate); (d) the registered land user of the affected agricultural land; and (e) the owner, property manager, or registered land right holder of the land affected in water works, water use, or water facility." Regardless of their activity, those designated by names will be regarded as impacted parties.

2.Proceedings related to obligation-imposing decisions

From the standpoint of the substance side of decisions, the group of processes carried out for imposing duties is another sizable category of water rights administrative actions. Such decisions serve the purpose of ensuring that no party would engage in undesired behaviors with respect to a particular regulatory issue, as explained in the section above. The permission procedure may be a useful instrument to ensure such lawfulness in situations when the impacted party interacts with the authority and exhibits legal behavior. However, there are instances when the impacted party disregards the legal requirements to the point where it doesn't even look for information about the need of licenses for its operations. The party may also deliberately evade the permission process. The authorities are responsible for investigating such incidents and determining the appropriate course of action. This is done via own-initiative procedures. Own-initiative procedures are different from proceedings upon requests in terms of how they begin. In these situations, the authority initiates an authority procedure after learning of a fact (in this instance, a water structure operating without a permission). The kind of information that must be obtained is not specified by law. As a result, any method may be used to get such indirect information.21. In these situations, the authority may, in theory, take into account whether or not the process is supported by the available data. Usually, the authority just choose whether or not to conduct an inspection initially. In actuality, however, there isn't much space for discretion when it comes to starting a process. In actuality, the authority may only take into account whether or not the collected information's topic is an authority case. If it is, the procedure can only be avoided if the case's subject is too marginal, which is rarely the case with regard to water administration because anything that needs a permit and is subject to

regulations—that is, creates an authority proceeding—is unlikely to be of marginal extent. The authority initially conducts an inspection after receiving the information in order to draw attention to the specific conditions. The authority decides whether to start the process based on the inspection's findings. When the authority conducts a focused inspection, usually based on a preliminary plan, it is another direct way to get information.22 It seems that inspection operations often precede own-initiative authority procedures. Since inspections are not categorized as authority cases—that is, as discrete parts of procedures—they are distinctive components of processes. However, an inspection is an important part of a 21. Incoming reports are perhaps the most frequent instance. There are almost no restrictions on how information may be received. A picture, a recital, or a movie may also provide the authorities with information.
22 Paragraphs 7 and 8 of Government Decree No. 66/2015 (III.30) on capital and county government offices, district (capital's district) offices, their professional control, and the seat and competence area of district offices regulate the planned regulating activities.

method, as the results of the inspection—that is, the determination that misbehavior has occurred—determine both the start of the procedure and often its outcome. This is because the results of the inspections confirm the veracity of the particular situation, and inspections are linked to the explanation of the facts.23. The process will not begin if, during an inspection, the authority does not disclose circumstances—that is, evidence—justifying the launch of a procedure and possible decision-making later on. The justification process is therefore completed, even if only partially, if the conditions for starting the procedure are stated. The effectiveness of the justifying process usually determines the substance of authority choices. Therefore, if the inspection is not done correctly, it might lead to the inability to make an effective conclusion. As a result, regulations pertaining to proceedings must also be followed during inspections. The fundamental processes are strongly linked to inspections. This relationship might be troublesome with regard to the administrative limit period. It raises the question of how long an authority has to decide whether to start a process if it finds misbehavior during the inspection. The legislation simply stipulates among the norms of own-initiative processes that the first act of proceeding is the commencement date for the procedural limit period, therefore it lacks explicit limitations.24. But in such scenario, what may be regarded as the first act of proceeding? The first act of proceeding, in my opinion, is the revelation of a legal violation; otherwise, the procedural limit period is meaningless. However, there are situations when, for instance, samples are collected during the inspection and their analysis takes longer. In these situations, the violation can only be disclosed

after the outcomes are known, therefore that will be the beginning point. However, there are no more barriers to the prompt start of the administrative procedure once the violation has been declared.25. The substance of rulings is where own-initiative processes and proceedings upon requests vary most. The decision's substance in own-initiative procedures might be either imposing punishment or outlining a responsibility. A decision outlining an obligation outlines the behavior that the impacted party must adhere to. Such behavior may take the shape of an active act, which typically aims to accomplish a certain task, or a passive one, in the event that the law enforcement agency mandates refraining from a particular action.26. Sanctions will be applied as legal repercussions if an impacted party's wrongdoing that violates public administration operations is discovered during the authority procedure.27.

23 See Boros 2010 for more details on reasons in administrative processes. 24 GPAP Act, Paragraph 104 (3) 25 Although the GPAP Act's Paragraph 50(6) stipulates that a procedural action's performance deadline is typically limited to eight days, I think that applying this rule to own-initiative proceedings is unreasonable and will only cause the proceeding period to be needlessly extended. 26 In water management, decisions that specify responsibilities are referred to as water rights duties. Refer to paragraph 18 of Government Decree No. 72/1996 (V.22.) about the use of authority powers in water management. Fines are usually imposed as a penalty of authority procedures. Fines may be used in a variety of ways in the administration of water rights, such as as a water management fine.

In authority proceedings, there is also a unique kind of judgment where the authority simultaneously announces an entitlement and imposes punishment. This kind is used when a facility may be allowed to operate but was built without a permission or in violation of the terms of an existing permit. In some situations, the implementation conforms with the law, but it was done without a permission or in violation of the permit's terms; yet, this does not warrant ordering the decommissioning of the specific item. As a result, even if the building may be saved, the infringement must have repercussions, usually the imposition of penalties.

3.Registries

Having enough information on the particular case is a prerequisite for a successful administrative process. Through witness reports or comments from impacted parties, the necessary details are often obtained throughout the hearing. Since the data may be required in the future, it makes sense for the authorities to gather and keep it in an

organized way to facilitate future procedures. It is sufficient to consider the possibility that the initial planning of authority inspections may not be feasible in the absence of information about the locations of the buildings or activities that need to be examined. Registries do this function. Naturally, registers serve as a foundation for strategic branch planning in addition to storing data that may be used in authority processes.28. These registers are relevant to the topic of this research not only because they are essential components of certain authority procedures, but also because adding or removing items from a registry is regarded as an authority proceeding. The designated authority is responsible for adding or removing entries from water-books registries. The order outlining the creation or revocation of the right or duty to be registered contains the justifications for such actions. It is eight days after the order is finalized. Since data delivery from registries falls within the category of authority processes, it is also necessary to specify the relevant regulations. Parties who are categorized as impacted parties may access the data from water-book registries, confirming their relevance. In actuality, this rule gives the authorities the power to take into account whether or not there is participation. This regulation was established prior to the implementation of the GPAP Act.29 GPAP Since the Act bases the title of affected party on direct participation, this factor must also be taken into account in respect to water registries. General procedural standards must be used in registries-related cases.Either as a water protection fee specified in paragraph 35 of Government Decree No. 438/2015 (XII. 28.) or as specified in that document. 28. Records of water management structures, which are a part of the water management records and essentially include the list and key information on waters and water constructions of national and local importance, might serve as a suitable foundation for such an act.

29 In accordance with Government Decree No. 182/2009 (IX.10), Paragraph 22 (3) of Government Decree No. 72/1996 (V.22.) on the application of authority powers in water management was approved. In conclusion, we can say that water rights administration procedures do not have any unique features that would need the creation of a unique set of procedural rules. Procedures are controlled by provisions outlined in the basic procedural regulations, with the exception of the minor rules partially discussed in this research.