PROPERTY RIGHTS REGIME IN CIVIL LAW REGARDING INCOME-GENERATING ACTIVITIES OF INTERNAL AFFAIRS BODIES: PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS

Atadjanov Dilmurat Tadjimuratovich
Independent Researcher at the Academy of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Uzbekistan, Lieutenant Colonel.
Tel.: (97) 707-76-01.
e-mail: atadil_76@mail.ru
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17111295

Abstract: This article addresses the issues surrounding the property rights regime in relation to income-generating activities of internal affairs bodies within the framework of civil law, and proposes solutions. It analyzes the characteristics of property rights of internal affairs bodies, the regulatory and legal basis for their income-generating activities, and practical problems. The article also examines shortcomings in existing legislation, obstacles to exercising property rights, and offers proposals for their elimination. The research aims to enhance transparency and efficiency in the activities of state bodies.

Keywords: civil law, internal affairs bodies, property rights, income generation, regulatory framework, legislation, transparency, efficiency

Internal affairs bodies constitute an important structural component in the system of state bodies. To perform their assigned functions and tasks flawlessly, these state bodies must be equipped with modern material and technical support and provided with timely and continuous financial resources. It is known that internal affairs bodies are financed from budget funds. Additionally, their material and technical support, necessary material resources, and property are assigned to them by the state based on the right of operational management as prescribed by law.

It is evident that market economy conditions create the need for self-sufficiency among its participants, and state bodies involved in these relations also seek legal ways to generate additional income necessary for the effective implementation of their activities. After all, our national legislation does not restrict state bodies and institutions from engaging in income-generating activities; on the contrary, it defines the legal mechanisms for their implementation. Moreover, the potential for problems such as shortages or insufficient allocation of state budget funds, which can occur in our country as in any other, creates the need for state bodies, including internal affairs bodies, to carry out income-generating activities within a framework that does not interfere with their main functions.

Of course, our national legislation provides state bodies, including internal affairs bodies, with the opportunity to carry out income-generating activities. In particular, Article 180 of the Civil Code states: "If, in accordance with the constituent documents, an institution is granted the right to engage in income-generating activities, the income received from such activities and the property acquired with this income shall be transferred to the independent disposal of the institution and recorded on a separate balance sheet." That is, our national legislation provides that internal affairs bodies, whose civil-legal status is an institution, can carry out income-generating activities in cases stipulated by their constituent documents. However, our legislation does not regulate in detail the right of state institutions to carry out

income-generating activities. In particular, the procedure for carrying out such activities and the legal fate of the funds and property obtained as a result have not been resolved.

It is known that internal affairs bodies exercise the rights of ownership, use, and disposal of the property assigned to them in the manner prescribed by Article 178 of the Civil Code and Article 24 of the Law "On State Property Management." At the same time, the legal status of the Department of Internal Affairs as a subject of the right of operational management and economic management, the powers to dispose of the property assigned on the basis of this right and the procedure for its restriction, and some relations related to the possibility of carrying out income-generating activities are regulated to a certain extent by special legislation regulating the activities of internal affairs bodies.

In civil legislation, the property rights of subjects of property rights (citizens, legal entities, and the state) and their exercise are distinguished by their civil-legal status and organizational-legal form, and a special procedure is established for them. In particular, Article 168 of the Civil Code states: "The specifics of the emergence and termination of property rights, the right to own, use, and dispose of property, depending on whether the property is the property of a citizen, legal entity, or the state, are determined by law." That is, the legislator linked the emergence or termination of property rights to the legal status (status) of the property subject (owner). More specifically, the property rights of state legal entities (the right of possession, use, and disposal) are distinguished by their organizational and legal form, and the state assigns its property to them on the basis of the right of operational management, as noted in Article 178 of the Civil Code. In addition, in the second part of Article 180 of the Civil Code, entitled "Disposal of the Institution's Property," there is a provision stating: "If, in accordance with the constituent documents, the institution is granted the right to engage in income-generating activities, the income received from such activities and the property acquired at the expense of this income shall be transferred to the independent disposal of the institution and recorded on a separate balance sheet." This allows us to emphasize that the legislator grants the institution, in addition to the right of operational management, another property right, which is called the "right of independent disposal of income." V.A. Saryev, who conducted a scientific analysis of Russian legislation on this issue (part 2 of Article 298 of the Civil Code), notes that "the regime of the right of operational management does not apply to such income and property of the institution. Such property cannot be withdrawn from the institution without its consent. As a result, a separate property right of the institution to a certain type of property arises - the right of independent disposal"[1]. In our opinion, this right of the institution, arising in special cases stipulated by law, differs in its content from other property rights. Due to the fact that the legislation does not clearly define the content of this right granted to the institution, various interpretations have arisen in the legal literature. In particular, in the literature, various doctrinal approaches are put forward by civilist scholars that "the right to independently dispose of the income of an institution" is a type of "operational management right," which is "the right of economic management," which is both "the right of economic management" and "the right of operational management," which is a "special type of limited property right," which is "property right." In this regard, we consider it expedient to conduct a scientific analysis of some of the doctrinal concepts expressed on this issue.

For example, V.A. Tsaryov approaches this issue from the point of view of the budget legislation of the Russian Federation (part 5 of Article 41 of the Civil Code of the Russian Federation), stating that "the institution's right of independent disposal is a type of right of operational management of property"[7], while O.A. Khatunsev states that "the right of independent disposal of income and property received from it is a separate property right of the institution, but these income and property received from them still belong to the institution on the basis of the right of operational management"[8]. Of course, each of these statements has its own legal basis. In particular, the content of the Civil Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan and the laws "On State Property Management" also provides for the assignment of property of state institutions to them on the basis of the right of operational management. However, in our opinion, if the legislator wished to establish the regime of the right of operational management of funds received by the institution from income-generating activities and property acquired at the expense of these funds, it would directly indicate this, as defined in part two of Article 181 of the Civil Code. That is, the legislator established the transfer to the operational management of the institution of products, products and income received from the use of property under operational management, as well as property arising in the institution under a contract or on other grounds. However, part two of Article 180 of the Civil Code stipulates that the funds received by the institution from income-generating activities and the property acquired with these funds are transferred to its independent disposal and are recorded on a separate balance sheet. Through such a comparative analysis, we cannot agree with the above-mentioned opinion of V.A. Saryev and O.A. Khatunsev, that "the right of operational management arises in relation to the income of the institution from income-generating activities and the property acquired at the expense of this income."

In this regard, V.V. Kvanina proposed the introduction of a regime of the right of economic management in relation to income and property received by the institution as a result of permitted entrepreneurial activity, and, in her opinion, believes that "it is under such a regime of property rights that institutions can independently dispose of this property (except for real estate) and funds, and, in addition, bear independent property liability for their entrepreneurial obligations"[10].

In our view, the author's opinion is based on the normative legal acts in force during the period of the former Union, including the Law of the RSFSR "On Citizenship and Property in the RSFSR" of December 24, 1990. In particular, these regulatory legal acts established a regime of the right of economic management in relation to property and income received by the institution from permitted entrepreneurial activity, as well as funds received from income-generating activities and property acquired at their expense. Of course, the opinion of V.V. Kvanina cannot be completely refuted, and this corresponds to the legislation of the Russian Federation, but such a point of view does not correspond to the reforms being carried out in our current national legislation. In particular, in accordance with the Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan dated February 7, 2025 No. ЗРУ-1025[11], the "right of economic management" was excluded from the Civil Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan.

The opinions of Professor E.A. Sukhanov on the issue under discussion are of particular importance. That is, E.A. Sukhanov initially firmly stated that the institution's "right of independent disposal of income is the right of economic management"[12] and that "the characteristic of its status as a separate real right, not directly indicated by the legislator, leaves no doubt that it is the right of economic management"[13]. However, subsequently, E.A.

Sukhanov proposed "to consider the right of independent disposal of property as a type of existing rights of this type, i.e., the right of "reduced" economic management or the right of "expanded" operational management."[14] Of course, it can be considered that E.A. Sukhanov's scientific conclusion, which contradicts his initial opinion, is related to the reforms carried out in the civil legislation of the Russian Federation, i.e., the emergence of institutions of various organizational and legal forms (budgetary, autonomous, private, etc.), the establishment of differences in the legislation in their activities that generate income, the legal regime of these earned income and property attributed to them, and the introduction of new rules. However, at the same time, we consider Professor E.A. Sukhanov's point of view to be one of the scientific approaches in civil studies worthy of admiration. That is, the scientist-civilist proposed not to consider the income of the institution from income-generating activities and the property acquired at the expense of this income as a separate new type of property right, but to use the existing types of property rights (the right of economic management and operational management) and define it as the right of "reduced" economic management or the right of "expanded" operational management. However, as mentioned above, due to the abolition of the economic management regime in our national legislation, it is not possible to accept and apply this proposal.

In legal literature, a number of civilist scholars have expressed the opinion that the "right of an institution to independently dispose of its income" should be recognized as a special type of limited property right. This is based on the fact that the institution's right of independent disposal of its income encompasses the main features of property rights, and the legislation allows the right holder to carry out certain types and volumes of legal actions in relation to income received as a result of income-generating activities and property acquired at their expense (recorded on the separate balance sheet of the institution). In particular, V.A. Saryev states: "The institution, as the owner of the right of independent disposal, has the right to own, use, and dispose of this property. At the same time, these rights are limited to a certain extent, and the institution is required to exercise these rights in accordance with the purposes of their organization. This is explained by the fact that the legislation grants this subject a special legal status in civil transactions - special legal personality"[15]. Ultimately, he believes that "the right to independently dispose of the institution's income" should be recognized as a separate type of limited property right. In our opinion, the fact that the legislation provides the institution, including the Department of Internal Affairs, with two types of property rights (i.e., the right of operational management and the right to independently dispose of income) also means that their civil-legal status has its own peculiarities.

Along with the above, in the legal literature, some lawyers believe that the funds and property obtained as a result of the income-generating activities of the institution belong to them on the basis of property rights. They argue that since the right of independent disposal is one of the most important elements constituting the right of ownership (i.e., the right of possession, use, and disposal), this right itself should be assessed as a right of ownership. For example, S.V. Prokofiev notes that "the independence of an institution means that it independently carries out all property transactions without the consent of other persons. Thus, the right of independent disposal does not differ from the right of ownership in terms of the scope of powers"[16], while V.A. Dozortsev notes that "the institution's right of independent disposal is broader than its right of economic management, and no restrictions,

such as the right of ownership, are established in its exercise"[17]. Lawyers V.P. Mozolin, E.V. Barinova, D.V. Saraev, supporting the opinions of the above-mentioned scholars, noted that "the legal regime of this category of property is very close to the legal regime inherent in property rights"[18].

In our opinion, as a result of such interpretation of the norms of the law, there is no basis for determining the regime of property rights in relation to the "right of independent disposal of the institution." Because, if the legislator wanted to equate the institution's right of independent disposal with the right of ownership, it would have directly indicated in the legislation that the funds received by the institution from income and entrepreneurial activity, as well as the property received from them, belong to them on the basis of ownership. As long as the legislator does not stipulate this, the institution's right to independently dispose of the funds received from income and entrepreneurial activity and the property acquired from them differs in essence from property rights.

Based on the foregoing, it can be said that the "right of independent disposal," established by law in relation to the funds and property of institutions received from permitted income-generating activities, differs in its essence from the right of operational management and ownership. This is justified by the fact that the legislator defines the institution's "right of operational management" (Article 178 of the Civil Code) and the right "to dispose of the property of the institution" (Article 180 of the Civil Code) in separate articles. In our opinion, this circumstance does not prevent the recognition of the institution's right of disposal as a separate type of limited property right.

Civilist literature expresses the opinion about the existence of a number of types of limited property rights. Article 165 of the Civil Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan establishes a list of restricted property rights. According to it, along with the right of ownership, the following are considered real rights: the right of economic management and the right of operational management; the right of lifelong inheritable possession of a land plot; the right of permanent possession and use of a land plot; easements. According to V. Ergashev, "this list is open. Moreover, since this article does not stipulate that other property rights can be determined only by law, the author states: "In our opinion, when creating a system of limited property rights in current civil legislation, it is necessary to proceed from the scope of powers included in a particular property right. Taking this criterion into account, the system of limited property rights can take the following form: 1) right of operational management; 2) the right of limited use of another's property (servitudes); 3) rights of use and possession of another's property (right of permanent possession and use of a land plot, right of lifelong inheritable possession of a land plot, usufruct, superficium); 4) preferential right to possess another's real estate; 5) the right to receive income from another's property (the right to give material remuneration). Based on the above classification, it is advisable to make appropriate amendments to Article 165 of the Civil Code." Agreeing with the author's opinion, we consider it expedient to include in Article 165 of the Civil Code the right of state institutions, including internal affairs bodies, to independently dispose of funds and property received from income-generating activities, as part of a system of limited property rights.

The right of operational management of the Department of Internal Affairs, which is a state institution, also has its own peculiarities. The right of operational management of the Internal Affairs Directorate differs from that of other state institutions mainly in its object. That is, property prohibited for civil circulation or restricted for free circulation is also

assigned to the Internal Affairs Department on the basis of the right of operational management.

It should be noted that, despite the fact that the Civil Code establishes that state property belongs to all state organizations and institutions in the same manner (on the basis of the "right of operational management"), at the same time, they are not granted equal powers and opportunities to exercise property rights (possession, use, and disposal) in relation to this property. Because the legislator established a special procedure for exercising the right of operational management of state organizations and institutions according to their civil-legal status and organizational-legal form. This can be explained by the fact that the right of operational management of a state enterprise and institution is defined in one article of the Civil Code (Article 178 of the Civil Code), while the disposal of the property of a state enterprise (Article 179) and the disposal of the property of an institution (Article 180) are expressed in separate articles.

Article 20 of the Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. ZRU-821 "On State Property Management" lists the subjects of state property management, which are: the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan; Agency; specially authorized state bodies; state institutions, including state bodies; local government bodies. The fact that this article does not provide for the possibility of determining other authorized entities only by law means that this list is complete and open. Also, in accordance with this norm, it is indicated that "state institutions, including state bodies," are a separate subject in the management of state property, and Article 24 of the law provides for their powers.

Internal affairs bodies are a state body with a complex structure. In their system, institutions of various organizational and legal forms operate. This means that the property rights of institutions with the status of a legal entity in their system have a special character and each of them needs to be studied separately.

According to A. Gorelik, "The state, following the easiest way of adequately financing budgetary institutions, gave them the opportunity to earn money from extra-budgetary sources and assigned state property, but this does not contribute to the high-quality fulfillment of the tasks intended for their organization. While having extra-budgetary revenues of a budgetary institution allows the state to save on the costs of financing them, the fact that such activities are permitted distracts them from properly fulfilling their main obligations."[21]

In our opinion, A. Gorelik's opinion does not correspond to the conditions and principles of a market economy. After all, allowing state institutions to engage in income-generating activities on the basis of specific conditions and criteria established by law (for example, such activity should not become their main goal, should not interfere with their implementation), does not distract them from the performance of their functions and tasks, but, on the contrary, serves as a financial support for their effective implementation.

It should be noted that there are a number of gaps in our national legislation regarding the legal regime of state institutions, including the property of the Internal Affairs Bodies. For example, their rights and obligations in relation to property and property rights acquired at the expense of funds received from activities that generate income, permitted in accordance with the legislation, or acquired on the basis of gifts, donations, wills, etc., are not sufficiently regulated.

In particular, there are gaps in the legislation regarding the powers of the Internal Affairs Bodies in relation to funds received from income-generating activities and property acquired at their expense. Granting the right to engage in income-generating activities to a state institution, including the Department of Internal Affairs, the legislator did not define the legal nature of such income and the property acquired from it. After all, the legislative resolution of the gap regarding the legal regime of income received by them from activities that generate income, and the property acquired at their expense, is of great practical importance. In particular, such issues as the institution's, including the Internal Affairs Department's, liability for its obligations, the legal status of income (i.e., what it can do with these income and property, legal capacity), and what rights are transferred to the parties (counterparties) based on the transaction with such income and property would be resolved.

In our opinion, the property rights and obligations of the Internal Affairs Bodies for the use of this type of property should be clearly enshrined in special legislation, their constituent documents, and regulations. At the same time, it should be taken into account that the funds and property received by the institutions of the Ministry of Internal Affairs from income-generating activities may be recovered from their civil law obligations. This situation increases the trust of participants entering into civil transactions with the Department of Internal Affairs. Indeed, as Professor N. Kuldashev emphasized, "State bodies are liable for their contractual obligations with funds obtained through economic activities at their disposal"[22].

The Civil Code does not contain a legal definition of the right of economic management and the right of operational management. However, Article 165 of the Civil Code establishes that both the right of economic management and the right of operational management are property rights. According to the doctrine of civil law, the right of economic management and the right of operational management belong to the group of limited property rights.

Article 24 of the Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan "On State Property Management" defines the powers of state institutions, including state bodies, in the field of state property management. According to him:

leases state property assigned to him on the basis of the right of operational management in the manner prescribed by law;

disposes of state movable property, including vehicles, assigned to him on the basis of the right of operational management, within the limits of his powers established by law;

makes decisions, in agreement with the Agency, on the transfer of real estate belonging to the organizations included in its structure from one organization to another on the basis of the right of operational management;

carries out the functions of the founder of subordinate state unitary enterprises and state institutions and ensures their effective management. In addition, it is envisaged that state bodies may exercise other powers in accordance with the legislation.

Article 26 of the Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan "On Property in the Republic of Uzbekistan" states: "Property that is state property and assigned by the owner to a state institution (organization) located on the state budget is under the operational management of this institution (organization)." The second part of this article provides for the following provision: "State institutions (organizations) that are part of the state budget and may carry out economic activity in cases stipulated by the legislation of the Republic of Uzbekistan, have

the right to independently dispose of income from such activity and property acquired from it."

Article 44 of the Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan "On Internal Affairs Bodies" provides for "financing and logistical support of internal affairs bodies, at the expense of the State Budget of the Republic of Uzbekistan and other sources not prohibited by law." However, this law does not specify what constitutes "other sources not prohibited by law."

Clause 25 of the Regulation "On State Institutions," approved by Resolution No. 302 of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan dated July 21, 2023, states: "If, in accordance with the constituent documents, the institution is granted the right to engage in income-generating activities, the income received from such activities and the property acquired at the expense of this income shall be transferred to the independent disposal of the institution and recorded on a separate balance sheet." This rule is taken literally from the norm established in part two of Article 180 of the Civil Code.

According to the analysis of special legislation on the activities of internal affairs bodies, it can be said that there is no provision in special legislation defining the property rights of internal affairs bodies to engage in income-generating activities and the funds and property obtained as a result of this. This means that their property rights are legally regulated by the general rules on the property rights of institutions established by civil legislation. After all, the Law "On State Property Management," which regulates the property rights of state bodies, provides for the determination of their property rights on the grounds provided for by civil legislation.

Internal affairs bodies acquire income and property as a result of income-generating activities in accordance with the procedure established by law. A. Gorelik "Of course, allowing the Department of Internal Affairs to carry out such activities will allow saving state financing costs. However, such activities interfere with the proper fulfillment of the main tasks of institutions"[23]. Despite the fact that civil legislation allows state institutions to engage in income-generating activities and, as a result, acquire certain property, the issue of the property regime for such property remains open.

V.Kovyazin proposed that "state institutions should be granted ownership rights to income received from entrepreneurial activity and property acquired from these income"[24], while U.Kulmurodov stated that..."a state institution is granted the right to engage in income-generating activities, and it is not contrary to the general provisions of civil legislation that it is also liable for the income received from it and the property acquired from it"[25].

Based on the foregoing, it is advisable to include the following provisions in part three of Article 76 of the Civil Code: "An institution is liable for its obligations with funds at its disposal and income received from entrepreneurial activity, as well as property received from these income. If these funds are insufficient, the owner of the corresponding property bears subsidiary liability for its obligations."

In conclusion, it can be said that limited property rights in our country have gone through several stages of development. First, the widespread introduction of the right of operational management, and then the right of economic management, and finally, the period of reforms leading to the abolition of the right of economic management. As for the right of operational management, the prospects for its complete disappearance remain quite uncertain, since state institutions must also continue their activities. If the owner has the right of operational management of the property assigned to the Department of Internal Affairs, the

regime of property rights for funds received from permitted income-generating activities and property received from them must be clearly defined by law.

References:

1.Царёв В.А. Право самостоятельного распоряжения доходами и имуществом учреждений как особое вещное право // Вестник МГПУ. Серия: Юридические науки. 2009. №1. –С.115. URL: https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/pravo-samostoyatelnogo-rasporyazheniya-dohodami-i-imuschestvom-uchrezhdeniy-kak-osoboe-veschnoe-pravo (дата обращения: 22.04.2025).

2.Хатунцев О. А. Ограниченные вещные права и их специфика в системе органов внутренних дел / О.А. Хатунцев. – Уфа: Полиграфист, 2000. – 102 с.

3.Кванина В.В. Гражданско-правовое регулирование отношений в сфере высшего профессионального образования / В.В. Кванина. – М.: Готика, 2005. – С. 250-251.

4.Гражданское право: Учебник: В 4-х тт. – Т. 2: Вещное право. Наследственное право. Исключительные права. Личные неимущественные права / Отв. ред. Е.А. Суханов. – М.: Волтерс Клувер, 2005. – С.172.

5.Царёв В.А. Право самостоятельного распоряжения доходами и имуществом учреждений как особое вещное право // Вестник МГПУ. Серия: Юридические науки. 2009. №1. –С.119. URL: https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/pravo-samostoyatelnogo-rasporyazheniya-dohodami-i-imuschestvom-uchrezhdeniy-kak-osoboe-veschnoe-pravo (дата обращения: 22.04.2025).

6.Дозорцев В. А. Принципиальные черты права собственности в Гражданском кодексе В.А. Дозорцев // Гражданский кодекс России. Проблемы. Теория. Практика: Сборник памяти С.А. Хохлова / Отв. ред. А.Л. Маковский. – М.: Изд-во Международного центра финансово-экономического развития, 1998. – С. 247; Постатейный комментарий к Гражданскому кодексу Российской Федерации, частей первой, второй, третьей / Под ред. Т.Е. Абовой, М.М. Богуславского, А.Ю. Кабалкина, А.Г. Лисицына-Светланова. – М.: Юрайт-Издат, 2005. – Ст. 297–299; Баринова Е. А. Вещные права в системе субъективных гражданских прав / Е.А. Баринова // Актуальные проблемы гражданского права: Сборник статей. Вып. 6 / Под ред. О.Ю. Шилохвоста. – М.: НОРМА, 2003. – С. 170; Сараев Д. В. Имущественные права учреждений // Юрист. – 2002. – № 9. – С. 44.

7.Царёв Владимир Александрович. Право самостоятельного распоряжения доходами и имуществом учреждений как особое вещное право // Вестник МГПУ. Серия: Юридические науки. 2009. №1. –С.115. URL: https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/pravo-samostoyatelnogo-rasporyazheniya-dohodami-i-imuschestvom-uchrezhdeniy-kak-osoboe-veschnoe-pravo (дата обращения: 22.04.2025).

8.Хатунцев О. А. Ограниченные вещные права и их специфика в системе органов внутренних дел / О.А.Хатунцев. – Уфа: Полиграфист, 2000. – С.71.

9.ФКнинг 181-модда иккинчи қисмида “Оператив бошқаришда бўлган мол-мулкдан фойдаланишдан олинган ҳосил, маҳсулот ва даромадлар, шунингдек муассасада шартнома бўйича ёхуд бошқа асосларда вужудга келган мол-мулк ҳам ушбу Кодексда, бошқа қонунчиликда мулк ҳуқуқини олиш учун белгилаб қўйилган тартибда муассасанинг оператив бошқаришига ўтади” деб, аниқ белгиланган.

10.Кванина В.В. Гражданско-правовое регулирование отношений в сфере высшего профессионального образования / В.В. Кванина. – М.: Готика, 2005. – С. 250-251.
11.Ўзбекистон Республикасининг 07.02.2025 йилдаги “Корпоратив муносабатларнинг ҳуқуқий асослари янада такомиллаштирилиши муносабати билан Ўзбекистон Республикасининг айрим қонун ҳужжатларига ўзгартириш ва қўшимчалар киритиш тўғрисида”ги ЎРҚ-1025-сон қонуни. URL: https://lex.uz/docs/7367697
12.Гражданское право: Учебник: В 2-х тт. – Т. 1 / Отв. ред. Е.А. Суханов. – М.: БЕК, 1998. – С. 606-609.
13.Гражданский кодекс России. Проблемы. Теория. Практика: Сборник памяти С.А. Хохлова / Отв. ред. А.Л. Маковский. – М.: Изд-во Международного центра финансово-экономического развития, 1998. – С. 224.
14.Гражданское право: Учебник: В 4-х тт. – Т. 2: Вещное право. Наследственное право. Исключительные права. Личные неимущественные права / Отв. ред. Е.А. Суханов. – М.: Волтерс Клувер, 2005. – С.172.
15.Царёв В.А. Право самостоятельного распоряжения доходами и имуществом учреждений как особое вещное право // Вестник МГПУ. Серия: Юридические науки. 2009. №1. – С. 118-119. URL: https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/pravo-samostoyatelnogo-rasporyazheniya-dohodami-i-imuschestvom-uchrezhdeniy-kak-osoboe-veschnoe-pravo (дата обращения: 22.04.2025).
16.Прокофьев С.В. Научно-практический комментарий к Федеральному закону «Об ипотеке (залоге недвижимости)» / Отв. ред. М.Г. Масевич. – М.: Контракт; ИНФРА, 1999. – С. 21.
17.Дозорцев В.А. Принципиальные черты права собственности в Гражданском кодексе В.А. Дозорцев // Гражданский кодекс России. Проблемы. Теория. Практика: Сборник памяти С.А. Хохлова / Отв. ред. А.Л. Маковский. – М.: Изд-во Международного центра финансово-экономического развития, 1998. – С. 247.
18.Постатейный комментарий к Гражданскому кодексу Российской Федерации, частей первой, второй, третьей / Под ред. Т.Е. Абовой, М.М. Богуславского, А.Ю. Кабалкина, А.Г. Лисицына-Светланова. – М.: Юрайт-Издат, 2005. – Ст. 297–299; Баринова Е. А. Вещные права в системе субъективных гражданских прав / Е.А. Баринова // Актуальные проблемы гражданского права: Сборник статей. Вып. 6 / Под ред. О.Ю. Шилохвоста. – М.: НОРМА, 2003. – С. 170; Сараев Д. В. Имущественные права учреждений // Юрист. – 2002. – № 9. – С. 44.
19.Эргашев, В. (2012). Чекланган ашёвий ҳуқуқлар моҳияти ва тизими. Обзор законодательства Узбекистана, (1), 13–19. извлечено от https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/uzbek_law_review/article/view/13885
20.Ўзбекистон Республикасининг 2025 йил 7 февралдаги ЎРҚ-1025-сонли Қонунига асосан ФКнинг 178-модда матни янги таҳрирда баён этилди, 179-модда эса 2025 йил 8 майдан ўз кучини йўқотган. Қонунчилик маълумотлари миллий базаси, 07.02.2025 й., 03/25/1025/0116-сон URL: https://lex.uz/docs/7367697?ONDATE=08.05.2025%2000#7368100
21.Горелик А.П. Гражданско-правовой режим имущества учреждений МВД России автореф. дис.... канд. юрид. наук. М., 2004. – С. 4.

22.Кулдашев Н.А. Ички ишлар органлари деликт муносабатлар субъекти сифатида: Монография. – Т.: Ўзбекистон Республикаси ИИВ Академияси, 2021. – Б. 168.
23.Горелик А.П. Гражданско-правовой режим имущества учреждений МВД России автореф. дис.... канд. юрид. наук. М., 2004. –С.4.
24.Ковязин В.В. Предпринимательская деятельность некоммерческих организаций системы МВД России: Правовые и организационные аспекты: автореф. дис.... канд. юрид. наук. –М. 2000. –С.9.
25.Қулмуродов У.И. Ўзбекистон Республикаси Ички ишлар вазирлиги тизимидаги таълим муассасаларининг фуқаровий-ҳуқуқий мақоми Юридик фанлар бўйича фалсафа доктори (PhD) дисс. – Т., 2024. – Б 118.