

HRSC020008/116/2026/3948

Dated: 19/08/26

To

The SGRA-cum-Superintending Engineer,
PHED, Rohtak (circle)
E-mail: serohtak@phedharyana.gov.in (9466975095)

The FGRA-cum- Executive Engineer
PHESD-2, Rohtak
E-mail: ee2rohtak@phedharyana.gov.in (9050527311)

The Designated Officer-cum-Sub Divisional Engineer,
PHESD No. 2, Rohtak
E-mail: sdephe2rtk@gmail.com (M) 09991010670

**Subject: Revision No. AAS26/2590884- Sumit-Restoration of water supply
due to minor problems [RTS - 3 Days]- Rohtak.- Interm orders-1**

Sir,

I am directed to invite reference on the subject cited above and to send herewith a copy of Final orders dated 14th August, 2026 passed by Sh. Anurag Rastogi, Chief Commissioner, Haryana Right to Service Commission, Chandigarh in respect of above cited case for information and compliance.

**BY THE ORDER OF THE HARYANA RIGHT TO SERVICE
COMMISSION AT CHANDIGARH.**

Encl: as above.



(Sube Khan)

Under Secretary-cum-Registrar,
Haryana Right to Service Commission
E-mail: rtsc-hry@gov.in

CC: Revisionist Sumit (M) 7027954848 (through AAS) for information.

Interim Orders- I

(Revision No. AAS26/2590884 - Sumit -Restoration of water supply due to minor problems [RTS - 3 Days]- Rohtak.)

Hearing date: 29.07.2026

Time: 11:00 am

Case type	Revision on AAS	
Department	Public Health Engineering Department	
Name of Service	Restoration of water supply due to minor problems [RTS - 3 Days]- Rohtak	
Date of application	25.04.2026	
RTS timeline	03 days	
RTS Due Date	29.04.2026	
District	Rohtak	
Name of the Revisionist	Sumit	
Designated Officer	Designation	Sub Divisional Engineer
	Action taken with date	Service completed on 01.05.2026
	Remarks on SARAL	"Complaint Close"
First Grievance Redressal Authority	Designation	Executive Engineer
	Date and mode of appeal submitted to FGRA	Auto appeal on 30.04.2026
	Remarks of the Revisionist	-
	Action taken by the FGRA with date	Appeal Resolved on 12.05.2026.
	Remarks of FGRA	As reported by the SDE-in-Charge that the complaint rectified. The direction is given to the SDE-in-charge to be more care full in future. Hence close the complaint.....
Second Grievance Redressal Authority	Designation	Superintending Engineer
	Date and mode of appeal submitted to SGRA	Self Filed by Applicant on Saral Portal on 13.05.2026.
	Remarks of the Revisionist	There is no solution yet. Also complaint has been closed without my consent or without contacting me. Kindly take strict action against the faulty and also ensure daily 2 times water supply in Nehru Colony
	Action taken by SGRA with date	Appeal resolved on 25.06.2026
	Remarks of SGRA	The Action Taken Report received from Designated Officer-cum-SDE PHESD No. 2 Rohtak that the complaint has been resolved as per statement given by the appellant and this office also contacted to the appellant

		telephonically (7027954848) on 25.06.2026 at 03:45 PM and he stated that his complaint has been resolved. So it is requested to close this complaint.....
Commission	Mode & Date of filing of Revision	Self Filed by Applicant on Saral Portal on 25.06.2026.
	Remarks of the Revisionist	The complaint has not yet been resolved. However the final judgment was supposed to be done by 29 April 2026, whereas it has been done on 25 June 2026. It is submitted that I am totally disagree and disappointed with such lethargic services of PHED. Also it is submitted that now since 17 June 2026, the sewerage water is mixed with the water supply. It is very serious issue. Many complaints have been lodged but no solution yet
	Whether Revision has been filed in time?	Yes
	Whether service has been applied under correct category?	Yes

2. Taking cognizance of the matter, the Commission sought a report from the Designated Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Engineer, PHESD No. 2, Rohtak, vide letter No. 2928 dated 02.07.2026, for a reply by 10.07.2026. Upon non-receipt of the report within the stipulated period, a reminder was issued vide letter No. 3094 dated 14.07.2026.
3. (a) In response, a reply was received from Sh. Rajesh Kumar, SDE, PHESD No. 2, Rohtak, vide Memo No. 1831 dated 20.07.2026. It was stated that the earlier complaint pertained to inadequate water supply during the canal-closure period in April and that the issue stood resolved following the installation of a tubewell at the Jind Chowk booster in May. According to the SDE, no water-supply issue presently existed in the area.
(b) The revisionist, however, contested this version and stated that the actual issue was the recurring contamination of drinking water with sewage since 17.06.2026. He submitted that although the water supply temporarily improved following the cleaning of the sewer line, the problem recurred whenever rainfall caused the sewer to overflow. He further alleged that contaminated water was again supplied following the rainfall on 20.07.2026 and requested that permanent remedial measures be undertaken to prevent the recurrence of this serious public-health issue.
4. (a) In view of the materially divergent versions placed before the Commission, a hearing was scheduled for 29.07.2026 at 11:00 am, under the chairmanship of the Secretary, Haryana Right to Service Commission. The Designated Officer, FGRA, SGRA and the revisionist were informed accordingly vide the Commission's email dated 23.07.2026. The hearing was held as scheduled and attended by the following:

- i. Sh. Amit Shoekand, SGRA-cum-Superintending Engineer, PHED, Rohtak Circle;
- ii. Sh. Sandeep Kumar, FGRA-cum-Executive Engineer, PHESD No. 2, Rohtak;
- iii. Sh. Rajesh Kumar, Designated Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Engineer, PHESD No. 2, Rohtak; and
- iv. Sh. Sumit, revisionist.

(b) Sh. Sumit, revisionist, could not join the hearing through VC. He was subsequently contacted telephonically, following which he joined the hearing through VC and was heard. He stated that he had been facing the problem for the past two to three years and had repeatedly approached the PHED for a resolution. He submitted that the water supply was disrupted on this occasion, following which he submitted an application on 25.04.2026, against which the notified RTS due date was 29.04.2026.

He further stated that during the rainy season, the sewer lines in the area overflow and sewage enters the drinking-water supply lines. According to him, leakages had also been detected in the water-supply lines during previous years, resulting in the contamination of drinking water with sewage. He stated that the sewer lines in the area were approximately 21 years old.

Referring to an earlier hearing before the Commission, which he had attended, the revisionist stated that the Department had undertaken to install a new booster to restore the water supply and ensure its availability twice a day. He further stated that, during the preceding six months, water had been supplied only once every two days.

(c) Sh. Amit Shoekand, SGRA-cum-Superintending Engineer, PHED, Rohtak Circle, stated that he had been holding additional charge of the post since 20.06.2026, while the regular charge was held by Sh. Shivraj Singh. Regarding the disposal of the appeal, he submitted that an Action Taken Report had been received from the Designated Officer stating that the complaint stood resolved.

He further stated that his office contacted the revisionist telephonically on 25.06.2026 at 3:45 P.M., during which the revisionist reportedly stated that the water supply had been running smoothly for the preceding two days and expressed satisfaction regarding the resolution of the complaint. On the basis of the Action Taken Report and the aforesaid telephonic interaction, the appeal was treated as resolved and an order recommending its closure was passed. When questioned as to why a formal opportunity of hearing had not been afforded to the revisionist, the SGRA clarified that although no formal notice of hearing was issued, the revisionist had been contacted telephonically before the passing of the order.

(d) Sh. Sandeep Kumar, FGRA-cum-Executive Engineer, stated that an opportunity of hearing was provided to the revisionist through the AAS portal on 08.05.2026, whereby the hearing was scheduled for 12.05.2026. He submitted that the revisionist did not appear on the scheduled date and, consequently, an order was passed in his absence ex parte.

According to him, the communication of the hearing through the AAS portal constituted sufficient opportunity to the revisionist. He did not, however, state that any further attempt had been made to contact the revisionist telephonically or through any other available means before proceeding to decide the appeal ex parte.

(e) Sh. Rajesh Kumar, Designated Officer-cum-SDE, stated that the revisionist had been receiving clean water for the preceding four days. Regarding the issues faced during April, May and June, he stated that these had primarily arisen due to the closure of canal-based water supply. He further stated that canal water, which was ordinarily received at an interval of approximately 16 days, was received after an interval extending up to 24 days during the aforesaid period.

6. (i) The Commission has carefully considered all facts and circumstances of the case. The Commission is constrained to record its grave displeasure at the casual, mechanical and wholly insensitive manner in which the original complaint and the appeals arising therefrom were dealt with at successive levels of the Department. The record reveals a serious failure of responsibility at every stage of the statutory grievance-redressal mechanism. A matter concerning the supply of drinking water, particularly an allegation of its recurring contamination with sewage, could not have been treated as an ordinary portal complaint and closed without proper field verification, water-quality testing and permanent rectification of the underlying defect.

The departmental authorities also appear to have conflated the mere availability of water with the supply of clean and potable water. A telephonic statement that the water supply had been "running smoothly" for two days could not, by itself, establish either the quality of the water being supplied or the permanent resolution of a recurring sewage-contamination problem.

The submission of the SGRA that he was merely holding additional charge does not absolve him of the statutory responsibilities attached to the office. Once entrusted with the additional charge, he was fully responsible for the proper and timely disposal of appeals falling within the jurisdiction of the SGRA, particularly where the matter concerned drinking water—a basic necessity of life and an issue directly affecting public health. In fact, the SGRA passed an order dated 25.06.2026 recording as follows:

"The Action Taken Report received from Designated Officer-cum-SDE PHESD No. 2 Rohtak that the complaint has been resolved as per statement given by the appellant and this office also contacted to the appellant telephonically (7027954848) on 25.06.2026 at 03:45 PM and he stated that his complaint has been resolved. So it is requested to close this complaint....."

When questioned as to why a formal opportunity of hearing had not been afforded to the revisionist, the SGRA stated that although no formal notice of hearing was issued, the revisionist had been contacted telephonically before the passing of the order. He could not justify the closure of the appeal without independently verifying whether the recurring contamination had been permanently remedied or not.

(ii) The action taken by Sh. Sandeep Kumar, FGRA-cum-Executive Engineer, was also deficient. Although an opportunity of hearing was conveyed through the AAS portal, the FGRA proceeded to decide the matter ex parte when the revisionist did not join the hearing. Given the nature and seriousness of the grievance, the FGRA ought to have made a reasonable effort to contact the revisionist telephonically before proceeding ex parte. The Commission itself contacted the revisionist telephonically during the present hearing when he was unable to join through the link, thereby demonstrating that such minimal effort was both feasible and necessary. The appellate mechanism provided under the Act cannot be reduced to a mere procedural formality.

(iii) The conduct of Sh. Rajesh Kumar, Designated Officer-cum-SDE, reflects a complete lack of responsibility and disregard for the statutory timeline prescribed under the Haryana Right to Service Act, 2014. Against a notified service-delivery timeline of three working days, the Department took approximately three months and has still failed to demonstrate that the underlying cause of the recurring contamination has been permanently rectified.

The automatic escalation of the appeal on the AAS portal establishes that no effective action was taken or recorded by the Designated Officer within the notified timeline. The matter constitutes a disturbing illustration of the casual manner in which even complaints involving clean drinking water and serious public-health concerns are being handled at the field level.

Therefore, finding him guilty for non-delivery of notified service, the Commission, in exercise of the powers vested in it under Section 17(1)(h) of the Act, imposes a token penalty of ₹5,000/- (Rupees Five Thousand only) upon Sh. Rajesh Kumar, Designated Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Engineer, PHESD No. 2, Rohtak. The amount shall be recovered from his salary of August to be paid in September and deposited in the State Treasury under Receipt Head "0070-60-800-86-51." The FGRA-cum-Executive Engineer, PHESD No. 2, Rohtak, shall ensure the recovery and deposit of the penalty and intimate compliance to the Commission within 30 days of receipt of these orders, at rtsc-hry@gov.in.

(iv) The conduct of Sh. Sandeep Kumar, FGRA-cum-Executive Engineer, and Sh. Amit Shokand, SGRA-cum-Superintending Engineer, has also been found unsatisfactory. Although the Commission is refraining from invoking penal provisions against them at this stage, its displeasure is hereby formally recorded, and their names shall be entered in the Commission's database of displeasures for future reference. They are cautioned that any repetition of such casual or mechanical disposal of statutory appeals shall be viewed seriously and may invite appropriate action under the Act.

(v) Sh. Sandeep Kumar, Executive Engineer, PHESD No. 2, Rohtak, shall personally supervise a comprehensive inspection of the water-supply and sewerage lines serving the affected area and ensure that all points of leakage, overflow or possible ingress of sewage into the drinking-water network are identified and permanently rectified. Merely restoring the flow of water for a few days shall not be treated as compliance with these directions.

He shall submit a detailed compliance report containing the following:

- a. photographic evidence covering the supply of clean water for seven consecutive days;
- b. details of the defects detected and the permanent remedial measures undertaken;
- c. d. confirmation that clean and potable water is being supplied to the affected area.

The report should reach the Commission by 21.08.2026 at its email id rtsc-hry@gov.in.

14th August, 2026

