

HARYANA RIGHT TO SERVICE COMMISSION S.C.O. No. 38 & 39 (2nd FLOOR), SECTOR 17-A, CHANDIGARH-160017 E-mail: - https://haryana-rtsc.gov.in/ Telephone: 0172-2711050

No. HRSC-020008/119/2025/3243 To

Dated: 07th Aug 2025

The Commissioner & Secretary to Government of Haryana, Urban Local Bodies Department, Haryana. E-mail: fclg@hry.nic.in

The Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Gurugram, the then SGRA-cum-DMC, Jhajjar. E-mail: emc@mcg.gov.in

The SGRA-cum-District Municipal Commissioner, Jhajjar.

E-mail: dmc-jhajjar@ulbharyana.gov.in

The FGRA-cum-Municipal Engineer, Municipal Council, Bahadurgarh. E-mail: eo-bahadurgarh@ulbharyana.gov.in

The Designated Officer-cum-Junior Engineer, Municipal Council, Bahadurgarh. E-mail: mcbgarh@gmail.com mcbgarh2016@gmail.com

Subject: Revision No. AAS25/1611875/ULB- Suraj Singh - Replacement of Street Lights [RTS - 10 Days]- Jhajjar- Final orders.

I have been directed to invite reference towards the subject cited above and to send herewith a copy of final orders dated 05.08.2025 passed by Sh. T. C. Gupta, Chief Commissioner, Haryana Right to Service Commission for information and necessary compliance, please.

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

CC: A copy of the above is forwarded to the appellant Suraj Singh for information.

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



## HARYANA RIGHT TO SERVICE COMMISSION S.C.O. No. 38 & 39 (2<sup>nd</sup> FLOOR), SECTOR 17-A, CHANDIGARH-160017 Website- https://haryana-rtsc.gov.in/ Telephone: 0172-2711050

## Final Orders

[In respect Revision No. AAS25/1611875/ULB- Suraj Singh - Replacement of Street Lights (RTS - 10 Days)- Municipal Council (MC), Bahadurgarh]

Hearing date: 29.07.2025

| Case Type  |   | Time: 03:00 p   |
|--|---|---|
|  | The state of the second of                      | Revision on Auto Appeal System (AAS)  |
| Department                                       |   | Urban Local Bodies  |
| Name of Service                                  |   | Replacement of Street Lights [RT - 10 Days]   |
| Date of Application                              |   | 05.05.2025  |
| RTS Timeline                                     |   |   |
| RTS Due Date                                     |   | 10 Days   |
| District   |   | 19.05.2025  |
| Name of the Appellant                            |   | Jhajjar   |
|  |   | Suraj Singh   |
| Designated Officer (DO)                          | Designation                                     | Junior Engineer (JE)  |
|  | Action Taken with date                          | Application Submitted   |
|  | Remarks of DO                                   | "Grievance Submitted"   |
|  |   |   |
| First Grievance<br>Redressal Authority<br>(FGRA) | 0   | Municipal Engineer (ME)   |
|  | Date and mode of appeal                         | Auto Appeal 20.05.2025  |
|  | submitted to FGRA                               | DE STERRESSE SER LEUR STERRESSE   |
|  | Remarks of the Appellant                        | NA  |
|  | Action taken by the FGRA with date              | Appeal Dismissed on 23.05.2025  |
|  | Remarks of FGRA                                 | "The meeting was scheduled by<br>given date and time but applicant<br>not come in the office. Hence<br>complaint may be dismiss. /" |
| Second Grievance<br>Redressal Authority          | Designation District Municipal Commission (DMC) | District Municipal Commissioner   |
|  |   |   |
|  | Date and mode of appeal submitted to SGRA       | Self Filed by Applicant on AAS<br>Portal on 23.05.2025  |
|  | Remarks of the Appellant                        | "Street light not working last 6 months month /" (Copy enclosed)  |
|  | Action taken by SGRA with date                  | No action   |
| STEEL SECTION OF STREET                          | with date                                       |   |

| HRTS Commission      | Mode and Date of filing of Revision                          | Auto appeal on 09.07.2025 |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|
|                      | Remarks of the Appellant                                     | NA                        |
| 6862298.2716         | Whether Revision has been filed in time?                     | Yes                       |
| in tronsletics - see | Whether service has been applied under the correct category? | Yes                       |

- 2. On perusal of the Revision details, it was observed that the DO, FGRA and SGRA did not take any action on the application and appeals filed by the applicant. Therefore, taking cognizance of the matter, notices under Section 17(1)(h) were issued to the DO and under Section 17(1)(d) to the FGRA and SGRA, in accordance with the provisions of the Haryana Right to Service Act, 2014 (hereinafter referred to as the 'Act') vide letter dated 15.07.2025.
- 3. In response to the notices, a reply was received from Sh. Jag Niwas, the then SGRA-cum-DMC, Jhajjar vide letter no. 954/DMC dated 17.07.2025. The reply stated that the streetlight has been fixed and is now operational. The same has been conveyed to the applicant and he is satisfied with the resolution.
- 4. (a) The hearing took place as scheduled, which was attended by the following:
  - i. Dr. Sushil Kumar-II, HCS, SGRA-cum-DMC, Jhajjar
  - ii. Sh. Rajesh Kaushik, FGRA-cum-ME, MC, Bahadurgarh
  - iii. Sh. Akash, DO-cum-JE, MC, Bahadurgarh

The complainant did not attend the hearing despite being given advance notice.

At the outset, the Junior Engineer (JE) was asked why the streetlight had not (b) been repaired within the notified timeline, i.e., by 19th May 2025. He explained that the streetlight in question was old, beyond repair and required replacement. He further informed that a procurement order for 3,000 new streetlights had been placed but the delivery was delayed due to pending inspection. Upon being asked whether the new streetlights had since been received, he confirmed that they had not. This prompted a query regarding how the streetlight was shown as repaired on 29th July 2025 on GRS portal. At this stage, Sh. Rajesh Kaushik, FGRA-cum-ME, clarified that the streetlight had been temporarily repaired. However, he added that the light was prone to recurring faults and that permanent resolution could only be achieved through its replacement. Sh. Rajesh Kaushik was further asked why he had dismissed the appeal on 23rd May 2025 merely on the ground of the complainant's absence, without ensuring that the streetlight had actually been repaired. He responded that steps for repair had indeed been initiated but this action was not updated on the portal due to an oversight by the Data Entry Operator. He expressed regrets for the error on his part in this matter.

- (c) Dr. Sushil Kumar, DMC Jhajjar was asked to explain the reasons for inaction on the second appeal that remained pending during the period from 23.05.2025 to 08.07.2025. He clarified that he was not serving as the SGRA during that time and had, in fact, joined as the DMC against a vacant post only on 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2025 i.e. after the appeal had already escalated to the Commission.
- The Commission has carefully considered all the facts and circumstances of this case. It is evident that Sh. Akash, Junior Engineer, attempted to mislead the Commission by claiming that the particular streetlight was not repairable. This assertion is contradicted by the fact that the streetlight was eventually repaired and not replaced with a new one. If the repair could be undertaken after the matter came to the Commission's notice, it could very well have been done earlier, within the notified timelines. Furthermore, the photograph uploaded by the Junior Engineer on the portal does not appear to match the streetlight for which the complaint was originally lodged by the complainant-who had also submitted a corresponding photograph. Even assuming that the same streetlight was indeed repaired, the repair was carried out on 29.07.2025 i.e. beyond the notified timeline and without any plausible justification. Accordingly, the Junior Engineer is found to have failed in delivering the notified service within the prescribed period. Therefore, holding him guilty of negligence in the discharge of his duties as a Designated Officer, the Commission, in exercise of powers vested under Section 17(1)(h) of the Act, imposes a token penalty of Rs 5,000/- upon him. This amount shall be deducted from his salary for the month of August 2025, payable in September 2025. The District Municipal Commissioner, Jhajjar is directed to ensure recovery of this amount from his salary and deposit the same into the State Treasury under the Receipts Head 0070-60-800-86-51. A compliance report in this regard must be submitted to the Commission by 10th September 2025, failing which the DMC would be required to attend a hearing through VC with the Chief Commissioner, Haryana Right to Service Commission to be held at 10:00 am on 11th September 2025.
  - (b) As far as the role of Sh. Rajesh Kaushik, FGRA-cum-ME is concerned, it is found to be deficient and not in accordance with the provisions of Section 6 of the Act, 2014. Instead of taking appropriate action, such as issuing directions to the Designated Officer to repair the streetlight or conducting a hearing with the complainant, he dismissed the appeal solely on the ground that the applicant failed to attend the hearing. However, the absence of the applicant from the hearing does not empower the authority to dismiss the appeal. He was duty-bound to adjudicate the matter on its merits. It is pertinent to mention that the designation under the Act is "First GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL Authority", which implies an obligation to redress the grievance of the applicant rather than reject the appeal on procedural grounds. The facts of the case clearly establish that the service in question had not been delivered at the time the appeal was dismissed on 23rd May 2025. Accordingly, finding him guilty of

not performing his duties in accordance with Section 6 of the Act, the Commission, in exercise of powers under Section 17(1)(d) of the Act, recommends to the State Government that suitable departmental action be taken against him. The Commissioner and Secretary, Urban Local Bodies Department is requested to inform the Commission of the action taken in this matter within 30 days of receipt of this order, as required under Section 18 of the Act, which provides as follows: –

- (1) "The State Government shall consider the recommendations made by the Commission under clauses (d), (e) and (f) of sub-section (1) of section 17 and send information to the Commission of action taken within thirty days or such longer time as may be decided in consultation with the Commission. In case the State Government decides not to implement any of the recommendations of the Commission, it shall communicate the reasons for not acting on the recommendations to the Commission.
- (2) The Commission shall prepare an annual report of the recommendations made by it under section 17 along with the action taken and reasons for not taking action, if any. The State Government shall cause a copy of this report to be laid on the table of the Haryana Legislative Assembly."

The action taken report from C&S, ULB will be incorporated in the Annual Report of the Commission for the year 2025-26 as mandated above to be tabled in the Haryana Legislative Assembly.

(c) As far as the role of the SGRA-cum-District Municipal Commissioner is concerned, it is noted that Dr. Sushil Kumar-II, HCS, was not holding the charge of District Municipal Commissioner during the relevant period. Infact, the post was vacant during this time and the functions were being discharged by the link officers. As per the information provided by Dr. Sushil Kumar-II, the said charge was being held by Sh. Pradeep Dahiya, IAS (from 23.05.2025 to 30.06.2025) and Sh. Jag Niwas, HCS (from 01.07.2025 to 08.07.2025). It is evident that the appeal was pending with Sh. Pradeep Dahiya, IAS for majority of the period. However, considering that he was serving in a dual capacity, holding the substantive charge of Commissioner, MCG—a post that is inherently demanding, the Commission is taking a lenient view in the matter and is issuing an advisory to exercise greater care in the future even in respect of the organisations where he is link officer and to ensure that responsibilities assigned under the Haryana Right to Service Act are fulfilled diligently. Since this advisory is being issued ex-parte, Sh. Pradeep Dahiya, IAS is at liberty to file a review against this order, should he wishes to do so.

With these orders, the case is hereby disposed of.

