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

File No.: HRSC-010004/53/2025 /2146 Dated: 9th June, 2025

To

The SGRA-cum-Deputy Commissioner,
Panipat, Haryana.
E-mail: dcpnp@hry.nic.in

The FGRA-cum-ADC,
Panipat, Haryana.
E-mail: adcpnp@hry.nic.in

The DO-cum- Tehsildar,
Samalkha Panipat, Haryana, Haryana.
E-mail: tehsildar.samalkha@hry.nic.in

Subject:- Revision No- AAS24/1308475-Appellant- Romika, Service-Backward Class Certificate [RTS - 07 Day] Revenue- Panipat.

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith a copy of the Interim order dated **3rd June, 2025** passed by Sh. T.C. Gupta, Chief Commissioner, Haryana Right to Service Commission, Chandigarh in respect of above case for information and compliance. Further, DC, Panipat is requested to submit the report to the Commission by **26.06.2025** through email at **rtsc-hry@gov.in**. Physical copies should not be sent. The reply being sent must also mention the name of the signatory along with the designation. The reply received without mention of the name of signatory will not be accepted.

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

CC: -

A copy is forwarded to ROMIKA (M) 7782895709 for information.

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

Interim Orders

(In respect Revision No- AAS24/1308475)

Hearing date: 03.06.2025 **Time: 12:00 noon**

Case Type		Revision on Auto Appeal System (AAS)
Department		Revenue & Disaster Management
Name of Service		*Backward Class Certificate*
Date of Application		28.10.2024
RTS Timeline		07 Days
RTS Due Date		06.11.2024
District		Panipat
Name of the Appellant		Ms. Romika
Designated Officer (DO)	Designation	Circle Revenue Officer (CRO)-cum-Tehsildar, Samalkha
	Action Taken with date	Service Completed on 23.05.2025
	Remarks of DO	*"Certificate Issued Successfully"*
First Grievance Redressal Authority (FGRA)	Designation	Additional Deputy Commissioner (ADC), Panipat
	Date and mode of appeal submitted to FGRA	07.11.2024 (Auto Appeal)
	Remarks of the Appellant	--
	Action taken by the FGRA with date	Appeal Resolved on 17.12.2024
	Remarks of FGRA	*"THE CASTE HAS BEEN VERIFIED BY CRID PNP /"*
Second Grievance Redressal Authority (SGRA)	Designation	Deputy Commissioner (DC), Panipat
	Date and mode of appeal submitted to SGRA	17.03.2025 (Self Filed by Applicant on AAS Portal)
	Remarks of the Appellant	*"Caste verification from adc office not completed yet /" (Copy enclosed)*
	Action taken by SGRA with date	Appeal Resolved on 18.03.2025
	Remarks of SGRA	*"The Catse has been verified by crid pnp /"*
HRTS Commission	Date of filing of Revision	14.05.2025
	Mode of Revision	Self-Filed by Applicant on Saral Portal

	Remarks of the Appellant	*"Tehsildar denied the valid proof of application and not verifying my application and I am now going to file a complaint to higher authority/."* *(Copy enclosed)*
	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 sent a letter to the DO, FGRA and SGRA vide letter no. 1871 on 20.05.2025 with a request to send an action taken report on the matter by 30.05.2025. Further, a hearing was scheduled to be held before Sh. T.C. Gupta, Chief Commissioner, Haryana Right to Service Commission on 03.06.2025 at 12:00 noon.

3. Accordingly, two replies were received:

   (a) Reply from the DC, Panipat vide memo no. 01/AAS dated 28.05.2025, stating that the OBC certificate was issued on 23-05-2025, with Certificate No. HROBCC/2024/219818 and Family ID: 7ARW7809. The applicant's satisfaction letter was attached with this letter.

   (b) Reply received from the ADC, Panipat vide memo no. 277 dated 28.05.2025, with the same information as provided by the DC, Panipat.

4. (a) The hearing took place as scheduled, which was attended by the following:

   i. Sh. Pankaj, IAS, ADC Panipat-cum-FGRA
   ii. Sh. Astitva Parashar, Naib Tehsildar, Israna (link Officer for Ms. Lalita, Tehsildar, Samalkha)

   Ms. Romika, the appellant, did not attend the hearing—possibly because her work has been done and she has submitted a satisfaction letter.

   (b) At the outset, the respondents were asked to explain the reasons for the delay in issuing the certificate, as the notified time frame for this service is 7 days, whereas it took seven months to issue the requisite certificate—an inordinate delay that is not acceptable. The FGRA explained that although the caste of the applicant was verified in time by both the Patwari and the Kanungo, the matter remained pending in the login of Shri Balwan Singh, Naib Tehsildar. Sh. Balwan Singh has been on leave for the past four months. After receiving notice from the Commission, his inbox was reviewed, and it was found that nearly 400 cases were pending in his login. These cases have since been transferred to the login of Ms. Lalita, Tehsildar, Samalkha. She verified the applicant's caste, and the OBC certificate was subsequently issued on 23.05.2025. When the FGRA-cum-ADC was specifically asked about his

earlier remark, "THE CASTE HAS BEEN VERIFIED BY CRID PNP /," even though the Naib Tehsildar had not given the final verification, he explained that he had recorded the remark based on the verifications carried out by the Patwari and Kanungo.

(c) Sh. Astitva Prashar, Naib Tehsildar, stated that he took charge on 28.05.2025 during the leave period of Ms. Lalita and is not involved in this case.

5. (a) The Commission has carefully considered all the facts and circumstances of this case. It is unfortunate that a service which was required to be delivered in seven days has been delivered in nearly seven months, for which not only the absence of Sh. Balwan Singh from his duties but also the gross negligence on the part of ADC and DC are responsible. When the first appeal was raised to the FGRA-cum-ADC on 07.11.2024, he should have inquired as to where the caste verification was stuck, instead of wrongly recording the remarks that the caste had been verified. Had he taken those steps, he would have come to know that the verifications were pending in the login of the then Naib Tehsildar Sh. Balwan Singh, and he could have taken action to transfer the pending cases from Sh. Balwan Singh to some other Naib Tehsildar—as has been done now after the receipt of notice from the Commission dated 20.05.2025. No rocket science was involved in this case, as is evident from the fact that after issuance of the Commission's notice, the caste certificate was issued within just three days. The same action could have been taken in the second week of November itself by the ADC.

(b) Similarly, the SGRA-cum-DC, despite knowing that caste verification from the ADC office had not been completed, resolved the matter within one day of receiving the appeal on 18.03.2025. The DC has been tasked by the government to redress the grievances of the people of Haryana on the spot, wherever possible, and for that purpose, they have also been directed to hold *Samadhan Shivirs*. However, in this case, despite being aware that caste verification had not been completed, the DC unfortunately did not take any action. Had he cared to look into the facts and circumstances of this case, he could have taken the same action which was eventually taken after receipt of the Commission's notice—and the grievance of not only this applicant but of 400 other applicants could have been resolved.

(c) It is extremely unfortunate to note the careless and negligent functioning of senior officers of the rank of ADC and DC who did not care to perform their duties as FGRA and SGRA respectively, as mandated under Sections 6 and 7 of the Haryana Right to Service Act, 2014 as per which they were required to afford an opportunity of hearing to the applicant. They appeared more interested in just disposing of the case rather than redressing the grievance

and doing justice to the applicant. Their role as FGRA and SGRA is to take steps to deliver the service to the applicant, rather than washing off their hands by stating that the caste verification from the ADC office had not been completed. In fact, the caste verification was pending due to the absence of the Naib Tehsildar, who comes under the administrative control of the DC. Therefore, this is a fit case where recommendations for initiating disciplinary action should be made against the ADC and DC to the State Government for failure to perform their duties as FGRA and SGRA respectively, in exercise of powers vested under Section 17(1)(d) of the Act. However, since Dr. Virender Kumar Dahiya, IAS, was reportedly out of the country and could not attend the hearing, he is given an opportunity to explain why such a recommendation should not be made. He is directed to send his explanation to the Commission via email at rtsc-hry@gov.in by 20.06.2025, and the final orders in both the cases shall be issued after receipt of explanation from Dr. Virender Kumar Dahiya, IAS.

6. At the same time, the leave record of Sh. Balwan Singh—from the date this case was sent to his login ID till 20.05.2025—may also be shared with the Commission to ascertain whether he was on leave or on duty during this period and still failed to take any action on the applications pending in his login. This information should also be sent by the Deputy Commissioner along with his explanation by 20.06.2025.

-sd/-
(T.C. Gupta)
CC, HRTSC

03rd June 2025