

Through Email only.



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-010004/11/2026/ 822

Dated: 25.02.2026

To

The Chief Secretary to Government of Haryana,
General Administration Department (Administration) Haryana Civil Secretariat,
Chandigarh.
Email:- suptd-ar.cse@hry.gov.in & service1.cs-hry@nic.in

The Chief Administrator,
HSVP, Panchkula.
E-mail: hsvp.rts@gmail.com

The Zonal Administrator,
HSVP, Panchkula.
E-mail: hsvp.rts@gmail.com

The SGRA-cum-Estate Officer-I,
HSVP, Faridabad
Email:- eofbdhsvp@gmail.com

Subject:- Revision No- AAS25/2296242-HSVP-Revisionist- Himanshu Sharma-Service-Issuance of Possession Certificate [RTS - 3 Days] (HSVP-EO-I, Faridabad)

&

Revision No- AAS26/2307113-HSVP-Revisionist- Sanjeev Verma-Service-Issuance of Possession Certificate [RTS - 3 Days] (HSVP-EO-I, Faridabad)

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith a copy of the Final order dated **19th February, 2026** passed by Sh. T.C. Gupta, Chief Commissioner, Haryana Right to Service Commission, Chandigarh in respect of above case for information and compliance. Further, CA, HSVP is requested to submit the reply to the Commission by **02.03.2026** 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 forward to the following :-

1. The Additional Chief Secretary to Government of Haryana, Town and Country Planning Department. Email: fctcp@hry.nic.in
2. Sh. Himanshu Sharma & Sh. Sanjeev Verma revisionists for information only. Email:- hs2599@gmail.com (Through AAS Portal)



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

Final Orders

Following two revisions are being disposed of through common order as the facts of the cases are identical.

(In respect of Revision No- AAS25/2296242-HSVP-Revisionist- Himanshu Sharma-Service-Issuance of Possession Certificate [RTS - 3 Days] (HSVP-EO-I, Faridabad)

&

(In respect of Revision No- AAS26/2307113-HSVP-Revisionist- Sanjeev Verma-Service-Issuance of Possession Certificate [RTS - 3 Days] (HSVP-EO-I, Faridabad)

Hearing date: 19.02.2026

Time: 11:30 am & 12 noon

(i) Revision No- AAS25/2296242-HSVP-Revisionist- Himanshu Sharma

Case Type	Revision on Auto Appeal System (AAS)	
Department	HSVP	
Name of Service	Issuance of Possession Certificate	
Date of Application	26.12.2025	
RTS Timeline	03 days	
RTS Due Date	30.12.2025	
District	Faridabad-I	
Name of the Appellant	HIMANSHU SHARMA	
Designated Officer (DO)	Designation	Junior Engineer, Estate Office-Faridabad
	Action Taken with date	Application Rejected on 29.12.2025
	Remarks of DO	"Road Falls In Litigation No Development Work At Site"
First Grievance Redressal Authority (FGRA)	Designation	Sub Divisional Engineer(Survey), Estate Office-Faridabad
	Date and mode of appeal submitted to FGRA	30.12.2025 (Self Filed by Applicant on AAS Portal)
	Remarks of the Appellant	"Respected Sir Madam I am the allottee of Plot No 49 Sector 80 Faridabad allotted through HSVP e Auction Full payment was made but physical possession has not been handed over My possession request was rejected due to road litigation and no development work Despite this extension fee has been charged from January 2025 which is unjustified without possession Fact details EAuction date 18 January 2023 LOI date 22 February 2023 Allotment date 30 June 2023 Full payment made 21 June 2023 Extension fee charged January 2025 without possession No court case on my plot as per HSVP portal since 18 January 2023 Despite repeated follow ups no resolution has been

		provided Charging extension fee without possession is against norms and causes mental harassment I am paying bank EMIs while HSVP has failed to hand over possession Surrounding plots exist but roads and development work are incomplete I request Provide a fixed date for physical possession Pay interest for delay as per HSVP policy Refund extension fee amount 3376 Clarify road litigation status and action taken Kindly resolve the matter urgently in a transparent and time bound manner /" (Copy enclosed)
	Action taken by the FGRA with date	Appeal Dismissed on 02.01.2026
	Remarks of FGRA	"Road falls in litigation, No development work at site. . /" N.A.
Second Grievance Redressal Authority (SGRA)	Designation	Estate Officer-I, Estate Office-Faridabad
	Date and mode of appeal submitted to SGRA	02.01.2026 (Self Filed by Applicant on AAS Portal)
	Remarks of the Appellant	"I am filing this appeal against the reply from HSVP FRGA officer stating road falls in litigation and no development work at site. The reply is generic and does not provide any timeline, case details or remedial action. Despite full payment and completion of all formalities, physical possession of Plot No. 49 Sector 80 Faridabad has not been handed over. No committed date for possession has been shared till date. Extension fee has been charged without offering possession which is unjustified and should be refunded. Delayed possession interest has also not been paid so far. I request HSVP to share a clear possession timeline, refund the wrongly charged extension fee, initiate payment of delayed possession interest and resolve the stated litigation on priority so that physical possession can be handed over at the earliest. /" (Copy enclosed)
	Action taken by SGRA with date	Appeal Dismissed on 05.01.2026
	Remarks of SGRA	"R/Sir application has been rejected as per J.E. remarks i.e. Road falls in litigation, No development work at site. . // " N.A.
HRTS Commission	Date of filing of Revision	05.01.2026
	Mode of Revision	(Self Filed by Applicant on AAS Portal)

	Remarks of the Appellant	<p>"I am submitting this appeal against repeated rejection with the same vague remark that road falls in litigation and no development work at site. The reply does not disclose any litigation details, case status, court order or possession timeline and therefore does not amount to proper grievance redressal. Full and final payment for Plot No. 49 Sector 80 Faridabad was made in June 2023, however physical possession has still not been handed over even by January 2026. No tentative or committed date for possession has been communicated for more than two years. HSVP has already charged extension fee for 2025 without offering possession and has now additionally raised extension fee for 2026 also. Charging extension fees without offering possession and without resolving access issues is arbitrary and against principles of natural justice. Release of delayed possession interest is a critical issue as the prolonged delay has caused continuous financial burden and stress to me and my family. Delayed possession interest has not been released till date despite full payment and prolonged delay. I request immediate intervention of the Appellate Authority to direct HSVP to share a time bound possession schedule, stop further extension fee demands, refund wrongly charged extension fees, immediately release delayed possession interest to reduce the financial burden on my family and resolve the stated litigation on priority so that physical possession is handed over without further delay. /" (Copy enclosed)</p>
	Whether Revision has been filed in time?	Yes
	Whether service has been applied under correct category?	Yes

(ii) Revision No- AAS26/2307113-HSVP-Revisionist- Sanjeev Verma

Case Type	Revision on Auto Appeal System (AAS)	
Department	HSVP	
Name of Service	Issuance of Possession Certificate	
Date of Application	23.12.2025	
RTS Timeline	03 days	
RTS Due Date	26.12.2025	
District	Faridabad-I	
Name of the Appellant	Sanjeev Verma	
Designated Officer (DO)	Designation	Junior Engineer, Estate Office-Faridabad

	Action Taken with date	Application Rejected on 26.12.2025
	Remarks of DO	"In litigation No development work at site"
First Grievance Redressal Authority (FGRA)	Designation	Sub Divisional Engineer(Survey), Estate Office-Faridabad
	Date and mode of appeal submitted to FGRA	02.01.2026 (Self Filed by Applicant on AAS Portal)
	Remarks of the Appellant	"Physical possession of Plot No 100 Sector 80 Faridabad allotted through HSVP e auction on 22 March 2023 has not been handed over till date despite full payment made on 19 October 2023. Possession application was not processed and was marked in litigation no development work at site though HSVP portal shows no court case against the individual plot. No committed timeline has been provided despite repeated follow ups and CM Window complaint. Appeal filed for time bound possession and applicable relief. /" (Copy enclosed)
	Action taken by the FGRA with date	Appeal Dismissed on 05.01.2026
	Remarks of FGRA	"In litigation . No development work at site. . /" N.A.
Second Grievance Redressal Authority (SGRA)	Designation	Estate Officer-I, Estate Office-Faridabad
	Date and mode of appeal submitted to SGRA	06.01.2026 (Self Filed by Applicant on AAS Portal)
	Remarks of the Appellant	"Physical possession of Plot No 100 Sector 80 Faridabad allotted through HSVP e auction on 22 March 2023 has not been handed over till date despite full payment made on 19 October 2023. Possession application was not processed and was marked in litigation no development work at site though HSVP portal shows no court case against the individual plot. No committed timeline has been provided despite repeated follow ups and CM Window complaint. Appeal filed for time bound possession and applicable relief. /" (Copy enclosed)
	Action taken by SGRA with date	Appeal Dismissed on 07.01.2026
	Remarks of SGRA	"R/Sir application has been rejected as per J.E. remarks i.e. In litigation . No development work at site. . /" N.A.
HRTS Commission	Date of filing of Revision	07.01.2026
	Mode of Revision	(Self Filed by Applicant on AAS Portal)

	Remarks of the Appellant	"Physical possession of Plot No 100 Sector 80 Faridabad allotted through HSVP e auction on 22 March 2023 has not been handed over till date despite full payment made on 19 October 2023. Possession application was not processed and was marked in litigation no development work at site though HSVP portal shows no court case against the individual plot. No committed timeline has been provided despite repeated follow ups and CM Window complaint. Appeal filed for time bound possession and applicable relief. /" (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, vide letter no. 159 on 12.01.2026 requested the SGRA-cum-Estate Officer – I, HSVP, Faridabad to submit an action taken report in the revision of Sh. Himanshu Sharma by 22.01.2026. Accordingly, a reply was received vide letter no. 269 on 22.01.2026, stating that plot no. 49, Sector 80, Faridabad was sold to Sh. Kamal Deep through e-auction on 18.01.2023. Letter of Intent was issued on 22.02.2023. Thereafter, allotment-cum-possession certificate was issued on 30.06.2023. It was stated that the said plot lies in village Badoli 36//18 and is under litigation in CWP No. 8525 of 2009 and the next date of hearing is 16.03.2026.
3. To further proceed in the matter, the Commission, requested CA, HSVP vide letter no. 566 on 05.02.2026 to share the noting sheet to ascertain as to how the said plot was e-auctioned despite not being fit for the same. He was requested to share the same by 16.02.2026. Additionally, finding the reply of EO-1, Faridabad unsatisfactory, he was requested to appear for a hearing before Sh. T.C. Gupta, Chief Commissioner, Haryana Right to Service Commission on 19.02.2026 at 11:30 am, conveyed vide letter no. 565 on 05.02.2026. He was also requested to clarify as to the whether the land on which the plot stood was acquired by HSVP or not.
4. In response, a reply was received from CCF, HSVP, Panchkula through email dated 17.02.2026 sharing the original noting sheet for the ibid plot. Additionally, a reply was received from EO-I, Faridabad vide letter no. 675 on 18.02.2026 while stating that the plot lies in khasra no. 36//18 and the land had been acquired by HSVP. Further, he had written to the allottee vide letter no. 531 on 09.02.2026 to submit bank details for payment of delayed possession interest but the same had not been received till date.
5. In the case of revision of Sh. Sanjeev Verma also, the Commission, vide letter no. 168 dated 12.01.2026 had also requested the SGRA-cum-Estate Officer-I, HSVP, Faridabad to submit

an action taken report by 22.01.2026. Accordingly, a reply was received from SGRA-cum-EO-I, HSVP, Faridabad vide memo no. 271 dated 22.01.2026, stating that the said plot is under litigation in CWP no. 8525 of 2009 and the next date of hearing is 16.03.2026. To proceed further in the matter, a hearing was scheduled to be held before Sh. T. C. Gupta, Chief Commissioner, Haryana Right to Service Commission on 16.02.2026 at 12 noon, conveyed vide letter no. 587 on 06.02.2026.

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

- (i) Sh. Naveen Kumar, HCS, SGRA-cum-Estate Officer-I, HSVP, Faridabad.
- (ii) Sh. Himanshu Sharma, the Revisionist in Revision No. AAS25/2296242
- (iii) Sh. Sanjeev Verma, the Revisionist in Revision No. AAS26/2307113

(b) Sh. Himanshu Sharma, reiterated the contents of his revision and stated that he was being charged extension fees for two consecutive years despite the fact that possession of the plot was not offered to him despite multiple applications and CM Window complaints. He stated that he had logged into his Allottee Corner as latest as 11:15 am on the date of hearing which still showed outstanding dues of around Rs. 3,000 on account of extension fees charged in 2026. Upon being pointed out to the Estate Officer, the same was reduced to nil during the hearing itself. He requested that the delayed possession interest be offered to him and the extension fees charged from him illegally in 2025 be refunded to him. Sh. Naveen Kumar, HCS feigned ignorance about the extension fees and expressed regrets that the same was charged. He admitted that the date of possession was corrected on the date of the hearing itself. He stated that once the bank details are provided by the revisionist, he would process the delayed possession interest at the earliest.

(c) Sh. Sanjeev Verma stated that he purchased the plot through e-auction for Rs. 1.09 crores and made the full payment on 19.10.2023. However, possession has not been handed over to him till date. On the contrary, he is being charged extension fees on the portal for not constructing the plot within two years. He further stated that he is living on rent in Noida and has taken a loan from a bank, on which he is paying a hefty rate of interest on a compounding basis. Sh. Naveen Kumar reiterated the contents of his reply dated 22.01.2026 and stated that the date of possession has been removed from the portal on 19.02.2026. Consequently, the extension fees will be removed from the account of the revisionist. He further stated that the interest will be paid to him after he provides his bank details along with a copy of the cancelled cheque. At this point, the revisionist intervened and stated that when possession was not handed over to him, he had submitted a letter in the Estate Office on 03.11.2023 vide Diary No. 11/2738 for the same. However, the EO requested him again to provide his bank details for payment of interest.

7. The Commission has carefully considered all the facts and circumstances of the present cases. It is unfortunate that plots in respect of which a stay has been operating since 2009, as per the statement of EO-I, HSVP pursuant to the orders of the Hon'ble High Court, were nevertheless auctioned by HSVP on 22.03.2023. Such action not only prima facie amounts to contempt of court but may also attract penal consequences under the IPC/BNS for

cheating. Had a private colonizer sold a plot without having a valid title, an FIR would have been lodged against the office bearers of such developer. However, despite these facts being brought to the notice of EO-I, HSVP, it is distressing to note that extension fees have continued to be demanded. This amounts to rubbing salt on the wounds of the allottees as, on the one hand, HSVP has not handed over possession of the plot and, on the other hand, it is demanding penalty in the form of extension fees for non-construction within two years. Such conduct reflects insensitivity and administrative irresponsibility on the part of officials of HSVP, Faridabad. It is noteworthy that only after the matter was taken up for hearing at 11:30 a.m. today and the issue was specifically raised, the date of possession was removed from the portal and an SMS was sent to the revisionist regarding the same prior to the present hearing. Similar issues have arisen in numerous cases before the Commission. Vide earlier orders dated 11.11.2025 in the revision of Sh. Dinesh Kataria, issued under letter no. 4854 dated 18.11.2025, the Commission had directed that in such cases, not only should the date of possession be removed from the portal but interest at the rate of 5.5%, as per Condition No. 5 of the allotment letter, should also be paid to the allottee suo motu, without insisting upon a separate request, so that some measure of relief is afforded to the affected allottees. Unfortunately, Sh. Naveen Kumar, HCS has failed to take action not only in accordance with those directions but despite receipt of the Commission's letter dated 12.01.2026 also in the present case. On being asked, he stated that approximately 190 such plots are under dispute. Proceedings in similarly situated cases have been conducted before the Commission for the last six months and it ought not to have been difficult to take the two corrective actions, namely, removal of the date of possession from the portal and payment of interest as per the terms of the allotment letter, in respect of these plots by now. In fact, such exercise would not require more than two to three working days. The Commission is conscious that Sh. Naveen Kumar was not the officer who conducted the auction of the plot and, therefore, cannot be held responsible for the initial illegality of putting the plots to auction. However, he is certainly expected to ensure compliance with the allotment terms and not harass the allottees further by demanding extension fees. He should have ordered these two actions - removal of date of possession from the portal and payment of interest as per terms of allotment letter when the 2nd appeals were filed with him. It certainly amounts to failure to perform duties under the Act. His failure to do so renders him liable for action under Section 17 of the Haryana Right to Service Act, 2014 (hereinafter referred to as the 'Act'). It is high time that HSVP should wake up from their deep slumber to act as per the rules/instructions and not harass the allottees unnecessarily. The Commission has earlier taken a lenient view in several cases on the assurance given by Sh. Naveen Kumar that the two corrective actions would be taken expeditiously in respect of all disputed plots. It is for this reason that the Commission had refrained from initiating action against him. However, the matter has now reached a stage where the Commission continues to receive revisions and is compelled to hear the distressing grievances of affected allottees without any meaningful resolution at the administrative level. The Commission finds itself unable to provide satisfactory answers to the legitimate queries raised by the allottees, such as: why the plot was put to auction when the title was not clear; when possession will actually be delivered; who will compensate them for the escalating cost of construction and why they should bear the additional burden of bank interest for no fault of their own. HSVP should not expect further leniency when

they have been defaulting in their promises time and again. The Commission has not been requesting Sh. Naveen Kumar, HCS to provide any relief beyond his powers to the allottees but has only time and again requested him to honour the terms of the contract, which he has repeatedly failed to do so. The Commission understands that the notified service in question cannot be delivered right now for legacy issues of HSVP but the SGRA-cum-Estate Officer is well within his duties and obligations to honour the terms of the contract related to the notified service in question. Accordingly, in exercise of the powers vested under Section 17(1)(d) of the Act, the Commission recommends to the Chief Secretary, Government of Haryana, initiation of suitable departmental action against Sh. Naveen Kumar, HCS for failure to perform his duties under Section 7 of the Act, as discussed above. The Chief Secretary, Haryana is requested to intimate the Commission of the action taken in this matter within 30 days from the date of receipt of these orders, as provided under Section 18(1) of the Act, which reads as under: —

‘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.’

At the same time, the EO is directed to make the payment of delayed possession interest within two working days of getting the bank details and confirm the same to the Commission at its email id. He is also directed to refund the extension fees charged from the revisionists in both cases and intimate the Commission accordingly by 02.03.2026.

8. Though these revisions merit higher compensation to the Revisionists but this Commission can award compensation only up to Rs. 5,000/- (the maximum permissible under the Act) in each case. Accordingly, in exercise of its powers under Section 17(1)(h) of the Act, the Commission awards compensation of Rs. 5,000/- each to Sh. Himanshu Sharma and Sh. Sanjeev Verma, which shall be paid by HSVP within 15 days of this order and CA, HSVP is requested to send compliance of the same by 02.03.2026. HSVP may initially pay the same from its own funds which it may recover from the defaulting officials after conducting a thorough investigation. Sh. Himanshu Sharma and Sh. Sanjeev Verma, the revisionists are requested to provide the following details to the office of CA, HSVP (cahsvp01@gmail.com) as well as to the EO, Faridabad (eofbdhsvp@gmail.com) and the Commission (rtsc-hry@gov.in) for making the payment of the compensation: -

- (a) Name of the Bank
- (b) Name of the Account holder in the Bank
- (c) Bank Account Number
- (d) Address of the Bank
- (e) IFSC Code

The allottees are, however free to approach the appropriate forum, such as the Consumer Forum, the Hon'ble High Court or any other competent authority, for claiming higher compensation for the harassment, financial loss, mental agony and hardship suffered by him. Since, the Commission is constrained with respect to the delivery of the notified

service, it cannot ensure possession of the plot in view of the existing conditions. Therefore, the Commission is filing both these revisions accordingly in the hope that HSVP will pursue the case legally to its logical conclusion.

9. Further, as pointed out in the preceding paragraphs, there are numerous such cases which have already been brought to the notice of CA, HSVP. During one of the hearings pertaining to EO-I, HSVP, Faridabad, Sh. Chander Shekhar Khare, IAS, CA, HSVP, had appeared through VC and assured the Commission that the two corrective actions, namely, removal of the date of possession from the accounts of such allottees and payment of interest, would be undertaken expeditiously. These observations are recorded in the orders passed by the Commission in the revision of Sh. Manoj Vashisht (AAS25/1866692) dated 27.01.2026, which were communicated to all concerned, including the CA, HSVP, vide letter no. 436 dated 29.01.2026. Unfortunately, the CA, HSVP has not been able to fulfil the same. He is, therefore, requested to personally review the status of all such cases pertaining to Faridabad and ensure that the aforesaid two actions are taken without further delay.
10. Another request made by such allottees is that they are required to pay monthly EMIs towards their bank loans. Therefore, the interest payable to them under the terms of the allotment should also be disbursed on a monthly basis. This would enable them to partially service their EMIs out of interest until possession of the plot is delivered, thereby providing some financial relief. Since HSVP is bound to pay interest in accordance with the terms of the allotment letter, the request appears to be reasonable. In the present era of information technology, acceding to such a request should not pose any significant administrative difficulty. Accordingly, the CA, HSVP is requested to consider payment of interest on a monthly basis or at least on a quarterly basis and consider intimating allottees of the tentative timeline of possession of their plots in a regular manner.
11. The Commission has analysed reasons for cropping / escalation of such cases. Broadly, possession of these plots has not been handed over for the following three reasons:-
 - (i) **Development works at the site have not been carried out by HSVP:** - CA, HSVP is requested to ensure that the development works are completed expeditiously in a time-bound manner. It is unfortunate that despite being aware that the development works at the site were incomplete, the then CA, HSVP proceeded to auction the plots after giving a direction that the development works be completed within two months in these cases. By no stretch of imagination, development works in HSVP can be completed within such a short period, as the process involves inviting tenders, finalizing contracts and execution of works in accordance with prescribed procedures. For this lapse on the part of the then CA, HSVP, the Commission has already recommended appropriate action to the Chief Secretary to Government of Haryana in two separate cases.
 - (ii) **The title is clear on record but certain farmers/landowners are creating obstacles on the ground:** - During one of the hearings, the Zonal Administrator, Faridabad, had informed the Commission that a possible solution was in the pipeline. CA, HSVP is, therefore, requested to take expeditious steps to resolve the issue so that the fate of those plots may be finalised without further delay.

- (iii) In cases where possession could not be delivered due to pending litigation, despite the plots having been auctioned by HSVP and total consideration amounting to crores having been collected from the allottees, thereby leaving them in a state of uncertainty, the CA, HSVP is requested to depute a dedicated legal team to pursue such matters before the competent courts and seek early vacation of stay orders. In the event that vacation of the stay is not feasible within a reasonable time, the authority may consider allotment of alternative plots in accordance with the applicable policy. The Commission is making these suggestions after having witnessed the hardship and distress faced by such allottees in scores of similar cases.

A copy of these orders is also being endorsed to the Additional Chief Secretary, TCP Department for information and action as deemed fit.

19th February, 2026

