



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-010004/86/2025 / 3273

Dated: 07.08.2025

To

The DO-cum-Estate Officer,
HSVP, Rohtak.
E-mail: eorohhtakhuda2@gmail.com

The CCF, HSVP, Panchkula.
E-mail: ccfhsvp@gmail.com

Subject:- Revision No- AAS25/1579290-Appellant- PRIYANKA SAINI-Service-Conveyance Deed [RTS - 7 Days] -Rohtak

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith a copy of the Interim order dated **05th August, 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, EO is requested to submit the report to the Commission by **14.08.2025** 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 the appellant- PRIYANKA SAINI (M- 9466666152) (through AAS Portal) for Information 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

Interim orders

(In respect Revision No- AAS25/1579290-Appellant - Priyanka Saini - Service-Conveyance Deed [RTS - 7 Days] - Rohtak)

Hearing date: 05.08.2025

Time: 12:00 noon

Case type		Revision on AAS
Department		HSVP
Name of Service		Conveyance Deed
Date of application		30.04.2025
RTS timeline		7 Days
RTS Due Date		08.05.2025
District		Rohtak
Name of the Appellant		Ms. Priyanka Saini
Designated Officer	Designation	Estate Officer, Rohtak
	Action taken with date	Application rejected on 15.05.2025
	Remarks of DO	“Reason of rejection updated soon”
First Grievance Redressal Authority	Designation	Administrator, Rohtak, Zonal Office-Rohtak
	Date and mode of appeal submitted to FGRA	09.05.2025 (Auto Appeal (SaraI))
	Remarks of the Appellant	N.A.
	Action taken by the FGRA with date	Appeal Dismissed on 10.06.2025
	Remarks of FGRA	“As per comment of Estate Officer, HSVP Rohtak,The application was rejected as per accountant comments due to Reference is made to the communication received from the allottee regarding four plots (E135, E136, E149, and E150) in Sector 27-28-26PIII Rohtak. The following matter requires attention: 1. For Plot No. E136, Smt. Priyanka Saini (highest bidder in e-auction) has reported that: o She made 5 transactions of Rs. 1 lakh each (total Rs. 5 lakhs) on 07-02-2022 o On 16-03-2022, 4 transactions of Rs. 1 lakh each were reversed to her Axis Bank account 2. This matter was escalated to Head Quarter multiple times: o 31-03-2022 o 13-04-2022 o 20-04-2022 No response has been received to date. 3. Current Status: o System still shows 4 entries of Rs. 1 lakh each dated 07-02-2022 as received payment for Plot No. E136 o Allottee has confirmed that amount was reversed and not re-deposited Recommendations: 1. For

		Plot No. E136: Application for Conveyance Deed should be rejected as the reversed amount has not been re-deposited. 2. For remaining plots (E135, E149, and E150): Process Conveyance Deed applications only after obtaining an affidavit from the allottee confirming that the deposited amounts for these plots have not been reversed to their bank account, the same was not submitted by applicant till the rejection/processing of said application. Hence, it is requested to dispose this appeal as there was no intentional delay. Hence this appeal is hereby disposed off. /.”
Second Grievance Redressal Authority	Designation	Administrator, Head Quarter, State-Haryana
	Date and mode of appeal submitted to SGRA	10.06.2025 (Self Filed by Applicant on AAS Portal)
	Remarks of the Appellant	“I applied for a conveyance deed on April 30th but it was cancelled. I visited the office seven times but the staff was uncooperative. I met with the former estate officer twice and they asked me to provide an affidavit but even after that my conveyance deed was not approved. /” (copy enclosed)
	Action taken by SGRA with date	Appeal Dismissed on 23.06.2025
	Remarks of SGRA	“In view of reply of Estate officer, service has been delivered for Plot No E149 as given in appeal. Details also confirmed from appellant through telephonic confirmation by this office about plot no E149 for the CDeed about delivery. Appeal disposed of. /”
Commission	Date of filing of Revision	23.06.2025
	Mode of Revision	Self Filed by Applicant on Saral Portal
	Remarks of the Appellant	“Please approve my Plot No. 136 conveyance deed request, which has been pending in the Estate Office Rohtak since 30th April 2025. I am exhausted from continuously following up, but no satisfactory response is being given only date after date, date after date. /.” (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 DO-cum-Estate Officer, Rohtak vide letter no. HRSC-010004/86/2025/2419 on 25.06.2025. He was requested to send the action taken report by 10.07.2025.

Accordingly, a reply was received from the Estate Officer, HSVP, Rohtak vide memo no. 226864 on 09.07.2025, stating that the applications for conveyance deeds were submitted for four plots — E-135, E-136, E-149 and E-150 — located in Sector 27-28-26P, Rohtak, in the name of Smt. Priyanka Saini. The allottee informed through email that the amount deposited by her against plot E-136 was reversed to her bank account. She was subsequently requested to submit affidavits for the remaining plots. Once received, these affidavits were processed and conveyance the deed for plot E-149 was executed between 20.05.2025 and 21.05.2025. In the case of plot E-136, it was found that four out of five payments of Rs. 1 lakh each were reversed and refunded on 16.03.2022. The matter was referred to the Head Office for investigation. However, no response was initially received. During the audit, it was observed that the reversed amount had not been re-deposited by the allottee. It was also noted that they had no mechanism to verify the transaction, as the Receipt Account was managed exclusively by the Head Office. A communication was sent to the Head Office on 20.05.2025, followed by a reminder on 25.06.2025. A response was received on 04.07.2025, which was forwarded to the complainant with a request to provide her bank account details. Another email was sent to the allottee on 07.07.2025, reiterating the same request but no response was received from her. It was acknowledged that the allottee admitted to having received the refund, which had not been re-deposited. In light of this, the execution was placed on hold.

3. For further proceedings in this matter, a hearing was scheduled with the DO-cum-Estate Officer, CCF, HSVP and the revisionist to be held before Sh. T. C. Gupta, Chief Commissioner, Haryana Right to Service Commission on 05.08.2025 at 12:00 noon, which was conveyed vide letter no. 2894 on 18.07.2025. In the meantime, two replies were received:
 - (i) Reply received from the Estate Officer, HSVP, Rohtak, vide memo no. 247644 dated 28.07.2025. The detailed reply may be treated as part of the orders and is enclosed herewith for reference.
 - (ii) Reply received from the CCF, HSVP, vide memo no. HSVP/CCF/AO-Cash/2025/251360 on 29.07.2025, stated that an amount of Rs. 5,00,000/- (comprising five entries of Rs. 1,00,000/- each) had been credited to CA, HSVP account number 50100347094933 on 07.02.2022 and was subsequently reversed on 04.03.2022. Accordingly, these funds were no longer reflected as debited in the HSVP account. All five entries were linked to Mobile No. 9466666152, which corresponded to Plot No. E-136, Sector-27-28, 26-Phase-III, Rohtak. It was further confirmed that no amount had been received from the allottee thereafter.
4. (a) The hearing took place as scheduled, which was attended by the following:

- i. Sh. Ashish Kumar, HCS, Designated Officer-cum-Estate Officer, HSVP, Rohtak.
- ii. Sh. Parduman K. Sachdeva, CCF, HSVP, Panchkula
- iii. Ms. Priyanka Saini, the appellant alongwith Mr. Neeraj Saini, h/o the appellant

(b) The complainant was represented by Sh. Neeraj Saini, who reiterated the contents of their complaint. He further stated that the issue now pertains only to Plot No. E136. As per the account statement available on the PPM portal of HSVP, the status reflects that the plot is fully paid, with no outstanding balance. He asserted that he was never informed by HSVP of any payment reversal by the bank. He also claimed that possession of the plot has already been handed over to him. Therefore, he is entitled to obtain the Conveyance Deed (CD) without making any further payment.

(c) On the other hand, the Estate Officer (EO) and Chief Controller of Finance (CCF) reiterated the contents of their replies, which have been incorporated in paragraph no. 3 above.

5. The Commission has carefully considered all the facts and circumstances of this case. It is indeed perplexing that if the amounts were actually reversed by the bank, the plot is still reflected as fully paid. If the statement of the Chief Controller of Finance (CCF) is to be believed—that five entries of Rs. 1,00,000 each, credited to the HSVP account on 07.02.2022, were subsequently reversed on 04.03.2022. Then the plot account should have been immediately debited by this amount, clearly reflecting the outstanding balance payable by the allottee in accordance with the terms of allotment. In such a situation, there would have been no question of offering or handing over possession of the plot. Therefore, HSVP appears to be clearly at fault in this matter.

As far as the allottee is concerned, if the entries had indeed been reversed as claimed by the CCF, he would have certainly received a message from his bank indicating that the amount had been credited back. In such a scenario, he would have been duty-bound to make the payment to HSVP again. During the discussion, it transpired that the allottee had taken four plots through e-auction. When the five entries of Rs. 1,00,000 each were reversed, he himself approached the office of the Estate Officer to ascertain the specific plot numbers against which the reversals had occurred. However, the EO was unable to provide this information, due to which the allottee could not deposit the amount from that date until the matter reached the Commission.

In the interest of justice, it is hereby ordered that the CCF shall provide the details of the bank account(s) in which the five entries of Rs. 1,00,000 each were originally credited, along with the details of the bank/branch from which these payments were made and the respective dates and details of the reversal entries. The said information must be shared with the Estate Officer by 07.08.2025 while

keeping the Commission and the revisionist in copy. Thereafter, the EO shall inform the allottee to make the payment along with applicable interest for which time till 14.08.2025 is given to the EO. The said communication should also be marked copy to the Commission. The allottee had contended that he is not liable to pay interest as he was not informed of the reversals. However, the Commission is not convinced by this argument. If the amount was indeed reversed by his bank, his claim lies against the bank and HSVP cannot be made to suffer on this account. The allottee is at liberty to seek redressal from the bank(s) concerned but HSVP shall remain entitled to recover interest on the outstanding amount. It shall be the responsibility of the allottee to make the payment upon receipt of communication from the EO in order to get the conveyance deed executed. Simultaneously, the CCF is also directed to inquire and report why there is no mechanism in HSVP to debit the allottee's account in the PPM portal when payment entries are reversed. In this particular case, the allottee voluntarily approached the EO to report the reversals. However, there may be other cases where allottees do not report such reversals and in such instances, the EOs may proceed to execute the conveyance deed based on the misleading entries on the PPM portal, resulting in financial loss to HSVP and the State exchequer.

This case will be disposed of only after receiving copies of the relevant communications from the CCF and the EO.

05th August, 2025

