

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

No. 3171 To Dated: 19.07.2024

The Additional Chief Secretary to Government Haryana,

Energy Department.

E-mail: acs.power@hry.gov.in

The Managing Director,

UHBVN.

E-mail: md@uhbvn.org.in

Sh. Sudhakar Tiwari, SGRA-cum-SE, Division (Electricity)-Pinjore, Panchkula

Contact: 7419801005

E-mail: seoppanchkula@uhbvn.org.in

XEN-cun-FGRA

Division (Electricity)-Pinjore, Panchkula

Contact: 9888021007

E-mail: xenoppinjore@uhbvn.org.in

The SDO(Op)-cum-DO,

Division (Electricity)-Pinjore, Panchkula

Contact: 7419402124

E-mail: sdooppinjore@uhbvn.org.in

Subject:- Revision Details -AAS24/1047255 Name- Sh. RAMESH KUMAR Service- Shifting of LT HT Lines [RTS - 21 Days] UHBVN

AutoAppeal(CM Window) on 27.06.2024.

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith a copy of the orders dated 17th July, 2024 passed by Sh. T.C. Gupta Chief Commissioner, Haryana Right to Service Commission, Chandigarh in respect of above 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

Endst. No. 3172

Dated: 19.07.2024

A copy of the above is forwarded the following:-

 Sh. Sh. Rajinder Kumar, SE, UHBVN, Nodal Officer for RTS matters on behalf of UHBVN. E-mail: r.untale@gmail.com

2. The appellant Sh. Ramesh Kumar Phone No. 8295642925 (through AAS) 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 (2nd FLOOR), SECTOR 17-A, CHANDIGARH-160017 Website-https://haryana-rtsc.gov.in/ Telephone: 0172-2711050

Interim Orders

(In respect of Revision Details-AAS24/1047255 Name- Sh. RAMESH KUMAR Service- Shifting of LT HT Lines [RTS - 21 Days] UHBVN Auto Appeal (CM Window) on 27.06.2024.

Hearing date: 17.07.2024

Commission

Case type	Revision on AAS
Department	UHBVN
Name of Service	Shifting of LT/HT Lines
Date of application	25.01.2024
RTS timeline	21 Days

Time: 10:30 am

DEC 1' 1'		The state of the s
RTS timeline		21 Days
Target Date		28.02.2024
District		Panchkula
Name of the Appellant		Sh. Ramesh Kumar
Designated Officer	Designation	Sub-Division (Electricity)-Pinjore
45,75	Action taken with date	Undertaken on 30.01.2024
	Remarks of DO	"Undertake."
First Grievance Redressal Authority	Designation	XEN, Division (Electricity)-Pinjore
	Date and mode of appeal submitted to FGRA	27.03.2024 (Auto Appeal)
	Remarks of the Appellant	NA
	Action taken by the FGRA with date	Direction issued on 09.04.2024
	Remarks of FGRA	"SUBMIT REPLY WITHIN 7 DAYS."
Second Grievance Designation Redressal Authority		SE, Circle (Electricity)-Panchkula
	Date and mode of appeal submitted to SGRA	14.05.2024 (AutoAppeal (Saral))
	Remarks of the Appellant	NA
	Action taken by SGRA with date	Interim order issued or 13.06.2024.
	Remarks of SGRA	"pfa 3 rd interim" Gist is as follows: Prompt action was not taken by SDO (OP) Pinjore. Complaint was filed on 09.04.2024 whereas demand for allocation of required material was raised by the SDO or 28.05.2024 and 07.06.2024.

filing of

Date of

Mode of Revision

Revision

Remarks

Appellant

28.05.2024 and 07.06.2024"

28.06.2024

NA

Auto Appeal (Saral)

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 letter to SDO, Sub-Division (Electricity)-Pinjore vide no. 2798 dated 02.07.2024. He was directed to investigate the matter and send the action taken report by 15.07.2024 and a hearing was scheduled to be held before Sh. T.C. Gupta, Chief Commissioner, Haryana Right to Service Commission on 17.07.2024.2024 at 10:30 am.
- 3. A response was received from SDO, Sub-Division (Electricity)-Pinjore vide memo no. 4648 dated 15.07.2024 stating that the site was visited and the estimate was framed. The material requirement has been sent but the material was not available in the central store. After receiving the material from the central store, work was completed and the complainant is satisfied. The delay was due to the hilly terrain and the non-availability of material and labour.
- 4. The hearing took place as scheduled which was attended by:
 - Sh. Rajinder Kumar, SE, UHBVN, Nodal Officer for RTS matters on behalf of UHBVN.
 - ii. Sh. Satyawan Nain, SDO, Sub-Division (Electricity)-Pinjore.

Sh. Ramesh Kumar, the appellant did not attend the hearing despite advance notice. From the history of the appeal on the AAS Portal, it is evident that the SDO did not take requisite action in the notified period of 21 days and he merely 'Undertook' the application on CM Window on 30.01.2024. When the appeal was automatically raised to the FGRA-cum-XEN, Pinjore, on 27.03.2024, he issued a direction in routine on 09.04.2024 to the SDO to provide the service within 7 days positively. Thereafter, he did not take any action and consequently the appeal was automatically escalated to the SGRA on 14.05.2024. It goes to the credit of the SGRA that he conducted the hearings and issued three interim orders, the latest being dated 12.06.2024 from which it is evident that he not only heard the case as appellate authority but got it resolved it actively. In these orders, he has held the SDO (OP) Pinjore as well as the JE (OP) responsible for delay and negligence. The relevant portion of the order is as under:-

"After discussion with SDO (OP) S/Divn. Pinjore during the hearing, it has been observed that prompt action was not taken by the SDO/OP S/Divn. Pinjore for the execution of the work. The complaint was filed on 09.04.2024 whereas the demand for allocation of required material was raised by the SDO on 28.05.2024 & 07.06.2024 causing delay in the shifting of HT/LT line, which clearly shows negligence on the part of the SDO OP S/Divn Pinjore. It seems that the SDO 'OP'/ JE 'OP' is taking shelter of non-availability of material inspite of requisite

material being available in stores. SDO OP S/Divn. Pinjore is directed to get the work of shifting of said HT/LT lines within a week without any excuse. The compliance report be submitted before the appellant authority by 18.06.2024."

Sh. Satyawan Nain was specifically asked during the hearing by the Commission to respond regarding the observations of the SGRA-cum-SE. He stated that the fault was on the part of Monu, JE. He further elaborated that this village falls at the border of Haryana and Himachal Pradesh and the terrain is hilly. Therefore, some additional time was taken in preparing the estimates as he prepared the estimates for the entire village and not just for the appellant. After arranging the material with the help of the SGRA-cum-SE, the work was completed. He was specifically asked to mention the date when the work was completed and he stated that it has been recently completed on 13.07.2024. He further added that Sh. Monu, JE has been negligent in performance of his duties and was suspended on 15.07.2024. He also attributed the delay to the availability of labour in hilly terrains.

Sh. Rajinder Kumar, SE-cum-Nodal Officer stated that the terrain is difficult and the electricity supply was continuing in the area but admitted that there was delay. However, he requested for lenient view in this case.

5. The Commission has carefully considered all facts and circumstances of this case. The complainant in this case filed a complaint on CM Window on 25.01.2024. However, it is unfortunate to note that despite undertaking this complaint by the SDO on 30.01.2024, no action was taken till 27.03.2024 when it was converted into an AAS Appeal. It is worthwhile to mention here that a landmark decision was taken on the directions of Hon'ble Chief Minister, Haryana to link CM Window with Auto Appeal System in respect of notified services so that in case, complaints filed under CM Window are not dealt with in a timely manner, they will be taken up by the Commission through the Auto Appeal System. It is only because of this system which was put in place by the Haryana Right to Service Commission, that the work of the appellant has been done though belatedly as is evident from the sequence of events. The lapse on the part of the SDO is clearly visible. Same has also been noted by the SGRAcum-SE in his orders dated 12.06.2024, portion of which has been quoted in para no. 4 above. Sh. Monu, JE is also responsible for the delay but it was for the SDO to take action against him. He should have recommended action against him to the senior authorities when he found lapses on his part instead of blaming him now. In that case, the Commission would have held only Sh. Monu, JE responsible for the lapses. There is definitely a delay in sending the demand estimate and he has taken shelter in non-availability of material in spite of the availability of requisite material which is not acceptable. As the Designated Officer, he is squarely responsible for the delivery of the notified

service and therefore, the Commission holds him accountable for the delay in delivery of the notified service. The Commission, in exercise of its powers vested under Section 17 (1) (h) of the Act, imposes a token penalty of Rs. 5,000/- on Shri Satyawan Nain, SDO. SE, Panchkula is directed to ensure the deduction of this amount from his salary of July, 2024 to be paid in August, 2024 and deposit the same in the State Treasury under the Receipts Head 0070-60-800-86-51. SE Panchkula is also requested to intimate compliance to the Commission by 12.08.2024 along with photocopies of the Challan at its email Id-rtsc-hry@gov.in.

- 6. As far as the role of FGRA-cum-XEN, Pinjore is concerned, it is also deficient because the same action which was taken by the SGRA-cum-SE should have been taken by him. He issued the directions in routine and failed to adhere to the provisions of Section 6 (2) of the Haryana Right to Service Act, 2014. In case of non-delivery of service, he was under an obligation to hold a hearing with the applicant as well as with the Designated Officer in which he failed. Therefore, it is a fit case where disciplinary proceeding should be recommended against him for which a notice under Regulation 10 of the Haryana Right to Service Commission (Management) Regulations, 2015 is hereby issued to him to respond by 30.07.2024 as to why disciplinary action under Section 17 (1) (d) of the Act may not be recommended against him to the State Government.
- 7. As far as the action taken by Sh. Sudhakar Tiwari, SGRA-cum-SE is concerned, the Commission would like to compliment him for the pro-active action taken by him and pointing out the deficiency on the part of his junior officials. It needs courage to fix the responsibility and the Commission is happy to note that he was not deterred from recording the truth. It is hoped that not only will he continue to work like this in future but the other officers will also take inspiration from him in not only performing the role of the appellate authority under Section 7 of the Act but also in taking pro-active steps to resolve the grievance/requirement of the applicants. Copy of this order is being endorsed to MD, UHBVN for bringing the good conduct of the SGRA-cum-SE to his notice.

Gupta)

HRTSC

17th July, 2024