



**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**

**No. HRTSC/Comp-196/Revenue /2024/305**

Dated: 28<sup>th</sup> Jan, 2025

To

The DO-cum-Tehsildar,  
Julana, District-Jind, Haryana.  
E-mail: [tehsildarjulana@gmail.com](mailto:tehsildarjulana@gmail.com) & [dcjind@hry.nic.in](mailto:dcjind@hry.nic.in)

**Subject: Complaint Regarding-Demarcation of Land if no standing Crop,**  
**From:- Sh. Krishan S/o Randhir Singh (Email:- [sdsingh29101054@gmail.com](mailto:sdsingh29101054@gmail.com) )**

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith a copy of the Interim order dated **22<sup>nd</sup> January, 2025** passed by Sh. T.C. Gupta, Chief Commissioner, Haryana Right to Service Commission, Chandigarh in respect of above case for information and compliance.

(Sube Khan)

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

Endst. No. HRTSC/Comp-196/Revenue /2024/306

Dated: 28 Jan 2025

A copy is forwarded to Sh. Krishan S/o Randhir Singh (Email: - [sdsingh29101054@gmail.com](mailto:sdsingh29101054@gmail.com) ) for information only.

(Sube Khan)

Under Secretary-cum-Registrar,  
Haryana Right to Service Commission  
E-mail: [rtsc-hry@gov.in](mailto: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**

**Interim Orders**

**(In respect of File No. HRTSC/Comp-196/Revenue/2024)**

**Hearing date: 22.01.2025**

**Time: 10:30 am**

<b>Case Type</b>	Complaint Case
<b>Department</b>	Revenue and Disaster Management
<b>Name of Service</b>	<i>Demarcation of Land if no standing Crop</i>
<b>Date of Application</b>	04.07.2023
<b>RTS Timeline</b>	45 Days
<b>RTS Due Date</b>	05.09.2023
<b>District</b>	Jind
<b>Name of the Appellant</b>	Sh. Krishan
<b>Designated Officer (DO)</b>	Tehsildar/Circle Revenue Officer (CRO), Julana
<b>First Grievances Redressal Authority (FGRA)</b>	Sub-Divisional Magistrate (SDM), Jind
<b>Second Grievances Redressal Authority (SGRA)</b>	Deputy Commissioner (DC), Jind

2. The complainant, Sh. Krishan submitted a complaint vide email dated 03.12.2024 for the service "*Demarcation of Land if no standing Crop*" notified under the Haryana Right to Service Act, 2014 (hereinafter referred to as the 'Act'). Taking cognizance of the matter, the Commission sent a letter to DO-cum-CRO (Tehsildar), Julana vide no. HRTSC/Comp-196/Revenue/2024/5620 on 12.12.2024, directing her to send an action taken report by 30.12.2024. A response was received from the DO-cum-CRO (Tehsildar), Julana vide memo no. 1225/O.K dated 30.12.2024, stating that the demarcation was completed and same was entered in the records on 30.12.2024.
3. On perusal of the reply, it is clear that while the demarcation process was completed, the same has happened only post intervention of the Commission. Given that the first complaint was made on 04.07.2023, it has taken 17 months for the service to be delivered. To fix responsibility for the undue delay in the service delivery, a hearing was scheduled with the DO-cum-CRO (Tehsildar), Julana along with the complainant to be held before Sh. T.C. Gupta, Chief Commissioner, Haryana Right to Service Commission on 22.01.2025 at 10:30 am, which was conveyed vide letter no. HRTSC/Comp-196/Revenue/2024/38 on 10.01.2025.
4. The hearing took place as scheduled, which was attended by:
  - i. Sh. Satpal Kanungo on behalf of Ms. Shalini Lather, DO-cum-CRO (Tehsildar), Julana.

- ii. Sh. Sandeep Singh and Sh. Krishan, the complainant.

It was informed by Sh. Satpal, Kanungo that Ms. Shalini Lather, Tehsildar Julana, is not well and that Sh. Pawan, Kanungo, is also unwell, and thus he had been asked to appear for the hearing in their place.

The complainant, Sh. Sandeep Singh, stated that he has been pursuing the demarcation case since 2023, but the process has not been completed. He mentioned that a resolution was passed by the Gram Panchayat recognizing the area as a public pathway (Rasta) and requested the authorities for demarcation, yet the demarcation has not been carried out by the Kanungo and the Patwari. Additionally, he claimed to have received a report dated 30.12.2024 indicating that demarcation had been completed, but upon speaking with the signatories, they denied conducting any demarcation on-site. Therefore, he requested that the demarcation be carried out again after the standing crop is harvested.

On the other hand, Sh. Satpal, Kanungo, appearing on behalf of the DO, stated that the responsible Kanungo for this land is Sh. Pawan, and the Patwari is Sh. Aman. He explained that after receiving the Commission's notice on 12.12.2024, a demarcation was carried out on 30.12.2024. However, due to the standing crop on the Rasta, they advised the complainant to take possession after the harvesting season. When questioned about how the demarcation was conducted with the standing crop still in place, Sh. Satpal could not provide an answer and stated that only Sh. Pawan, the Kanungo, could respond to this query.

5. The Commission has carefully considered all the facts and circumstances of this case. The first issue is the delay, which is certainly there in this case. The second issue is whether any demarcation was done on the ground or not. The demarcation report contains the signatures of seven persons, including the Sarpanch of Gram Panchayat, Nandgarh. When the Gram Panchayat itself had requested the demarcation of the land and the Sarpanch had signed the demarcation report, it means that he is satisfied. Therefore, the verbal statement of the complainant that the signatures are fake or have been obtained through misrepresentation does not carry any weight, and these allegations are rejected altogether. However, the question remains as to how the demarcation was done with the DGPS machine when there was a standing crop on the ground, as also stated by Sh. Satpal, Kanungo, during the hearing. In view of the above, the following is ordered:

- i. The DO-cum-CRO i.e. Tehsildar, Julana to explain as to why there was delay in carrying out the demarcation in this case.

- ii. How this demarcation was done when there was standing crop on ground on 30.12.2024?

The answer to the above queries should be sent to the Commission via e-mail at [rtsc-hry@gov.in](mailto:rtsc-hry@gov.in) by 7th February 2025. The DO should also fix the responsibility for the delay and submit the report along with their explanations. If this report is not received by the specified date, she, along with the concerned Patwari, Sh. Aman, and Sh. Pawan, Kanungo, are directed to appear before the Commission via video conference at 12:30 pm on 10<sup>th</sup> February 2025.

22<sup>nd</sup> January, 2025

