

HARYANA RIGHT TO SERVICE COMMISSION  
S.C.O. No. 38 & 39 (2<sup>nd</sup> FLOOR), SECTOR 17-A, CHANDIGARH-160017  
E-mail: [rtsc-hry@gov.in](mailto:rtsc-hry@gov.in) Telephone: 0172-2711050

No. HRTSC/SM-052/ULB/2021/ 2334

Dated 07.06.2022

To

1. Sh. Prem Prakash,  
Zonal Taxation Officer,  
Municipal Corporation, Faridabad.  
E-mail: [cmc.mcfbd@gmail.com](mailto:cmc.mcfbd@gmail.com)

**Subject: - Revision appeal order no.HRTSC/SM-052/ULB/2021/1529 dated 19.04.2022.**

\*\*\*\*\*

I am directed to forward herewith a copy of the order dated 07.06.2022 passed by Sh. T.C. Gupta, Chief Commissioner, Haryana Right to Service Commission, Chandigarh in respect of above case for information.

**BY THE ORDER OF THE HARYANA RIGHT TO SERVICE COMMISSION AT CHANDIGARH.**

Encl: as above.




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

Endst. No. HRTSC/ SM-052/ULB/2021/ 2335

Dated: 07.06.2022

A copy of the above is forwarded to Sh.Puneet Arora(Complainant) for information.

(Sube Khan)  
Under Secretary-cum-Registrar  
For 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: haryana-rtsc.gov.in Telephone: 0172-2711050

### Orders

The 'Revision Appeal' filed by Sh. Prem Parkash has been perused. Firstly, wrong nomenclature has been used by Sh. Prem Parkash for filing this 'Revision Appeal'. The correct name should have been 'review application' under section 17 (1) (i) of the Haryana Right to Service Act, 2014. Coming to the merits of the case, nothing new has been submitted by Sh. Prem Parkash in this appeal. It had been wrongly stated that Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Faridabad deputed Zonal and Taxation Officer as Designated Officer under Right to Service Act, 2014 vide order dated 02.09.2021. In fact, Zonal Taxation Officer has been notified as Designated Officer right since 07.05.2015 when the service was notified and the Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Faridabad only reminded the concerned officers about their role as designated officers vide his communication dated 02.09.2021. Moreover, as designated officer, it was his duty to review the pendency of notified services pertaining to his branch and if the requisite report was not being sent by the other branch officer namely Assistant Engineer (Building), Ballabgarh in this case, he should have taken up issue with him and if the file was not traceable, he should have got it reconstructed as has been done by his present successor. Moreover, during his tenure, he again got a complaint from the complainant on social media which he forwarded in routine to Assistant Engineer (Building) and this aspect has already been dealt with in the main orders in detail. He remained ZTO in Ballabgarh Zone from 11.01.2019 to 24.08.2020 i.e. for more than one year and seven months. This period was sufficient for him to review the pendency of his branch. Therefore, finding no merit in this so called 'Revision Appeal', treated as 'review' under section 17 (1) (i), is hereby dismissed. However, since the complainant does not want to receive the compensation, orders dated 20.04.2022 are modified to the effect that no compensation shall be paid to the complainant Sh. Puneet Arora as communicated by him. Otherwise also, it has been informed by the appellant that accepting the orders of the Commission, he has deposited the penalty amount of Rs. 10,000/- in the State Treasury. Therefore, nothing survives in this appeal/review.

7<sup>th</sup> June, 2022

