



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

HRTSC/File no.87/ SM-90/ 5477

Dated: 21.12.2022

To

Sh. Suraj Bhan, IFS,  
DFO, Yamunanagar,  
Forest Department, Haryana

**Subject:** - Final order regarding Suo-moto notice no. HRTSC/File no.87/SM-90/1112 dated 24.03.2022.

I am directed to forward herewith a copy of the order dated 19.12.2022 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  
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: [www.haryana-rtsc.gov.in](http://www.haryana-rtsc.gov.in) Telephone: 0172-2711050

### ORDERS

#### Final Orders in respect of following suo moto notices:

1. HRTSC/File no.87/SM-88/1110 issued to Sh. Ram Kumar Jangra, DFO, Panchkula.
2. HRTSC/File no.87/SM-89/1111 issued to Sh.R.S.Dhull, DFO, Gurugram.
3. HRTSC/File no.87/SM-90/1112 issued to Sh. Suraj Bhan, DFO, Yamunanagar.
4. HRTSC/File no.87/SM-99/1121 issued to Sh. Bhupinder Singh, DFO, Panchkula.
5. HRTSC/File no.87/SM-219/2671 issued to Sh. Afzal Khan, RFO, Nuh.
6. HRTSC/File no.87/SM-224/2676 issued to Sh. Sunil Sharma, the then Range Forest Officer (Retd.), Pinjore.
7. HRTSC/File no.87/SM-229/2681 issued to Sh.G. Raman, IFS, APCCF Development Haryana, Panchkula.

1. An RTS review was held on 27.07.21 with the officials of Haryana Forest Department under the chairmanship of Chief Commissioner, Haryana Right to Service Commission to discuss the RTS performance of the Department in its two notified services – 190 'Permission for Felling of Trees' and 191 'NOC in respect of PLPA or Forest or Restricted Lands'. Inter alia, the Department was asked to share data pertaining to cases for the two services delivered outside RTS timelines for the period 01.07.20-30.06.21. The Department was further instructed to share monthly RTS performance reports with the Commission by 10<sup>th</sup> of every month. While data for the period 01.07.20-30.06.21 was shared by the Department vide their letter no. MIS/36 dated 02.09.21 informing of 521 and 114 delayed cases for both the services respectively across the State, the details pertaining to Designated Officers were missing. On Commission's reminder, revised data of delayed cases for the periods 01.07.20-30.06.21 and 01.07.21-07.01.22 was shared by the Department vide their letter no. MIS/92 dated 13.01.22. The same informed of 526 and 117 delayed cases for both the services respectively for the period 01.07.20-30.06.21 and; 36 and 9 delayed cases for both the services respectively for the period 01.07.21-07.01.22 along with the names of Designated Officers. The total of delayed cases across the two services for both the periods came to 688. 230 of these fell in the COVID wave 1 and 2 periods (July,20-August,20 and Mid-March,21-June,21). Considering that offices were functioning with limited staff and almost all Departments, including Forest, were also called upon to support the COVID relief work, all these cases were filed by the Commission. 17 cases were also filed owing to minor delays in very limited cases from the concerned officers and for 6 cases, explanation was sought from CF-Gurugram Office and PCCF office. For the remaining delayed cases- Suo moto notices were issued to 14 DFOs to ascertain the reasons for delay and if imposition of penalty was called for.
2. Replies were received from all of the 14 respondents and all of them also appeared for hearing before the Commission in person or through VC on 19.04.22.
3. Among others, in the following cases, the lapse was observed at the level of officers other than the 14 respondent DFOs and hence, the suo moto notices were issued to the

