



ARYANA 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

HRTSC/ File no. 170/SM-350 /1889

Dated: 04.05.2023

To

Sh. Manoj Kumar,
Bank Manager, Sarva Haryana Gramin Bank,
VPO- Hassangarh, Tehsil- Barwala, Hisar, Haryana
(8569817940)

Subject: Final orders regarding review petition in respect of Suo-moto notice no. HRTSC/File no.170/ SM-350/74 dated 15.02.2023.

I am directed to forward herewith a copy of the final order dated 04.05.2023 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
Email: rtsc-hry@gov.in

Endst. No.HRTSC/File no. 170/SM-350 /1890

Dated: 04.05.2023

A copy of the above is forwarded to Sh. Surender Kumar (Complainant) for information.



(Sube Khan)

Under-Secretary cum Registrar,
Haryana Right to Service Commission
Email: rtsc-hry@gov.in



Final Orders

(In respect of Review Petition dated 15.03.23 filed by Sh. Manoj Kumar, Branch Manager, Sarv Haryana Gramin Bank, Hasangarh)

Sh. Manoj Kumar, Branch Manager, Sarv Haryana Gramin Bank, Hasangarh submitted a petition dated 15.03.23 to the Commission, requesting for review of Commission's orders dated 23.02.23 in the AAS Appeal no. AAS22/340408 filed by Sh. Surender Kumar. The review petition first cited reasons for delay in disbursement and the need for filling of another form by the appellant. It then cited that between 08.08.22-28.10.22, he communicated the appellant multiple times regarding the need for filling the additional form of the bank and even went to his home, attaching an affidavit to this effect from the appellant Sh. Surender Kumar. This was found surprising as neither the Sh. Manoj Kumar, nor Sh. Surender Kumar had made his claim during the hearing dated 20.02.23 before the Commission. At that time, Sh. Surender Kumar had expressed being inconvenienced by Sh. Manoj Kumar for the application. The Chief Commissioner, after receiving the review petition, spoke to Shri Surender Kumar on telephone regarding this matter. When questioned, he conceded that the statement has been obtained from him by the Bank Manager after lot of request was made to him by Shri Manoj Kumar and some other persons. He even conceded that the affidavit which was signed by him was got made by Shri Manoj Kumar himself. He further stated that he did not go to Notary Public for attestation but attestation has been got done by Shri Manoj Kumar himself.

The Commission has considered all the facts and submissions of the case. The penalty imposed by the Commission earlier was not for getting that additional form filled. The penalty was for the delay of almost three months in getting that form filled. The claim of Sh.

Manoj Kumar of having contacted the appellant multiple times is highly discrepant, as the same was not claimed during the initial hearing and now even the complainant has refuted the contents of the affidavit and has revealed the true facts. Also, if this was the case, Sh. Manoj Kumar should have at least intimated the Department, from which the initial application had been received by his branch that the appellant was not coming forward to complete the formalities. This review petition is based on concocted story and is backed by a false affidavit. In view of these observations, the review petition of Sh. Manoj Kumar is hereby dismissed. However, the Commission is refraining from initiating any further action against Shri Manoj Kumar for submitting a false affidavit.

4th May, 2023

