

## Chandigarh Right to Service Commission

(Chandigarh Administration)

Nagar Yojana Bhavan, C- Wing, Sector 18-A, Madhya Marg, Chandigarh -  
160018 Phone No. 0172-2700018, email – [chd.rtsc@chd.nic.in](mailto:chd.rtsc@chd.nic.in) website:  
[rtsc.chd.gov.in](http://rtsc.chd.gov.in)

No. PS/CRTSC/2025/ 71

Dated: - 19/08/25

Petition No. 22 of 2025-2026

Shri Paramjeet Singh

Vs.

Branch Incharge-cum-Designated Officer (under the Right to Service Act),  
office of Estate Officer, UT Chandigarh.

### ORDER

Whereas, a complaint/application has been received in the Chandigarh Right to Service Commission on 03.06.2025, from Shri Paramjeet Singh, in which he has stated as under:-

*"Myself Mr. Paramjeet Singh owner house no 4025 Sec 46 D Chandigarh senior citizen aged 75 years. For the last 04 years I have going from pillar to post for getting the details of extension amount I have to deposit in the estate office Chandigarh for my above house, every time I have to come back with no results, I was allotted the house on 01/06/1982, building plan was approved on 2005, building was constructed on 2006, after that I was told that new rates for approval will come and we will let you know, then I again started requisition estate office people that let me know the extension amount I am ready to deposit but no response, my electricity meter connection was also installed on 08.12.2008, I have submitted all documents to Estate Office, but I am really surprised that I am ready to pay extension charges, but Estate Office people are not ready to let me know, I am already 75 years old, I do not know if in my life-time I will get my extension fee submitted or not, this is the position of Estate Office, UT, Chandigarh, where they do not care even of old age people like us.*

*So You are requested to deal in this matter and help me in getting the extension charges calculated so that I can deposit them, I will be very grateful to you".*

2. As per Sr. No. 55 of the list of Public Services, 'Calculation and Intimation of Pending Dues' was required to be provided to the applicant within a period of 35 working days from the date of submission of application. In the instant case, as stated by the applicant, he had submitted application in the Estate Office four years ago, but the Designated Officer (under the Right to Service Act) failed to provide the service to the applicant within the stipulated time-limit, even till the date of submission of application in the Commission i.e. by 03.06.2025.

3. Therefore, the undersigned being Chief Commissioner of the Chandigarh Right to Service Commission, by taking suo moto action under Section 17 (1) (b) of the Punjab Right to Service Act 2011, as extended to the Union Territory

of Chandigarh, called upon the Designated Officer to Show Cause as to why penal action should not be taken against him under Section 2(h) of the Punjab Right to Service (Amendment) Act 2014, as extended to the Union Territory of Chandigarh vide Suo Moto Notice bearing No. PS/CRTSC/2025/99-102, dated 13.06.2025. He was also directed to appear before the undersigned on 19<sup>th</sup> June, 2025 alongwith complete record of the case as well as reply to the notice.

4. The case was heard on 19.06.2025. Shri Paramjeet Singh, the applicant and Sh. Gurbachan Singh, Branch Incharge-cum-Designated Officer, Estate Office, UT, Chandigarh were present. The Designated Officer submitted his written reply to the Show Cause Notice, which was taken on record. He also stated that the delay has occurred on the part of various officials of the Estate Office. He further stated that now the service has been provided to the applicant. This fact was also admitted by the applicant.

5. In view of the above, the Designated Officer was directed to supply a photocopy of the relevant noting sheets to ascertain the names/designations of the officials on whose part the delay occurred in providing the service to the applicant. On the basis of the copies of noting sheets subsequently made available by the Designated Officer to the Commission, it was found that Ms. Saroj Khillan, Senior Assistant/Accountant (Retired voluntarily), was responsible for 43 days of delay (on different occasions) in supplying the requisite information/putting up the file to the Designated Officer, which led to a considerable delay in providing the service to the applicant by the Designated Officer. This lapse on the part of Ms. Saroj Khillan, Senior Assistant/Accountant (Retired voluntarily), was viewed seriously by the Commission, it being against the spirit of the Right to Service Act.

6. Therefore, the undersigned being Chief Commissioner of the Chandigarh Right to Service Commission, by taking suo moto action under Section 17 (1) (b) of the Punjab Right to Service Act 2011, as extended to the Union Territory of Chandigarh, called upon the said Ms. Saroj Khillan (Retired voluntarily), Senior Assistant/Accountant of the Estate Office, UT, Chandigarh to Show Cause as to why penal action should not be taken against her under Section 2(h) of the Punjab Right to Service (Amendment) Act 2014, as extended to the Union Territory of Chandigarh vide Suo Moto Notice bearing No. PS/CRTSC/2025/127-130, dated 03.07.2025. She was also directed to appear before the undersigned on 11<sup>th</sup> July, 2025 alongwith complete record of the case as well as reply to the notice.

7. The case was heard on 11.07.2025. Shri Paramjeet Singh, the applicant and Ms. Saroj Khillan, Senior Assistant/Accountant (Retired voluntarily)



were present. Ms. Saroj Khillan, submitted her written reply to the Show Cause Notice, which was taken on record. The relevant extract of her reply is mentioned below:

"It is humbly submitted that the undersigned rejoined the Estate Office on 12.01.2025 after she was transferred from the office of the Registrar of Co-operative Society, when she was entrusted with the charges of 3 seats namely G V, MCD and Motor Market. It is pertinent to mention here that all the aforesaid seats were very heavy seats, with the pendency running into thousands of files of active nature. It is also pertinent to mention here that the concerned accountant namely Mrs. Rajbir Kaur who had been dealing with all the aforesaid seats had already been on long leave at the time of the re-joining of the undersigned leading to the huge pendency of files. It is also most important to submit that the undersigned dealt with the concerned file as soon as it was so put up by the concerned clerk and submitted the same to the Branch Incharge. Thereafter the undersigned had been dealing with the concerned file on top priority basis and in the meanwhile the undersigned had also taken VRS on 28.03.2025. The concerned file had never been pending with the undersigned for any unreasonable time and it was always dealt with diligently and it never remained with the undersigned beyond the permissible time".

8. From the above statement of the official, it has been established that there were thousands of files lying unattended on the tables of the concerned officials in the Estate Office due to one or the other reasons. Such type of tendency on the part of government officials cannot be justified on the ground that due to shortage of staff, they are holding work of more seats. This practice needs to be curbed, so that assured service delivery can be provided to the people. The official took voluntary retirement from government service on 28.03.2025 only, but the delay attributable to her pertains to the period when she was working on the concerned seat in the Estate Office. By giving such type of excuses, the official could not justify the delay of 43 days which occurred on her part in providing the service to the applicant. Therefore, the reply/statement of the applicant is not justified. Therefore, she is liable for penal action under the provisions of the Acts *ibid*.

9. In view of the above, a delay of 43 days has been established on the part of Ms. Saroj Khillan, Senior Assistant/Accountant (Retired voluntarily), Estate Office, UT. Chandigarh. Therefore, as per provisions of Section 2 (h) of the Punjab

Right to Service (Amendment) Act, 2014, as extended to the Union Territory of Chandigarh, the undersigned holds Ms. Saroj Khillan, Accountant (Retired voluntarily), office of Estate Officer, UT, Chandigarh guilty of not taking in time action in the matter due to which the service could not be provided to the applicant within the stipulated time-limit, and therefore, the purpose of Right to Service Act for which it is enacted, has been defeated. Accordingly, to meet with the requirements of justice, I, being the Chief Commissioner, Chandigarh Right to Service Commission, hereby, impose a penalty of Rs. 1500/- on the abovesaid Ms. Saroj Khillan, Accountant (Retired voluntarily), office of Estate Officer, UT, Chandigarh. Out of the above mentioned amount of penalty, 50% is ordered to be paid to the applicant, Shri Paramjeet Singh.

*de*  
*Shri*  
Dr. Mahavir Singh, IAS (Retd)  
Chief Commissioner

To

*Chatter*  
Ms. Saroj Khillan  
Accountant (Retired)  
Estate Office, UT Chandigarh

(Residence of House No. 3045,  
Sector 38-D, Chandigarh)

**Copy is forwarded for information and necessary action to:-**

*1*  
*20/8/25*  
1. Sh. Nishant Kumar Yadav, IAS, Estate Officer-cum-Second Appellate Authority (under the Right to Service Act), UT, Chandigarh; for recovery of penalty from the above said official namely Ms. Saroj Khillan, Accountant (Retd.), Estate Office, UT, Chandigarh, he may refer to Rule 12 of the Chandigarh Right to Service Rules, 2019 as notified vide Notification No. 28/67/1-IH(11)-2019/15461 dated 11.10.2019, if need be take up the matter with the pension disbursing authority of the official.

*20/8/25*  
2. Shri Naveen Rattu, DANICS, Assistant Estate Officer-cum-First Appellate Authority (under the Right to Service Act, UT, Chandigarh;

3. Shri Paramjeet Singh, House No. 4025, Sector 46-D, Chandigarh for information.

*20/8/25*