

Social Audit
of
Delhi Public Grievances
Commission

A Report

September 2010



IC Centre for Governance
NEW DELHI

」

」

SOCIAL AUDIT

OF

DELHI PUBLIC GRIEVANCES
COMMISSION

A Report

September 2010

 **IC Centre for Governance**
New Delhi

┌

┐

Social Audit of Delhi Public Grievances Commission is printed and published by Mahesh Kapoor on behalf of the IC Centre for Governnace. New Delhi-110057

Printed at Rakmo Press Pvt. Ltd. C-59, Okhla Industrial Area,
Phase I, New Delhi-110020

Please address all correspondence to IC Centre for Governance
Niryat Bhawan, Rao Tula Ram Marg, New Delhi-110057
e-mail:iccfg@yahoo.co.in

CONTENTS

	Pages
1. Introduction	1 - 2
2. Summary Of Conclusions And Suggestions	3 - 6
3. Basic Outline Of The Project	7 - 10
4. Nature Of Public Grievances	11 - 13
5. The Delhi Public Grievances Commission	14 - 17
6. PGC Cases Studied By The Project Team	18 - 33
7. Profile Of The Complainants	34 - 36
8. Analysis Of Cases In Social Audit	37 - 48
9. Interaction With Departments	49 - 51
10. Conclusions Of Social Audit	52 - 58
ANNEXURES	59
I. Resolution Creating PGC	61
II. MOU between PGC and IC Centre for Governance	68
III. List of Cases Studied by Project Team	71
IV. List of Cases in which Complainants Interviewed in Social Audit	85
V. Questionnaire	89
VI. Media Campaign of PGC	93
VII. Systemic Reforms Reported by PGC	99

Chapter 1

Introduction

'When all is said and done, a lot more is said than done'

Commissioned by Public Grievances Commission of the Government of NCT of Delhi, this study makes an effort to investigate the impact of the Commission on the redressal of grievances of the people of Delhi during financial years 2008-09 and 2009-10. It also covers four months of the financial year 2010-11. It does not, however, attempt any analysis of the status of public services carried out by different departments of the government. For that, separate studies are indicated.

The Delhi Public Grievances Commission is a unique organization. We failed to identify a comparable public structure in any other state when seeking to set standard benchmarks for grievance redressal.

In our view, the Commission provides one of the best methods of settling the genuine grievances of those citizens of Delhi, who cannot get relief from the government agencies. A succinct observation by a senior bureaucrat of Delhi sums up the role of the Commission. During a face-to-face interaction, he said that PGC was 'a friendly watchdog with an effective bark but no bite owing to its structural limitations'.

It is a limited social audit of Public Grievance Commission with the objective of eliciting the responses of the complainants, who approached the Commission with their grievances. Their responses concerning the level of satisfaction derived from the intervention by the Commission provides a good measure of the Commission's effectiveness. It is hoped that the conclusions of this study would be of some help to the policy makers in taking decision on the future shape and scope of an independent grievance redressal mechanism.

The IC Centre for Governance is grateful to the Government of Delhi for reposing confidence in the Centre's ability to conduct a reliable study in the public domain. We must acknowledge the fullest support and guidance of Smt Meenakshi Datta Ghosh, Chairman of PGC right from the initiation of the study till its completion. She, along with her colleagues Shri S K Kain, Smt Nisha Samuel and Shri Dinesh Gupta was always ready to offer advice and guidance to the Project team.

We are thankful to Jamia Millia Islamia for providing the vital support of its student-surveyors, who contacted the complainants in every part of Delhi and accomplished the task on schedule.

The Project Team was ably assisted by Ms Sonali Mishra, Project Officer, who in spite of her other preoccupation, coordinated the study. The secretarial assistance was provided by Vinod Kumar Maurya.

Most importantly, the study could not have been done efficiently and within the stipulated schedule without the active involvement of the members of the Core Group of the Centre.

PROJECT TEAM

- Veronica Peris
- Shobha Goyle
- A B Lal
- Shanti Narain
- Pratap Narayan
- Mahesh Kapoor
- Narendra Swarup
- Mukund B. Kaushal
- Prabhat Kumar

Chapter 2

Summary of Conclusions and Suggestions

The Public Grievances Commission is a vastly innovative initiative taken by the Government of NCT of Delhi.

That it deserves to be emulated by other progressive state governments is our unambiguous recommendation.

PGC provides a credible forum for listening to the grievances of the common man in a sympathetic manner.

The Commission is able to provide much needed relief to the poor and low income groups in their problems at the cutting edge of administration.

PGC has been able to perform its functions because it does not have a turf to defend. It acts like a fair arbiter of people's grievances to the best of its capability and judgment.

The percentage of complainants who have expressed satisfaction with the way PGC functions and its effective manner of resolving their problems is about 70%, a performance still to be demonstrated even by the statutory right to information administration.

Its approach has generally been positive and it has been particularly successful in tackling problems requiring inter-departmental and inter-agency coordination.

PGC intervention in a case always elicits a response from the concerned departments. Sometimes the response is not within the specified time and reminders are sent.

In many cases, it is observed that the complainant does not take interest in the matter after registering the complaint. He/she does not even bother to attend the hearings. But the Commission pursues the complaint with the concerned department and arrives at a conclusion. This is highly commendable, considering the fact that such complainants are generally prevented from attending the hearings because of distance or expenses involved.

PGC intervention has expedited the resolution of some long standing grievances, which could have remained pending for long, but have been resolved within a few months.

In some cases it is seen that, on receipt of notice from PGC, action has been taken by the department concerned to redress the grievance even before the first hearing at PGC.

The intervention of PGC has led to highlighting the problem and its notice being taken by the department for redressal.

The pro-public orientation of PGC is highlighted by the fact that the onus of proving a complaint as false or baseless has been placed on the department concerned and not on the Complainant to prove the genuineness of the complaint.

While the Commission is yet to become an ideal grievance redressal system, it has definitely made an impact on the working of several departments by its intervention.

The present Chairman of the Commission has introduced many significant improvements in the working of the Commission during her two-year tenure. She has issued meticulously crafted Standard Operating Procedures for dealing with complaints received.

She has also introduced an innovative practice of entertaining complaints of serious nature affecting communities and localities. A new system of taking *suo-moto* cognizance of people's problems from the print media has been started. Some of these cases are given in Chapter 6.

The present Chairman of the Commission should be complimented for conceiving and mounting a comprehensive publicity campaign for creating awareness about the simple and convenient process of redressing grievances of general public.

The team strongly endorses the need of a sustained publicity drive to be carried out by the Commission and supported by the Delhi Government awareness programme.

Another area needing greater attention is systemic improvement in the working of administrative departments.

The Commission should make an attempt to study the grievance redressal mechanisms in the departments.

The Commission should not leave loose ends in several cases of serious nature. This can be corrected by computerisation of cases and online reporting of final action by the concerned department.

The government departments should be asked to pay heed to directions of the Commission.

A close analysis of the 'not satisfied' cases shows that most of them are annoyed either because of non-fulfilment of their unreasonable claims or because they wanted to use PGC for settling scores with their adversaries.

There are, however, some instances of real genuine grievances. We suggest that these and such other complaints should be reconsidered by the commission.

A powerful provision of the Resolution, which could provide requisite sharpness to its effectiveness, relates to the Commission's authority to conduct research into systemic causes of complaints for bringing about reforms for greater transparency and responsiveness. We suggest that the Commission should conduct such studies for identified departments.

In some cases where, apart from grievance, corruption charges have been levelled against officials in the concerned department, PGC has concentrated on redressal of the grievance while not commenting on the charges.

At present, the Commission is centralized at one place near ITO with the result that it may not be easily accessible to public located in far off localities. It would be helpful if its benches are located in each district.

The tenure of the Chairman, which is only 2 years at present, should be extended to 5 years (or 65 years of age whichever is earlier) to ensure continuity and accountability over a reasonable period. This is permissible under the resolution of September 1997.

The Commission does not enjoy any penal powers over the delinquent staff in other departments. It would be useful if, as in case of Central/State Information Commissions under RTI, the PGC is also authorized to impose monetary penalty on staff found deliberately harassing the public to serve as a deterrent for the future as well as be a warning to other officials.

A large number of illiterate or semi educated complainants are not able to follow the language of proceedings in the Commission. It is suggested that the notices and orders of the Commission to such persons should be sent in Hindi also.

A sizeable number of complainants are senior citizens. It is suggested that they should be provided with necessary facilities when they visit the office of the Commission.

We recommend that work-study be carried out by the Delhi government to determine the requirement of presiding officers and supporting staff of the Commission.

In addition to the enhancement of the strength of the Commission, there is a need to upgrade the technological competence of the Commission too. The work of computerization, which has been going on for the last six years, should be completed without further delay.

There is a model of 'Online Complaints Management System' under operation in Municipal Corporation of Mumbai. The model has been successfully installed and operated by PRAJA, a civil society organisation. PRAJA could be persuaded to share their software with PGC if efforts are made. It is suggested that PGC look at the model

A website should be installed to facilitate on-line registration of complaints and grievances. The complaints can then be sent online to the concerned departments for Action Taken Reports without any lapse of time.

Cases where follow up is required can be kept in a separate folder to be monitored by the Commission at regular intervals. Cases where compliance is pending for more than six months should be brought to the notice of the Government.

Finally, the Government of Delhi is aware of the demand for placing the Commission on a statutory footing. We understand that this demand has been raised in various quarters. The Commission has also urged the Government to consider statutory status for the Commission in its annual reports.

We realize that it is a policy matter and the Government must be having good reasons for not accepting the request. But short of according a statutory status to the Commission, some additional powers making the departments more responsive to its directions could be conferred on the Commission. Periodic meetings with Department generating substantial meeting/grievance from the public should be held by the Commission to review the recommendations made for systemic improvements in their functioning.

Chapter 3

Basic Outline of the Project

The project with Public Grievance Commission of the government of NCT of Delhi is an opportunity for the IC Centre for Governance to embark on a project of social audit with a difference. Normally social audits are confined to eliciting the views of the clients or recipients of a certain scheme or programme and examining the responses critically. There are a few examples of social audit like the citizens' report of Public Affairs Centre of Bangalore and Jean Dreze's survey of National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (NREGS) in four North Indian states. But our study incorporates both the elements – responses from the citizens as well as views of the Commission and departments.

Since the government of NCT of Delhi and Public Grievances Commission are actively involved in the present project (indeed it has been sponsored by them), it gives us an opportunity to see both sides - the supply and the demand sides - of the grievance redressal system in Delhi. It would be interesting to analyse the expectations of an enlightened state government from a novel structure of listening to the woes of the citizens. At the same time, it would be possible to study the actual performance of the system in meeting the objectives of the intended policy of the Delhi Government.

With responses from both the intended beneficiaries and the operators of the scheme, we also hope to suggest some improvements in the framework for a more effective grievance redressal mechanism.

There are two other powerful instruments of claiming accountability from the government - the Right to Information and the Consumer Protection legislations - that can be and are resorted to by aggrieved persons. It is our presumption that both these instruments have not been used as effectively and widely as they are capable of. Whether PGC's services have been optimally utilized by the citizens of Delhi should be a part of the study, which unfortunately has not been included in the terms of the present study.

Another weakness of the project is the non-coverage of examination of other forms of grievance redressal systems elsewhere. It would have been rewarding in the present context to look at best practices in other

states and other countries for alternative models and to see the difference between statutory and non statutory dispensations. Time and budget permitting, CfG can embark on a separate study on this aspect or PGC can be requested to sponsor a second phase of the present study to cover these aspects.

An MOU was executed between Public Grievances Commission and IC Centre for Governance on 30 March 2010. It defined the terms of the study and the time period of its completion. A copy of the MOU is at **Annexure 1**.

It was proposed to conduct the project in three clearly defined phases.

FIRST PHASE – INITIAL STUDY

- The origin of PGC and its background was critically studied. the resolution under which PGC was created was looked into.
- The structure of PGC and its rules & procedures were studied. More information on the systems and procedures was available while going through the case files.
- The statistics regarding the number of cases entertained, disposed of, accepted and rejected were collected for the years 2008-09 and 2009-10. The classification of these statistics by departments was attempted. Another classification was on the basis of types of grievances i.e. personal, collective and institutional.
- We selected about 400 (actual number 399) representative cases of different types for deeper study. Each of these cases was reduced to a one page précis bringing out the salient features like details of the complainant, gist of the grievance, department concerned, number of hearings, time taken for disposal, judgement and general directions, if any, given to the department. This was a particularly time consuming exercise which involved six members of the Project Team for almost a month.
- These 399 cases were analysed for further examination. Several points for consideration emerged from these cases. They also helped in the preparation of the questionnaires for the complainants as well as questions for the departments.
- Simultaneously PGC was requested to give the details of separate communications sent to the departments for general directions and suggestions for systemic changes.

- The Core Group of the IC Centre met and drafted the questionnaires both in English and Hindi so as to be understandable to different types of complainants

SECOND PHASE – FIELD STUDY

- The main objective of the field study was to generate the responses of the complainants regarding the extent of satisfaction in the selected cases. This entailed engaging at least two enumerators, selecting 100 cases, making the questionnaire and approaching the complainants.
- The selection of the cases for social audit was done very systematically taking care of avoiding bias of any kind. There were two stages of random samplings; first, while picking the 399 cases for initial study and second, when 100 cases were selected for personal interviews. The sample of the 100 cases for personal contact has all the ingredients of the whole set including the departments covered and the types of complaints. Each member of the set of the sample is independent of others. Therefore, it can be said with reasonable certainty that the cases selected for social audit are fairly representative of all the cases decided by the Commission during the two year period.
- Contacting the complainants was done through telephonic contacts, personal interviews, internet and written communications. The sheets pertaining to individual cases and copies of the questionnaire were given to the enumerators and their progress watched daily. Geographical locations of the complainants were kept in view while planning the meetings.
- Monitoring the work of the enumerators was done by members of the Project Team.
- The responses, as and when completed, were handed over to the Project Coordinator for concurrent evaluation and analysis. Any deficiencies found in the responses were referred again to the enumerators.
- The first cut of conclusions started when about 50 responses had been received.
- During the same period, the members of the group met the departmental officers to get their responses to the general directions and suggestions for systemic changes. Cooperation of the Chairman PGC was availed to contact the departmental heads. Prior to

personal meetings, letters were dispatched to the heads of the departments containing all the relevant points.

- The group met periodically to examine and analyse the responses from the departments. This being the most important (and the most difficult) part of the project required the maximum demand on our physical and mental resources.

THIRD PHASE – ANALYSIS OF THE MATERIAL

- When the bulk of responses from complainants and departmental heads had been collected, a structured meeting was organized with PGC to ascertain whether the Commission has anything to add or suggest for further enquiry. Attempts to rectify the gaps and infirmities in the collected data were made with help from PGC.
- The structure of the report was finalized in a meeting of the Project Group and the Project Coordinator tasked to come up with her analysis of the responses.
- The draft report was prepared by a drafting group and the final report approved by the Group.
- A decision to publish the report was taken by the Core Group of CfG in consultation with the Chairman, PGC.

It is a matter of satisfaction that the Project Team was able to complete the study within the stipulated time period.

Chapter 4

Nature of Public Grievances

“Government is supposed to act in the interest of citizens”, says Joseph Stiglitz. He further expounds that there is a natural asymmetry of information between those who govern and those whom they are supposed to serve. This asymmetry gives the rulers the discretion to abuse their authority. Free information and free speech not only make abuses of government less likely but they also enhance the likelihood that people’s needs would be met.*

A failure in fulfilling the legitimate demands of the citizen gives rise to grievances vis-à-vis the concerned government agency. These grievances can take many forms. For instance, there are grievances tracing their legitimacy to the rights given to the citizens under the Constitution of India. The Right to exercise Franchise, the Right to Information and (now) the Right to Education are those enshrined in the Constitution. Their violation by an agency of the Government creates public grievance.

Then there are statutory rights bestowed by different laws passed by the legislature. These include the right to employment assured by the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act, the right to claim relief under Consumer Protection Act etc. Failure to adhere to their provisions gives rise to public grievances.

The Government, in order to provide welfare to the people, makes policies and draws up schemes from time to time, and issues its decisions to implement them. These are in the shape of government resolutions and orders. Necessary administrative machinery and required budgets are also approved to reach the benefits to the targeted beneficiaries. In fact, bulk of the grievances occur because the identified government agency is not able to perform its functions to the complete satisfaction of all citizens. Some of the examples of such grievances pertain to Public Distribution System, Health Care, Integrated Women and Child Development Scheme, mid-day meals, Concessional food grains for BPL families etc.

*‘Transparency in Government’ in The Right to Tell, The World Bank 2002

Finally, grievances can arise because of discrimination, harassment, and injustice at the hands of government officials. These can be broadly classified as violation of the principles of natural justice. We can also club the grievances on account of corrupt practices, inefficiency and favouritism under this category.

In the last decade many ministries and departments of the Government have published their Citizens' Charters to enable the citizens to learn about the services. These can be helpful to the citizens for knowing their entitlements.

A public grievance is about the pain felt by individuals and communities arising out of non-fulfilment of legitimate assurances by the government. If a sanctioned road project has not been implemented, it is a grievance. If a man hole remains uncovered, it is a grievance. If the water supplied in municipal taps is contaminated, it is a grievance. And if the food grains meant for public distribution system are diverted into black marketing due to collusion between the traders and government officers, it is a serious grievance.

Unless the state institutions are fully alive to these grievances and unless there exists a watchdog organization to keep a watch over the performance of state institutions, people's satisfaction will not be achieved. The weak, poor and deprived sections of people will remain helpless against the apathy, avarice and oppression of the people in authority.

The watchdog should provide a freedom to raise one's voice against government's inaction, which may be for whatever reason. The people should not only be free to lodge a complaint but they should also be encouraged to do so and the process of lodging the complaint should be made easy, convenient and non-intrusive.

A far reaching concept is that redress of grievances against the State should be made a legal right. That's what the proposed model Public Services (Protection and Regulation) Bill, 2010 is about. The Bill drafted by the Legislative Department of Government of India seeks to establish the right to have access to, demand and receive public service in accordance with specified public service performance standards in a transparent manner. It also gives all persons the right to hold the public service officers accountable for service deficiencies and provides for lodging complaints with respect to the deficiencies.

The larger questions of participation in governance and assuring equal opportunity apart, the limited issue we are concerned with

pertains to guaranteeing the benefits announced by the State to every citizen. In this context, a public grievance may be defined as a felt exclusion of a person or group of persons from such benefits. A public grievance can be caused by corruption, discrimination, harassment and injustice by those responsible for providing the public good.

In India, there seems to be a tendency towards making the weak, poor and marginalized invisible. It is not only in formulating policies but in apathy, inefficiency and incapacity of the State institutions to deliver the already promised goods to the people. For example, a person is entitled to report the occurrence of a legal offence to the police. If, however, the police officer refuses to entertain his report, it becomes a public grievance.

We are not presently concerned with eradication of poverty and hunger, achieving the goal of universal primary education or ensuring environmental sustainability because these desirable objectives have not yet been formalized by the State. The Millennium Developmental Goals, though accepted in principle, have not yet been guaranteed.

Against these requirements, the institution and functioning of Delhi Public Grievances Commission should be viewed. An effort is sought to be made in this report.

Chapter 5

The Delhi Public Grievance Commission

In September 1997, the government of NCT of Delhi created the Public Grievances Commission by a resolution approved by the Government of India. It was mandated to be 'responsible for speedy redressal of complaints of the public against acts of omission or commission on the part of public officials....and to recommend such action as considered necessary for removal of such grievances'. The Commission was to have the same independence and autonomy as the Union Public Service Commission. A copy of the Resolution of the Government of NCT of Delhi creating the Commission is at **Annexure 2**.

The commission was to be advisory in character. Its advisory jurisdiction spread over all the departments of the Government of NCT of Delhi as well as local bodies and other organizations/undertakings financed by it. The Delhi Development Authority did not come under the Commission's jurisdiction.

The Commission could take *suo-moto* action on any complaint received by it or which came to its notice from the media etc. It could, however, not act on any sub-judice matter.

Any person aggrieved by any act of omission or commission on the part of a public official can make an application to the Commission giving specific details of the case supported by an affidavit. The recommendations of the Commission shall be given due consideration by the appropriate administrative authority for its speedy implementation.

The Commission could also conduct research into systemic causes of complaints for bringing administrative reforms for greater transparency and responsiveness. The Commission was to submit two annual reports separately for Delhi Police and for other departments.

The establishment of a Commission to deal with grievances of the people relating to the departments of the state government was an imaginative decision of the Government of NCT of Delhi more than a decade ago. The new paradigm of bringing information in the public

domain had not yet been created. In fact, the Government of India was just awakening to the need of the freedom of information to deal with the age-old asymmetry of information.

Brought to existence in September 1997, the Delhi Public Grievances Commission was a step in the desired direction. It was a precursor to the shape of things to come. Interestingly, a draft Public Services (Protection and Regulation) Bill, 2010 has been circulated by the Legislative Department of Government of India only a couple of months back. The Bill seeks to ensure that the scheduled public services like education, rural development, health care etc are provided to each citizen to the prescribed standards.

Unfortunately, the example of Delhi Government has not been emulated by any other state government. On the basis of our research in the available material and feed back from the complainants, we can unhesitatingly say that the model of DPGC is worth replication. Even today, the DPGC remains a unique institution, the only one of its kind. It has substantially lived up to the expectations of the people.

The Delhi government must be congratulated for its selection of the chairmen and members of the Commission over the last decade. Though belonging to the administrative stream, the chairmen and full-time members have managed to rise above their bureaucratic bonds and have acted largely independently. Their knowledge of administrative rules and procedures has helped them and also the complainants.

It does not, however, mean that there is no room for improvement in the constitution and functioning of the Commission. There are several areas in which the Commission needs immediate attention of the State Government. The structural limitations of the Commission are briefly summarised in a later chapter.

Some observations by the Commission on its own work gleaned from the published Annual Reports give an insight into how it perceives itself;

- That the commission should be imparted statutory status has been felt for quite some time. A previous chairman observed it in the annual reports for 2002-03 and 2003-04. A draft bill on granting statutory status to the commission was also sent in October 2004. (2004-05) Annual Report)
- Non compliance and delays in compliance of commission's

recommendations have been repeatedly pointed out as one of the weaknesses of the system. In 2002-03 and 2003-04 annual reports, special mention has been made of cases of unauthorised construction of buildings, hazardous to public safety, in MCD areas. It is not known whether any action has been taken in specific cases or any systemic correction has been carried out by the Government. It would perhaps be advantageous if such cases are brought in public knowledge to enable the civil society to make efforts.

- According to a former chairman, the commission does not enjoy the same measure of independence and autonomy as Union Public Service Commission as was intended in the Resolution of September 1997. He stated that every matter of financial clearance has to be sent to the Finance Department of the Delhi Government. (Annual Report 2003-04)
- Most of the cases of non compliance or non response pertain to MCD. They mainly relate to unlicensed factories, inadequate development works, demolition of unauthorised buildings etc. (Annual Report 2004-05)
- Some success stories have also been given in the Annual Reports. (2004-05)
- A study was conducted by the Divisional Commissioner through an NGO 'Centre for Civil Society' on the system of registration of documents in the sub-registrar offices in Delhi. The report of the study was submitted to the Commission. The Commission drew the attention of the Government to a) lack of guidance services, b) difficulty in obtaining no objection certificates and c) opacity in valuation of properties. The implementation or otherwise of Commission's recommendations is not known. (Annual Report 2004-05)
- It has been mentioned in the annual report of 2004-05 that there is always a spurt in the number of complaints received after advertisements are released in the newspapers. Therefore, the commission releases advertisements at regular intervals. Also, part time members of the commission have attended Bhagidari Melas at regular intervals and interacted with public. Pamphlets are also distributed in the Melas. (Annual Report 2004-05)
- In 2001-02 it was found that employment exchanges were not being intimated of recruitments by the concerned departments. The

departments were resorting to recruitments through direct advertisements in the newspapers. It was in violation of the provisions of The Employment Exchanges (Compulsory Notification of Vacancies) Act, 1999. on the advice of the commission, a circular was issued to all the departments. (Annual Report 2001-02)

- Success stories have been given in the Annual Report of 2006-07.
- Two cases of systemic reforms have been mentioned in the annual report of 2006-07. They are a) pertaining to sewer maintenance charges of DJB, and b) publication of results of Subordinate Service Selection Board.
- No annual reports have been published after 2006-07. It is not known whether they have been prepared and submitted.
- As required by the Resolution of 1997, separate annual reports for Delhi Police have not been submitted.

The Public Grievances Commission is perhaps the only ray of hope for the citizen who finds himself/herself in a helpless position having failed in getting its legitimate due from the government agencies. Even those whose grievances could not be redressed by the intervention of the Commission grudgingly admit that they will use it again because 'there is no other option'. We feel that it is a very sad commentary on our much touted responsive governance.

Chapter 6

PGC Cases studied by the Project Team

In this chapter, an effort has been made to give a brief description of the evolution of the work of the Commission since its inception as also the manner in which it deals with the grievances brought to its notice by the citizens of Delhi. An attempt is also made to analyse the cases to present the types of grievances pertaining to different departments of Delhi Government.

It is observed that, over the years, since the setting up of PGC in 1997, there has been a significant increase in the number of grievances received and disposed off by it, particularly during the last 4 years as can be seen from the following particulars:

Table 1: Grievances Received and Disposal

Year	Number received	Number disposed off (incl. carried forward)
1998-1999	1598	1182
1999-2000	669	788
2001-2001	763	677
2001-2002	812	871
2002-2003	1259	1186
2003-2004	1359	1432
2004-2005	1264	1276
2005-2006	1733	1729
2006-2007	3699	3521
2007-2008	4023	4168
2008-2009	4542	4429
2009-2010	3716	3722

This increase in the number of grievances can perhaps be attributed to increasing awareness about this forum and its effectiveness in redressing the same. This perhaps would also explain the abrupt jump in the number of complaints in the year 2006-07. However, considering the population of over 17 million and the general unsatisfactory state

of services provided, this number is not very significant and points towards the continued need for a sustained awareness campaign.

The detailed particulars of the grievances received and disposed off by PGC during the period 2008-09, 2009-10 and first 4 months of 2010-11, covered by this study, are given in **Table 2:**

Table 2 : Disposal of Cases Memberwise

Member	Year	O/B **	Receipt	Total	Disposal/ Closure	C/B **	% of Disposal
Chairman (Grievances)	2008-09	54	624	678	594	84	88
	2009-10	56*	496	552	493	59	89
	2010-11#	59	134	193	63	130	
Chairman (Appeals)	2008-09	47	199	246	213	33	87
	2009-10	33	161	194	179	15	92
	2010-11#	15	43	58	28	30	
Member (Full Time)	2008-09	153	1914	2067	1956	111	95
	2009-10	106*	931	1037	926	111	89
	2010-11#	111	268	379	185	194	
Member Part Time (DKJ)	2008-09	92	1529	1621	1423	198	88
	2009-10	425*	612	1037	633	404	61
	2010-11#	404	163	567	284	283	
Member Part Time (NS)	2008-09	59	475	534	456	78	85
	2009-10	161*	214	375	207	168	55
	2010-11#	168	61	229	170	59	

Notes: * The figures of Opening Balance for 2009-10 are correct as per reconciliation done in PGC. Apparently, Closing Balance for 2008-09 is not correct as per PGC records.

** O/B –Opening Balance

** C/B – Closing Balance

(1-4-2010 to 31-7-2010)

DEPARTMENT WISE RECEIPT OF NEW GRIEVANCES

The total number of complaints/grievances received during 2008-09 was 4542 and during 2009-10 it was 2253. The department wise analysis is given in following Table.

Table 3

Department	Number Of Grievances Received During	
	2008-09	2009-10
MCD	1409	649
Delhi Police	974	374
Delhi Jal Board	363	197
Education	320	142
Power	263	203
Revenue	201	108
Food & Supply	195	163
RCS	95	36
DSW	59	34
DTC	54	33
Health & Family Welfare	53	33
Total	4536	2256

It will be seen from the above table that grievances pertaining to MCD account for the largest number, being about 31 percent in 2008-09 and 29 percent in 2009-10. This is followed by Delhi Police, accounting for about 21 percent and 17 percent respectively. Seven departments, namely MCD, Delhi Police, Delhi Jal Board, Education, Power, Revenue and Food & Civil Supplies departments accounted for 82 percent and 81 percent of the total grievances received by PGC during 2008-09 and 2009-10 respectively. This is not surprising as these departments/agencies have maximum interface with the public in their day to day life.

The Project Team studied a total of 399 cases, picked up on random basis but keeping in view the relative department wise weight in the total number of grievances received during the period. A complete list of these cases along with the names of the complainants and the departments is at **Annexure 3**. The department-wise number of cases studied are given in the Table 4.

Table 4

Department	Number of Cases Studied
MCD	96
Delhi Police	80
Delhi Jal Board	52
Revenue	43
Food & Supply	40
Education	31
RCS	10
Miscellaneous	47 (other departments having 1 to 7 cases)
TOTAL	399

DEPARTMENT WISE DISCUSSION OF THE CASES STUDIED

MCD : A total of 96 cases were studied. The largest number of complaints pertained to unauthorized construction and encroachment; the details of complaints under major categories are given in the Table 5.

Table 5

Nature of Grievance	Number
Unauthorized construction and encroachment	36
Unauthorized commercial establishments and illegal installation of mobile tower	10
Bad condition of roads	10
Non grant of ACP/non payment of terminal dues	6
Unauthorized parking/use of place for worship	6
Maintenance/development of parks	4
Poor sanitation/inappropriate waste disposal	4
Choked drains/open sewer/water logging	3
Miscellaneous	17
TOTAL	96

Out of the above, 49 grievances were resolved fully or partially. 24 grievances were not resolved, which included 8 cases which were either sub-judice/pseudonymous/withdrawn or not justified. 23 cases were inconclusive.

Delhi Police : A total of 80 cases were studied and the numbers of grievances under major categories are given in Table 6.

Out of the above, 26 cases were resolved fully or partially. 27 cases were not justified/substantiated/sub-judice or withdrawn. 19 cases

Table 6

Nature of Grievance	Number
Harassment/Extortion	9
Kidnapping/Intimidation	7
Police Inaction in Assault//Torture/ Theft/ Trespassing cases	6
Non registration of FIR/no medicalexamination	5
Verbal abuse/intimidation/threat toEye witness	5
Inaction in property disputes	5
Police atrocities against women/	5
Corruption/harassment/extortionNarcotics sale/anti social elements	3
Police complicity in armed attack/Criminal assault	3
Cheating/manhandling	3
Miscellaneous	29
TOTAL	80

were inconclusive and 8 cases remained unresolved. The reason for high percentage of inconclusive or unresolved cases appears to be that in most cases once a complaint is registered, the police say that further investigation/action will be taken as per the course of law. The case is closed in PGC. There is hardly any follow up of these cases and it can not be ascertained whether the matter was finally resolved.

Delhi Jal Board: A total of 52 cases were studied, the details of which are given in Table 7.

Table 7

Nature of Grievance	Number
Discrepancy in water bill	13
Non supply of water	10
Inadequate water supply	6
Contaminated water	5
Choked sewer line	5
Damaged sewer/manhole	3
Chocked and overflowing sewer	2
Inappropriate sewage discharge	2
Miscellaneous	6
TOTAL	52

Of these, 25 cases were resolved during the hearing, 10 cases were resolved partially and giving directions for the future. 17 cases, were not resolved or with inconclusive result. During the field survey, 16 complainants expressed full satisfaction with the outcome, 4 stated that their problem was partially resolved and 11 stated that they were not satisfied with the outcome.

Revenue : 43 grievance cases pertaining to the Revenue department were studied. An analysis of the main grievances is given in Table 8.

Table 8

Nature of Grievance	Number
Compensation for land acquired	5
Non payment of riot victim compensation/Ex-gratia to widow	5
Non recovery of dues	4
Encroachment of Government land	4
Non issue of OBC certificate or correction	4
Unauthorized construction	3
Pollution by industry	3
Non demarcation of land/denial of permissionfor construction	3
Mutation of property/illegal sale of land	3
Inadequate allotment of land/improperprocedure for land acquisition	2
Miscellaneous	7
TOTAL	43

22 grievances were resolved fully or partially and 2 cases were withdrawn. 11 cases were either not justified or were sub-judice or pertained to DDA over which PGC has no jurisdiction. The remaining 8 remained unresolved.

Food & Civil Supplies: A total of 36 cases pertaining to Food & Civil supplies Department were studied. The particulars of the type of grievances are given in Table 9.

Table 9

Nature of Grievance	Number
Compensation for land acquired	5
Non-issue of BPL card	10
Non-issue of Ration Card	6
Non-issue of ration	4
Non-renewal of BPL card	2
Black marketing by shop keepers	4
Miscellaneous	14
TOTAL	40

Out of a total 40 grievances, 18 cases were resolved fully or partially. 5 cases were withdrawn or not found justified and 17 cases could not be resolved as due to heavy backlog of applications for renewal of BPL/Ration cards, the matter was closed with a direction to expedite the matter. Of the 20 Complainants contacted during Field Survey, 13 were satisfied with the outcome. In our meeting with the head of the Dept. F&CS, we were also informed that there is a certain quota for BPL cards to be issued in a year, and once that is full; no further applications can be entertained.

Education : A total of 31 grievances pertaining to the Education Department were reviewed by the Team. The main types of grievances are given in Table 10.

Table 10

Nature of Grievance	Number
Non-payment of Terminal dues/ACP/reimbursement of medical bills	14
Non-issuance of ACP scheme benefits	1
Non-payment of VI CPC Pay Scale arrears	1
Denial of admission/fee concession under EVS	2
Appointment as Teacher under OBC	1
Corporal punishment to Ward	1
Miscellaneous	11
TOTAL	31

21 grievances were resolved during the hearing in PGC. In 5 cases, either the matter was sub-judice or the complaint was not justified. The remaining 5 cases remained unresolved.

Registrar of Cooperative Societies (RCS): A total of 10 grievance cases pertaining to RCS were studied by the Team. 5 cases related to corruption and mismanagement, 2 to foul play and delay in allotment of flats, 2 cases of difficulty in mutation and undue objection for registration of a flat and 1 case of complaint against a Society for undue penalty charged. 3 cases were resolved and the remaining cases remained inconclusive or unresolved.

Suo-Moto cases : The PGC Act also authorizes it to take *suo-moto* notice of cases based on media reports. During the period under review, serious efforts were made by the Commission on this aspect. The nature of the grievances related mainly to the quality of drinking water, caving in of roads leaving a deep and wide crater, dilapidated condition of public library, serious malpractice in disbursing emoluments to Nursing Orderlies, sealing of cell phone towers, rise of crime in Dwarka, unauthorized parking, over charging by Autos and corruption in RTO. Some of the cases reviewed by the Study Team are covered in the following paragraphs.

- (i) The "Hindustan Times" of April 24, 2010, carried a report about the Middle Lane of Connaught Place not receiving the same attention as the Inner Circle and the Outer Circle. A notice was issued to NDMC. In response, EE(CP) who also attended the hearing before Chairman, PGC, advised that the Middle Circle of CP is a service corridor for utilities meant for the establishments in the Inner and Outer Circles and the work of its modernization is being taken up which will take about 18 months although the ground work will be completed by October 2010. The Commission directed the ground work to be completed by 10th October, 2010.
- (ii) "Hindustan Times" of April 28, 2010 carried a report about alarming rise in crime in Dwarka Sub-city and the hesitation/unwillingness on the part of Delhi Police to register minor and major crimes. Notice was issued to Joint Commissioner of Police (HQ). At the first hearing on 28th May, 2010, ACP (Vigilance), Delhi Police, and Inspector, Dwarka PS, filed a reply from SHO, PS, Dwarka conveying that the PS was created only on 22nd September, 2009 and complaints were being registered regularly. The case of the car having been robbed, mentioned in the news

item was solved within 3 hours with the recovery of the car and arrest of 4 culprits and recovery of arms and ammunition. However in view of the reports about incidents of crime not being registered, Commission directed DCP, South West District to be present at the next hearing with an explanation as to why there is this perception that PS Dwarka is unwilling to register the cases/FIR. Additional DCP (SW District) attended the next hearing on 29th June and explained how the cases are being promptly registered and solved. A separate counter had also been established at PS Dwarka for helping Residents Welfare Associations.

- (iii) "Times of India" dated May 03, 2010 carried an item about a wide crater/pothole on the model BRT Corridor at the Tilak Bridge-ITO crossing. A notice was issued to Engineer-in-Chief, PWD and MD, DIMTS. In response, AE, PWD and Senior Consultant, DIMTS, attended the hearing before the Chairman, PGC. AE, PWD stated that the road in question had been handed over to DIMTS while the latter stated that the road had not yet been handed over to DIMTS. However, after receiving the intimation from PGC, in public interest, DIMTS alerted RITES/DJB/PWD/CPWD and the Traffic Police about the complaint. The crater occurred due to persistent leakage in underground water supply line of CPWD, which had since completed the repair work. The PGC directed these agencies to make their staff accountable and that it would be glad to assist in coordination.
- (iv) "Navbharat Times" dated May 03, 2010 carried an item about non-availability of water in hospitals of Government of NCT of Delhi, especially in Lok Nayak Hospital, Lal Bahadur Health & Family Welfare and Secretary, DJB. Hearings were held on 25th May and 14th June, 2010 attended by officers of DJB, H&FW Deptt. and the concerned hospitals. Officials of LBS and LN Hospitals confirmed that there was no shortage of water and the water coolers were also functioning normally; the water coolers which were not functional were being replaced with new ones. As for GTB Hospital, CMO (NFSG) stated that MS had convened a meeting with DJB officials about the shortage of water and the need to commission 2 bore-wells. It was agreed that the hospital should apply for additional water supply and also take up the matter with CE, Water Project (Planning) DJB. EE (Civil) PWD was directed to take up the matter with DJB. EE (Civil) PWD also informed that water harvesting system has already been installed

in the New Ward Block Building, new building of School of Nursing and residence of MS. He was directed to install water harvesting system in existing building of GTB Hospital campus. The Principal Secretary, H&FW was requested to ensure that water harvesting systems, now mandatory for govt. buildings including hospitals were being installed at all hospitals.

- (v) "Navbharat Times" dated May 03, 2010 carried another report about the wholly inadequate practices adopted to collect samples of drinking water from water cooling machines and also to verify the safety of products sold by vendors of sugar cane juice, "chaat" like golgappe and bhalle papdi etc. Notice was issued to Commissioner, MCD and Director, Prevention of Food Adulteration. Dy. MHO (Public Health), MCD filed a reply and stated that cooling plants are allowed to function only after issue of license and water is supplied by DJB. If the plants use ground water, then the quality of water is tested before grant of license. All the water trolleys are numbered and licensed and MCD Health Deptt. keeps a regular check on these. He filed a detailed report conveying number of raids conducted during the year; action had been taken in 77 cases during the year. The Commission felt that the report filed was satisfactory but inadequate. He was directed to make frequent surprise checks and to publicise the findings as well as penalties imposed.
- (vi) "Dainik Jagran" dated June 14, 2010 carried an item about serious malpractices in the disbursement of emoluments to Nursing Orderlies working in several hospitals of GNCT of Delhi, like Lok Nayak Hospital, Guru Teg Bahadur Hospital and Lal Bahadur Shastri Hospital, by the contractor appointed by Dte. of Health Services. A notice was issued to Principal Secretary, Deptt. of H&FW. The representatives from GTB, LBS and Lok Nayak Hospitals attended and stated that contracts were awarded after following due procedure and no complaints had been received from employees against the contractors. The Commission directed that formal and informal discussions should be held with the outsourced staff and should also put in a system for check so that the contractor does not indulge in any malpractice.
- (vii) "Dainik Jagran" dated June 14, 2010 also carried a news item about a Sulabh Shauchalaya functioning virtually within the premises of a government school in the Buland Masjid Area of Shastri Park. Taking *suo- moto* notice of this, a notice was issued

to Secretary, Department of Education and Deputy Director, Education (North East), MD DSIIDC, Deputy Commissioner, Shahdara North Zone, MCD and SDM, Seelampur. Two hearings were held on 7th and 21st July. Deputy Director Education (NE) stated that Sulabh Shauchalaya was demolished on 20th June and filed a report from the Principal and photo in support. It was also mentioned that the school had all facilities like boundary wall, toilets electricity and drinking water. Installation of RO System, fencing of the boundary wall and interlocking tiles on the pathway and the ground was necessary. DSIIDC stated that it had to be upgraded to Secondary School needing additional construction for which plans had been forwarded to the Directorate of Education. PGC directed the Education Directorate to ensure allocation of funds to enable construction within stipulated time.

- (viii) "Dainik Jagran" dated June 14, 2010 had yet another item about
- (i) heavy barricades having fallen on the Ring Road near Maharana Pratap ISBT causing danger to vehicular movement and possibly inviting a major mishap/accident on this road and
 - (ii) the street lights along this road being dysfunctional which has aggravated the chances of major accidents at night. A notice was issued to Principal Secretary, PWD and Deputy Commissioner, Civil Lines Zone, MCD. At the hearing, PWD and NDPL officers reported that the carriage way was now free of obstruction, the street lights had also been attended to and were now functional and being monitored through automatic monitoring and control system.

It will be seen from the above details of some of the *suo-moto* cases, that the Commission has been successful in resolving the grievances covered in the media. What is particularly noteworthy is the fact that where more than one department/agency was involved, the problem of coordination got resolved because of PGC's intervention, which would have otherwise remained hanging in passing the buck from one to the other.

Some Success Stories: While generally the PGC has been effective in getting the grievances received by it resolved, during 2008-09, it made vigorous efforts to ensure prompt and satisfactory redressal of grievances received from the members of the public. Ample opportunity was given in hearings to both the complainant and the respondent department/agency and regular monitoring helped in

resolving the grievances. Some of the notable cases of success studied by the Team are mentioned in the following paragraphs.

- (i) Shri Saudan Singh (Case No.PGC/07/East/155/Rev.) complained that Shri Ravi Shankar Vashist, r/o 14/4 Krishna Nagar, Shahdara, Delhi had died during 1984 riots due to a bullet injury. Later his wife also expired in 1991 leaving behind a daughter, Ms Yashpana Sharma. Several representations were made by the family to various authorities for ex-gratia relief to the family without success. This complaint was registered in May 2007 and 6 hearings were held between May 2007 and December 2008, when the progress was reviewed and directions were issued from time to time for compliance and follow up action. Finally, in the hearing held on 23-12-2008, the concerned SDM informed the Commission that the ex-gratia compensation amount of Rs 685,000/- was paid to the family. Thus, with the intervention of PGC, a long standing grievance was resolved.
- (ii) Shri P.C.Das (Case No. PGC/08/North/223/Rev.) complained in June 2008 that he had not been paid the wages due to him, due to process of recovery against M/s Green Roadways. He had been awarded Rs 29,990/- by Addl. Distt. & Sessions Judge, who was also the Presiding Officer, Labour Court XVI, Karkardooma Courts on 28-4-2007 following which a recovery certificate was issued by Dy. Labour Commissioner on 12-10-2007 to Collector, North District, for implementing the recovery on which no action had been taken. PGC called for a report from Deputy Commissioner, North and 3 hearings were held June and November 2008. As a result, Revenue authorities issued arrest warrant and the Police arrested the offender who then paid the amount, which was handed over to the Complainant.
- (iii) Shri Ravi Dutt (Case No. F33(01)/08/April/DSSSB), who is physically handicapped, complained that he was not being recommended by DSSSB for appointment as Assistant Teacher in the Education Deptt. This reason given for this was that he was unable to perform manual work by his hands due to physical deformity despite the fact that the Medical Board, Orthopedics, of RML Hospital had declared him physically fit for performing duties of a Primary Teacher. The matter was taken up by the Commission; 4 hearings were held between June and December 2008 and, as a result of close monitoring of the case, DSSSB/ Education Deptt. issued offer of appointment to him on 5-11-2008.

- (iv) Smt. Indramani Gupta (PGC April/08/070/44/DSW) and Smt. Indu Bhatnagar (PGC/May/070/46/DSW) complained in April 2008 about denial of ACP benefit even 3 years after their retirement. PGC, taking a serious view in the matter, advised the Social Welfare Deptt. to process the case on priority and submit an action taken report. In the hearing in Dec. 2008, the representative of the Department informed that both the teachers have been granted the benefit of ACP scheme w.e.f. 9-8-1999 vide order dated 19-11-2008.
- (v) Shri Hemant Kumar Chandra (PGC/2008/East/228/Rev.) complained in July 2008 that he had applied for caste certificate for his two daughters and furnished all requisite documents and affidavit but the certificates had not been issued. The staff of SDM (Preet Vihar) had completed the due verification and 2 neighbours had also given witness along with their identity proof. One Shri Raj Kumar sitting outside the office had, however, come to his residence and demanded money for handing over the certificate. On his refusal, he was challenged that he would not get the certificate and the same will be shown as misplaced. PGC sought a report from Dy. Commissioner (East). During the first hearing of the case in September 2008, SDM (Preet Vihar) conveyed that the complainant had visited his office and the requisite certificates for his daughters had been handed over to him. SDM (Preet Vihar) was, however, directed to identify the person/tout who had allegedly approached the complainant and demanded money. Required preventive measures to check such harassment of common people should also be taken.
- (vi) Shri R.K.Verma (PGC/2008/LNH/26) complained that the Directorat of Vigilance, Govt. of NCT of Delhi had not issued Vigilance Clearance Report on account of a pseudonymous complaint against him. He was never suspended or charge sheeted or any departmental proceedings held against him for any allegations. As a result, his retirement benefits were not released after his retirement on 30-6-2008. PGC sought a report from Directorate of Vigilance. 3 hearings were held and at the final hearing, the representative of the Department conveyed that the case against Shri Verma had been closed. After getting NOC, the Lok Nayak Hospital from where he had retired conveyed the orders for release of pension and submitted bills for terminal benefits to Pay & Accounts Office.

- (vii) Smt. Krishna Rani (PGC/08/NW/210/Rev.) complained in March 2008 that her husband had died in a militant attack while on a pilgrimage to Amarnath Yatra and ex-gratia relief of Rs 1 Lakh had not been released to the family. She further alleged that a cheque was forwarded to the Office of Divisional Commissioner, Government of NCT of Delhi by Government of J&K but even after 8 years, the complainant and her family had not received it. The Commission sought a report from Divisional Commissioner. The cheque could not be traced and the matter was taken up with Deputy Commissioner (Anantnag), Govt. of J&K for issue of a duplicate cheque. The Commission also directed the Divisional Commissioner to depute a responsible person to J&K to obtain a duplicate cheque/ draft. As a result of the matter being pursued vigorously by Chairman PGC, the cheque for Rs 1 lakh was received and handed over to the Complainant at the final hearing.
- (viii) Shri T.K.Jain (PGC/08/DJB/225) had complained that DJB had not taken any action on his letter dated 6-10-2008 regarding damage of sewage and water system of DDA flats C-3 A/84 A, B, C to 89 A, B, C (18 flats). It was further mentioned that he was approaching the Commission after seeing its advertisement in print media 'Unique Single Window facility where every grievance gets speedy and fair redressal'. The Commission forwarded it to CEO, DJB for immediate action and report. The concerned Zonal Officer initiated the required action and at the hearing held on 15-1-2009 a report was submitted stating that the action for repairing the pavement of DDA flats and damage to sewage and water system had been taken, as confirmed in writing by the complainant. Shri Jain also addressed a thanks giving letter to Member (F/T).
- (ix) Shri Raj Kumar Toofan (PGC/08/DJB/15453) complained about tube well being defective and several complaints to local DJB office and senior officials of DJB had not led to any action to resolve their grievance. PGC forwarded the complaint to CEO, DJB for immediate action and compliance report. In the first hearing, it was submitted by the Nodal Officer that EE (E&M), under whom the area comes, had been requested to take necessary action. As the residents of the area were facing acute shortage of drinking water, Commission advised the Nodal Officer to ensure immediate action. At the subsequent hearing,

the Commission was informed that the damaged motor had been repaired and there was smooth and proper supply of drinking water to the residents. The Complainant also thanked the Chairman for resolving the problem.

- (x) Col. P.K.Mahajan (PGC/2007/RCS/106) complained that he, along with his two sons had purchased 2 flats in Vikram Nagar CGHS, Plot 14, Sector 12, Dwarka in December 2005. These were got converted from lease hold to free hold with Conveyance Deed registered on 30-6-2006 and he and his sons applied for the membership of the Society after completing all formalities. Despite repeated requests, this has not been done nor had there been any response. He had also taken up the question under RTI. PGC referred the case to RCS for immediate action and Report. RCS informed that the Society had not refused membership but some discrepancies had been committed which needed rectification. It also reported that some unauthorized constructions had been made and the two flats have been amalgamated due to which DDA had not issued the Completion Certificate to the Society. RCS also contended that there had been amendment in Section 91 of DCS Act, 2007, made effective from 13-1-2007 clearly providing for only one membership in a housing Society. The Commission observed that the request in this case was prior to the amendment and the issue needed to be sorted out by the Society as per Section 91 of DCS Act 2003. The complainant at further hearing stated that he was being unnecessarily harassed despite having completed all formalities. The Commission advised ARCS, SW, to call an immediate meeting with Complainant, Society and DDA and sort out the matter within a fortnight. Finally, RCS informed on 30-4-2008 that the matter had been sorted out and membership of the Society had been granted to Col. Mahajan and his sons and Share Certificates issued. The Complainant also confirmed this and thanked the Commission for getting him justice.

From the analysis of cases studies by the Project Team, it is observed that :

- (a) It is clear from the working of the Public Grievances Commission that this is a unique and inexpensive forum for the general public to approach for redressal of its grievances against various Government departments/agencies and it has been generally effective in getting genuine grievances resolved. Its approach has

generally been positive and it has been particularly successful in tackling problems requiring inter-departmental and inter-agency coordination.

- (b) PGC intervention in a case always elicits a response from the concerned departments. Sometimes the response is not within the specified time and reminders are sent. PGC intervention has expedited the resolution of some long standing grievances, which could have remained pending for long, have been resolved within a few months.
- (c) In some cases it is seen that, on receipt of notice from PGC, action has been taken by the department concerned to redress the grievance even before the first hearing at PGC.
- (d) It has been observed that some cases have been prematurely closed/appear incomplete as the department had replied that action will be taken but it would require some time because of rules and procedure or paucity of resources. However, the intervention of PGC has led to highlighting the problem and its notice being taken by the department for redressal.
- (e) The pro public orientation of PGC is highlighted by the fact that the onus of proving a complaint as false or baseless has been placed on the department concerned and not on the Complainant to prove the genuineness of the complaint.
- (f) In some cases where, apart from grievance, corruption charges have been leveled against officials in the concerned department, PGC has concentrated on redressal of the grievance while not commenting on the charges.
- (g) There is a difference in the perceived effectiveness of PGC depending upon the nature of the grievance. While it is quite effective in ensuring redressal of grievances concerning certain departments like MCD, DJB and Food & Supplies, its role is limited in cases concerning Delhi Police and Registrar, Cooperative Societies, where rules/law and procedure of the concerned department entail delays.
- (h) PGC has been particularly useful and effective in resolving grievances requiring inter departmental/agency coordination e.g. as between MCD/DJB/Delhi Police or between different divisions of the same department e.g. Building, Works and Maintenance divisions of MCD so that the matter may not remain hanging on the argument that the job pertains to another division or department.

Chapter 7

Profile of the Complainants

The social audit of the impact of the Commission was conducted through personal contacts with randomly selected cases from among the 399 case files studied by the members of the Project team. It was originally planned to have interviews with 100 complainants. But as the second phase of the project proceeded, the surveyors got more enthused and completed 134 cases before the closure of the second phase.

In order to maintain uniformity in the responses, the complainants were interviewed on the basis of a questionnaire, which was finalized after much deliberation in the Core Group of the IC Centre for Governance. Care was taken to keep the questions simple and objective because the complainants did not belong to a homogeneous class. There were many complainants who appeared to be uneducated or with minimal education. Some of the questions related to their age, educational and income profiles to get an idea of their backgrounds.

A copy of the questionnaire is at Annexure V.

These 134 cases form the basis of our conclusions regarding the impact of the working of the Commission. The list of these 134 cases is given in **Annexure IV**.

A study of the age profile of the complainants shows that the complainants are evenly distributed in terms of their ages. 78 are younger than 50 years and 56 are above 50 years. An interesting fact is that there are 27 senior citizens. Most of the senior citizens have raised issues of public interest.

It is interesting to note that most of the complainants, who have approached the Commission, are educated though there are some illiterates too. More than 70% of them have received education beyond class 10. There is a fair number of graduates and post graduates. Advocates, doctors, engineers and teachers are among the complainants but there is a larger percentage of non-graduates. There are only 11 illiterate persons whose petitions have been drafted by others.

A significant fact in the income distribution of the complainants is that more than 40% belong to extremely low income families with an

income of less than Rs 1 lac per annum. They have mostly raised personal problems like issue of ration cards, employment and non payment of salaries etc. (to be seen from their sheets).

More than 50% have incomes between Rs 1 lac and Rs 5 lacs. They can be said to belong to lower middle class or middle class. There appears to be poor correlation between educational qualifications and incomes.

The remaining 7-8% of the complainants have incomes of more than Rs 5 lacs. Thus it can be safely deduced that the affluent section of the population does not approach the commission for looking into their grievances. Perhaps they have other means of dealing with their problems or they have no problems with government agencies. It also shows their aversion to raising issues of general public interest.

We are of the view that if the Commission listens to the small problems of the poor people and makes efforts to bring some succour to them, it has fulfilled its purpose. One should not expect a body of advisory nature to take effective steps to right the wrongs of other state institutions.

The table below shows the quantitative distribution of age, educational qualification and income among the 134 cases studied.

Survey Cases (134)

Fully satisfied (54)			
Age	Below 50 years 33	Above 50 years 21	Senior citizens 7
Education	Illiterate 3	Upto class 10 17	Above class 10 34
Annual Income	Less than 1 lakhs 19	1-5 lakhs 30	Above 5 lakhs 5

Partially satisfied (34)			
Age	Below 50 years 33	Above 50 years 21	Senior citizens 6
Education	Illiterate 7	Upto class 10 9	Above class 10 18
Annual Income	Less than 1 lakhs 19	1-5 lakhs 14	Above 5 lakhs 1

Not satisfied (46)			
Age	Below 50 years 26	Above 50 years 20	Senior citizens 14
Education	Illiterate 1	Upto class 10 7	Above class 10 38
Annual Income	Less than 1 lakhs 18	1-5 lakhs 25	Above 5 lakhs 3

Total (134)			
Age	Below 50 years 78	Above 50 years 56	Senior citizens 27
Education	Illiterate 11	Upto class 10 33	Above class 10 90
Annual Income	Less than 1 lakhs 56	1-5 lakhs 69	Above 5 lakhs 9

Chapter 8

Analysis of Cases in Social Audit

The responses of the complainants were collected by the surveyors with the help of a questionnaire. The carefully prepared questionnaire contained two aspects;

- the personal background of the respondent including his/her age, educational qualification and financial status etc, and
- His/her experience with the Commission.

A copy of the questionnaire is at **Annexure V**.

Initially 100 selected cases were given to the surveyors, but they completed the work ahead of the time schedule allotted for the purpose. Therefore, 50 more cases were given to them. Ultimately, we succeeded in getting precise and cogent replies from 134 complainants. Some of these responses were received by post and by e-mails.

In this chapter, it is intended to present an analysis of the responses. The cases are divided into three categories – fully satisfied, partially satisfied and unsatisfied. The number of a case, wherever mentioned, refers to the **Annexure IV**.

It may be mentioned that among the people who approached the Commission with their grievances, there is a preponderance of complainants satisfied with the functioning of the Commission. As many as 88 complainants say that they are either fully or partially satisfied with the Commission.

54 FULLY SATISFIED CASES

An analysis of the satisfaction derived from the intervention of the Commission shows that most of satisfied persons belong to the lower middle class or low income groups. It can be concluded that there is no better recourse for the poor people deprived of natural justice from the government agencies than the Public Grievance Commission. Some of the personal responses would bring out this aspect of the Commission in bold relief.

There are many legitimate claims of persons employed by the government which remain unresolved despite repeated requests and

complaints to the departmental heads. This is mainly because of part inefficiency and part callousness of the handling officials. Cases involving non implementation of Assured Career Progression scheme (Case no: 16, 20), non-payment of pensionary benefits (Case 146) etc were easily resolved by approaching the Commission. These may be considered grievances of a minor nature in a larger perspective, but they are of vital importance for individuals of meagre resources.

There are a number of cases of Delhi Jal Board which pertain to wrong and inflated water bills (Cases 71, 77, 78). All these matters were sorted out by the Board without much difficulty within a very short time. In these cases, the Commission did not have to hold more than 1-2 hearings. Ambassador Soni (Case 80) says that repeated complaints did not elicit any response from DJB, but the action taken by the Commission was decisive and quick. We are surprised that a large number of grievances of this type remain pending for years without recourse because they are not brought to the notice of the Commission.

The fact that the disposal process adopted by the commission is easier and quicker than courts of law is the hallmark of the functioning of the Commission. It is endorsed by several complainants (Cases 11, 30, 46, 60, 62). It is also an inexpensive route because no obligatory payment is required.

Apart from the individual grievances, many inconveniences being experienced by localities have also been successfully dealt with by the Commission. Defective sewerage pipes, contaminated water supply, dry taps for weeks etc are failure of civic services requiring immediate attention. But these urgent matters are not heeded by Delhi Jal Board when reported to them. But when they come before the Commission in the form of a public grievance, the officials of the Board spring into action and provide some redress without delay (Cases 46, 58, 63, 67, 77 etc).

In Food & Civil Supplies Department, the number of cases resulting in positive action is quite large. Some representative cases of full satisfaction are those of non-issue of modified APL cards, issue of duplicate ration card, complaints regarding ration depots etc (Case no: 194, 195, 196).

There are a few spurious, pseudonymous and motivated complaints too, but they have been detected in time and suitably treated.

Finally, there are cases of wilful harassment and discrimination by officials. They stand among the most serious and delicate of Commission's charge. Making them more complicated are allegations of blackmailing and corruption. Fortunately, such cases do not outnumber simpler cases. However, they require and get a deeper and more sympathetic processing in the Commission.

The case of Niranjn Singh (**Case no: 119**) relates to blatant harassment by the local police, which resulted in disciplinary action being taken against three policemen. In another case (**Case no: 110**), the public spirited complainant reported about the movement of the traffic against traffic rules at a busy signal. It was corrected by the police by deputing traffic staff at the place. This perhaps shows that simple but far reaching inconveniences of the public can be easily removed by the intervention of the Commission.

Similarly, there is another case (**Case 281**) where action was taken against an auditor, who in collusion with some officials of the Registrar of Cooperative Societies gave false certification of audit reports.

A remarkable fact of the fully satisfied cases is that almost all the complainants belonged to the lower middle income or low income groups (less than Rs 5 lac per annum). It means that PGC is being sparsely used by the affluent.

The complaints relating to DJB are of two types – one relating to sewage lines and the other relating to water supply. There was a complaint received by e-mail about a road left in disrepair after DJB completed its work on water pipes (**Case 207**). DJB said that it was MCD's responsibility. MCD repaired the road and informed PGC. Similarly there was a complaint regarding water being supplied for a few minutes at an unearthly hour (**Case 54**). It was promptly corrected by DJB. A senior citizen wrote about open sewage lines emitting stink in a public park (**Case 55**). DJB rectified it by replacing pipes.

Cases of satisfied persons belonging to BPL families relating to non-issuance or cancellation of ration cards include **Cases 187, 126, 192, 169 and 188**.

The experience with complaints against Delhi Police is mixed. Among satisfied citizens, there are cases of non registration of FIR (**Cases 85 and 132**). In these cases, report was lodged after the intervention of PGC.

A case of harassment and demand of bribe by local police personnel (**Case 123**) was satisfactorily resolved by higher police officers.

Warning was issued to the erring head constable. The complainant, however, says that the local constables still ask for money occasionally. He is totally satisfied with PGC.

There are some complaints relating to municipal authorities. An illegal construction was demolished on the complaint of a senior citizen (**Case 247**). Residents of a densely populated colony complained about a resident installing a mobile tower in his premises endangering the safety of the neighbourhood (**Case 33**). It was demolished after due enquiry though it took eight months to demolish the construction. A kiosk blocking the culvert and causing inconvenience to the residents was removed on a public interest complaint (**Case 240**). An encroachment on public road was looked into and demarcation carried out on a complaint by a labourer (**Case 224**). Encroachments by shopkeepers were removed and regular encroachment clearing drives commenced in INA market (**Case 23**). The tree branches from street came into a person's house. On his complaint to PGC, the branches were promptly cut (**Case 269**). The roads of a certain area in Vasant Kunj were lying unrepaired for a long time because of confusion of the ownership of the roads (**Case 5**). PGC got the matter clarified and the roads were re-carpeted.

A special feature of many such public interest complaints was that the complainants were not present during the hearings. Still, PGC persisted with the redressal of grievances.

Cases 150 and 156 were about non-payment of dues by the education and health departments. In both cases, the legitimate arrears and pensionary benefits were paid.

34 PARTIALLY SATISFIED CASES

There are 34 complainants who say that they are partly satisfied. An analysis of their responses shows that most of them are fully satisfied with the decisions taken by the Commission. Some of them have even expressed their gratitude to the Commission during and after the hearings. For example, an officer of the Airport Authority of India sent an e-mail, "thanks for such a medium to converse with public" (**Case 254**). Similarly, a retired employee of the education department, who got his medical expenditure reimbursed because of the intervention of the Commission, has thanked the Commission (**Case 62**).

Many other complainants should have been fully satisfied with the outcome of their cases. Strangely, they express only partial satisfaction

in their personal interviews for no apparent reason. Delhi Jal Board revised the water bills of the consumer in **(Case 42)**, rectified water supply in **(Case 62)** and cleared the choked sewerage pipes in **(Case 52)**. In **(Case 255)**, the pension of a retiree was refixed and in **(Case 147)**, the assured career progression was granted.

Still they are only partly satisfied mainly because the grievances were not completely redressed by the concerned departments despite absolutely just orders of the Commission. This comment recurs from time to time in the interviews of the complainants. A complainant, who was being harassed by NDMC for a long time, got his sanctioned power load installed on account of the commission's directions **(Case 22)**. He has stated that 'he was happy with PGC but not with NDMC'. Another complainant, whose daughter had been abducted, was also satisfied with the commission but held Delhi Police responsible for delaying the investigations **(Case 136)**.

Some complainants were satisfied with the final outcome in their cases, but were unhappy with the delay in the hearings in the Commission. Ten complaints of non-issue of BPL ration cards had a similar experience. The ration cards were issued due to the intervention of the Commission **(Cases 177, 178, 190, 192)**.

A salutary feature of the working of the Commission is that once the factor of grievance is established, the Commission does not insist on the personal presence of the complainant for pursuing his/her case. In several cases, the grievance was heard despite the absence of the complainant and got it resolved **(Cases 278, 191, 173, 52, 7, 114)**.

All the complainants say that they will continue to approach the Commission in future in case of a grievance. They would also advise others to use the Commission whenever required.

There are, however, some cases where the commission could not fully resolve the complaints due to the complex nature of cases. Such cases included a complaint regarding illegal factories in residential areas **(Case 255)** requiring a thorough probe in the functioning of MCD and choked sewerage lines in large areas **(Cases 44, 35)** where coordination among different departments was required.

There is a singular case **(Case 149)** in which the complainant, though his unpaid salary was paid by its intervention, is of the opinion that the commission is more inclined to rely on the departmental version.

Among the cases where the complainants express partial satisfaction with the outcome of their complaints are ration card restoration of BPL ration cards (**Cases 193, 180, 179, 199**). In all these cases, ration cards were issued. However, they are not fully satisfied because they are not getting ration from the fair price shops.

A very poor vendor complained of harassment by police beat constable (**Case 99**). The beat constable was warned to mend his conduct and the SHO asked to be more pro-active in solving poor people's problems.

In a case of blockage of sewer lines, PGC got it cleared (**Case 4**). But the complainant is not fully satisfied because the main problem is the defective entire sewage system. DJB has reported that the proposal is under consideration of the government.

A senior citizen complained of non-consideration of his past services in the calculation of his pension (**Case 142**). It was found that his earlier services were in some other state and the corresponding records were not available. The Commission took the trouble of writing to the authorities in the other state and persisting with the case till it was resolved. It took two years but the complainant got his pension recalculated. We consider this to be an excellent example of the effectiveness of the Commission. The complainant, however, is not fully satisfied because his medical expenditure has not been reimbursed.

46 CASES OF NON-SATISFACTION

Having dealt with a representative sample of the satisfied citizens, we hasten to add that many other complaints are only partially removed by the intervention of the Commission and yet many others remain unresolved. An analysis of such cases would indicate a large area of discontent among the petitioners. It would also help in suggesting possible remedies and improvements in the system.

A recurrent feature in the responses of the complainants not satisfied with the role of the Commission is that the Commission is unduly influenced by the government departments.

Another set of comments made by those more critical of the Commission ranges from 'a waste of money' to 'totally rubbish'. We think it is neither.

There are 46 cases of complainants expressing total dissatisfaction either with the functioning of the Commission or with its inability to

enforce its decisions on the departments. Their negative response could be because of non-genuineness of their complaints, suspicious backgrounds, over expectation of commission's outreach and indifference of some departments to the directions of the commission.

There are even some cases of complainants' misunderstanding of the role of the commission. They seem to think that not only their immediate grievances should be redressed but all their grievances should be resolved by the commission for all time to come. We are of the view that these should not be considered as cases of non-satisfaction.

For instance, the complainant sought issue of a BPL ration card. The Commission got the card issued. But the complainant is not satisfied because he is not getting kerosene oil from the KO depot (**Case 176**)!

Similarly, BPL card was issued to another complainant at the intervention of PGC, but he is not satisfied because his address on the BPL card is not correct (**Case 175**).

In yet another case, a Good Samaritan complained about the state of disrepair of a pedestrian bridge. PWD reported to the Commission that the aluminium sheets pilfered from the bridge have been replaced and grievance redressed. The complainant even did not attend the hearing (**Case 6**).

In another case, there was an internet complaint regarding contamination in water supplied by Delhi Jal Board. DJB reported on the next hearing that action had been taken and the quality of water is now satisfactory (**Case 65**). In this case also, the complainant did not attend the hearing.

A lady teacher complained that the employment exchange had not sent her name for any vacancy. The employment exchange reported that her turn had not yet come chronologically. She was later forwarded for a vacancy on her turn. But she is dissatisfied because she did not get the job (**Case 15**).

On a complaint of DJB workers cutting his electric wires and telephone lines while laying the water pipeline. The complainant did not attend the hearing but the DJB reported that the matter had been settled and the complainant was satisfied. In his personal response by e-mail, he says that he is not satisfied (**Case 37**).

A complaint against improper investigation by Delhi Police in the case of death in accident was taken seriously by the Commission. After

four hearings, it was admitted by the police that the investigating officer was at fault and his explanation was called. The accused were arrested and case sent for trial. The complainant is not satisfied with the police for having delayed the investigations. He also said that the police threatened him of dire consequences (**Case 88**).

It is intriguing why these complainants are not satisfied with the action taken by the Commission.

In a class of complaints, it is noticed that the complainants were not entitled to the relief asked for. Obviously, they would not be expected to be happy with the outcome of their complaints.

A complainant wanted a BPL ration card issued to him. He did not attend the hearings. On enquiry, the Department of Food & Civil Supplies found that he was not entitled to a BPL card as his income was higher than the threshold limit of poverty line (**Case 168**).

Similarly in another case of an identical nature, the Department of F&S reported that the complainant had applied for an AAY card and not for a BPL card. However, the matter was re-examined on the insistence of the complainant. It was found that he was not eligible for BPL card (**Case 181**).

There was a complaint regarding non-allotment of an industrial plot under the relocation scheme of polluting industries. He took no interest in his case but the Directorate of Industry reported that his case did not fall under the relocation scheme and was consequently rejected (**Case 17**).

There are several complaints involving general public interest. In such cases, the grievances arise from alleged non-delivery or deficient delivery of essential services by the concerned departments. We feel that the reasons for the frustration of the complainants in these cases are genuine. Apart from the failure to redress the grievances, they also indicate an unsatisfactory level of civic services in many areas.

A representative case of this genre is **Case 184**, in which the complainant alleged black marketing of essential commodities by the fair price shops and kerosene oil depots of a circle. He also produced CDs showing the fact of black marketing. The Commission took a lot of interest in the case and repeatedly asked the Department of Food & Civil Supplies to conduct investigations in the matter through the enforcement wing of the department. The Commission held six hearings over a period of six months. The department was asked to

take the help of the complainant in making a door-to-door checking of ration cards. There were no tangible results. Finally in December 2009, the Commission asked the department to appraise it of the outcome of investigations. There is no further information of the action taken. The complainant says that the problem continues and that he was harassed by the local police for having raked up the issue.

Case 75 relates to clogged and overflowing sewage lines despite repeated requests to DJB. The complainant could not attend the hearings but the Commission took immediate cognizance and ordered clearance of the sewage in the locality. The complainant says that the department did not comply with Commission's orders. The residents of the locality had to pay money to the police to get the work done. According to him, the Commission does not ensure compliance of its directions.

The problem was the same with sewage lines in **Case 84**. DJB reported to the Commission that the system had been checked and remedial action started. The complainant says that he is very happy with the action taken by the Commission and whatever work was done was at the instance of the Commission. But the department left the work midway. There is no mechanism in the Commission to ensure compliance.

The complaint in **Case 2** was regarding allegations of poor quality of newly carpeted roads, which led to their being damaged extensively. PWD reported that the damage was due to excessive rains and would be repaired within a fortnight. PGC directed the department that the quality of the roads should be monitored closely. The complainant says that no action was taken regarding the poor quality of construction. He says that PGC being a government agency is under the influence of the defaulting departments. It needs to be more proactive to command the confidence of people.

In **Case 64** the complainant drew the attention of the Commission to shortage in water supply in a cluster of forty houses. DJB in their Action Taken Report said that there were many reasons for lack of supply i.e. higher elevation, bifurcated lines, undulating topography etc but promised to look at possibilities. The Commission asked DJB to consider separate underground reservoir for them in consultation with RWA. The complainant says that DJB did not take any action.

The complainant of **Case 217** is neither satisfied with DJB nor with the Commission. In this case there were choked storm water drains

with missing manhole covers. The case was closed with MCD reporting that work was done. The complainant, a senior citizen, says he was not informed of the hearing. When he went to the Commission, he was not treated well by the Commission.

A senior citizen made the complaint in **Case 215** regarding sewage blockage, bad roads, open drains etc. MCD reported that necessary action was taken for repair of the road and sewage work was being attended to. The complainant accuses MCD of not taking any action.

There are many cases pertaining to unauthorised construction, encroachments and violation of building bye laws. The complainants are not satisfied with the outcome of their complaints to the Commission. These cases range from large scale unauthorised construction by flat owners of DDA flats in Vasant Kunj (**Case 261**), unauthorised encroachment in a park in Saket (**Case 112**), illegal construction by neighbour blocking complainant's access to his water tank (**Case 222**), construction without prior approval by neighbour causing inconvenience to the complainant (**Case 32**) and unauthorised construction and encroachment on road by restaurants (**Case 227**). In all these cases, the Commission was unable to get effective action from the concerned departments.

These complainants are most critical of the efficacy of the Commission. While most of them agree that they will continue to seek the Commission's platform for raising their grievances for want of any other option, a few are of the opinion that it is better to go to the courts for relief. One of them goes to the extent of saying that "PGC should be closed and wasteful expenditure on it avoided".

The other cases, where the complainants are not satisfied, are of a varied nature. One case was closed as beyond PGC's jurisdiction because it related to the maintenance of a DDA park (**Case 28**). An employee of the Education Department was not given stepping-up benefits because he had not exercised his option. The Commission concluded that he was not entitled to the stepping-up benefits (**Case 167**). There was a general complaint regarding prevailing corruption in the Transport Department. Since the complainant did not produce any evidence, it was closed (**Case 12**). In **Case 83**, the allegation of excessive billing for water by DJB could not be pursued by the Commission because DJB kept insisting that the bills were correct. A person complained against a group-housing society for not allotting flats to its members. The Registrar of Cooperative Societies put the process of allotment in motion on the direction of the Commission. But

it was revealed by RCS that the complainant was not even a member of the society (**Case 284**). A petition for construction of a subway under the Metro line was considered out of the purview of the Commission (**Case 256**). In **Case 13** regarding diversion of the bus routes in a colony was closed because Commission accepted the constraints of Delhi Transport Corporation. There was a half hearted complaint by e-mail regarding deficient water supply, which was not pursued by the complainant though it was considered a 'fast track' case by the Commission (**Case 61**). A senior citizen complained against a group housing society for charging a penalty of Rs 1170. It was held that he was liable to pay the penalty according to rules (**Case 278**). There are two cases of non receipt of ration cards (**Cases 185, 183**).

There is a particularly unfortunate case of a lady, who had requested for her name to be substituted in place of her deceased husband in the allotment of a flat. The claim was apparently undisputed. Even the will of the deceased was in favour of the widow. But surprisingly the case dragged for more than 18 months without any resolution. Ultimately, the Commission advised her to file a petition before Registrar of Cooperative Societies or approach the grievance redressal committee of RCS (**Case 280**).

Cases where the grievances are not tenable for a variety of reasons leave the complainant frustrated because he does not appreciate those reasons. He wants that his grievance must be redressed. For instance, an economically weak person applied for his son's admission in Vikas Bharti School (**Case 157**). The complaint arose from the fact that his son was not admitted. The school explained that there were 174 applications for 6 seats and the complainant's son was not successful in the draw of lots.

A senior citizen complained that in spite of his property being sealed by MCD, he had received water bills (**Case 43**). DJB explained that the arrears of water charges were prior to sealing of his property. He is not satisfied.

In **case 294**, the complainant wanted compensation for his land at enhanced acquisition rates. It was reported to PGC that the complainant had been paid compensation at original rates and he had accepted the payment. He is, therefore, not entitled to enhanced rates. He is not satisfied.

An illiterate lady applied for BPL ration card and was assured by PGC that card would be issued (**Case 197**). It was found that her name was already entered on her husband's card. She is not satisfied.

The secretary of a Resident Welfare Association is confused about his own complaint. He had complained of defective water bills by DJB (Case 56). A meeting was arranged between DJB and RWA and matter sorted out. In personal interview, he refers to some other complaint against Horticulture Department.

A public interest case was registered by a senior citizen regarding delay in the construction of government hospital in a village (Case 297). It was stated by Deputy Commissioner that the decision of the government is in abeyance because of a court case in the High Court. There does not seem to be any follow up of the court case and final resolution of the matter.

A complainant stated that his neighbours had assaulted his family members, but the police did not register a criminal case (Case 129). It was reported that the injuries were caused by a blunt object and therefore, a non-cognizable FIR was lodged under section 323 IPC. The complainant is not satisfied.

There was a complaint regarding non-approval of building plans by MCD in Munirka village (Case 219). It was reported that the plot is subdivided and therefore, building plans cannot be sanctioned according to present policy. The complainant is not satisfied and says that he would file a PIL in the High Court. He also says that MCD should give him the policy in writing.

There is one bad case where PGC does not appear to have taken pains to arrive at a conclusion. While most other cases are either resolved in favour of the complainant or rejected as not acceptable, this case is left at a loose end. It is a public interest complaint regarding the death of 3 labourers at a government construction site (Case 214). According to the complainant, the junior engineer should be held responsible for the death of the workers. PGC asked for a report in the matter from MCD. It kept sending reminders to MCD but nobody appeared for two years. Finally, PGC closed the case without giving any reason. The matter was also not reported to higher authorities in government. We are of the view that PGC should *suo-moto* take up the case afresh.

Chapter 9

Interaction with Departments

In the course of the field work of the project, the Study Team made serious efforts to contact the heads of some departments with a view to eliciting their perceptions of the Commission. The efforts did not receive the desired response from most of them. While some of them promised to meet the members of the team at a later convenient time (which never came), the others sought an excuse in the rush of construction work for the impending Commonwealth Games.

It is our conclusion that most senior officers of the government do not attach much importance to the monitoring and evaluation of their work by independent agencies. They consider such approaches irritating and useless.

However, we are grateful to two heads of important departments, who did spare time to meet the Team and discuss the impact of the Commission on their functioning. In this part, we discuss the gist of these discussions.

The main purpose of meeting these bureaucrats was to understand;

- What is the grievance redressal mechanism within the department
- whether intervention by PGC has added value to grievance redressal
- whether any systemic changes have been brought about by PGC's intervention

The Secretary-cum-Commissioner, Food & Civil Supplies Department said there were several types of complaints relating to the issuance of ration cards and the functioning of fair price shops/ kerosene oil depots. The problem about BPL cards was six monthly reviews had to be carried out owing to constantly changing numbers due to seasonal migration into Delhi and seasonal return to their native places.

There were complaints regarding malpractices in the distribution of food grains at fair price shops. But more complaints were received

about non-availability of kerosene oil at the kerosene oil depots. This was most surprising because kerosene oil is hardly used in Delhi.

She said that there existed a system of central registration of complaints, which were forwarded to regional additional commissioners for resolution. There was a monthly review meeting at the level of the Commissioner.

In addition to complaints relating to ration cards and supplies, there were occasional complaints of corruption against officers too. These were looked into by vigilance units directly under the charge of additional commissioners. While most of the complaints against officers are anonymous or pseudonymous, disciplinary action is taken against erring officers whenever established.

She said that the experience with Public Grievance Commission was generally good. The Chairman and the full time member had particularly been helpful to the department. She appreciated the nature of orders passed by the Commission. There were no stinking orders or strictures and the directions were generally helpful to the department.

The only problem was that officers of the department had to attend multiple hearings in PGC. It created additional burden on the officers to deal with PGC and Information Commissioner of RTI. According to her, it would be better for the department to strengthen its own grievance handling mechanism to reduce its dependence on an outside agency to deal with public complaints.

On the question of PGC's assistance in effecting systemic improvements, she was of the view that it would be difficult for PGC to suggest such improvements because of the intricacies of the department.

The Divisional Commissioner & Principal Secretary, Revenue did not perceive PGC as an irritant. According to him, PGC was a useful organization as it brought many issues that needed attention to the knowledge of the department.

The main complaints pertaining to the Revenue department concerned non-recovery of dues, non-allotment of land in compensation, non-issuance of SC/ST/ OBC certificates etc.

The Divisional Commissioner said that the records of Revenue Department were not in order and it would take at least six months of undivided attention to set them right for the grievances relating to land etc are properly handled.

He said that though there was an in-house system of grievance redressal in the Department, the experience showed that lesser importance was given to it in the hierarchy. Priority attached to grievance redressal was low. There were matters of urgency being attended to rather than giving priority to redressing grievances. Therefore, an external check like that of PGC on the internal system had a definite role to play.

The Divisional Commissioner felt that PGC did not have enough teeth in the absence of statutory authority. As of now, it was a friendly type of body. Structurally it represented a friendly neighbour, as it could not 'kick where it hurts'. He remarked that even if it fell short of being a statutory body, it should be armed with powers to impose fines if its directions were not carried out by a department.

From these interactions with departments, the Project Team got the impression that they did not resent the interventions by the Commission. They seemed to hold the view that PGC was another arm of the government to listen to public complaints and alert the concerned departments.

Chapter 10

Conclusions of Social Audit

The Public Grievances Commission is a vastly innovative initiative taken by the Government of NCT of Delhi. We presume that this initiative was also inspired by the Chief Minister in 1997. While the other celebrated scheme of Bhagidari has been given prominence over the years, PGC retains a low profile in the public eye.

This initiative is unparalleled in any other state of the country. That it deserves to be emulated by other progressive state governments is our unambiguous recommendation.

In our social audit survey, we found a preponderance of satisfied citizens. The percentage of complainants have expressed satisfaction with the way PGC functions and its effective manner of resolving their problems is about 70%, a performance still to be demonstrated even by the statutory right to information administration.

PGC provides a credible forum for listening to the grievances of the common man in a sympathetic manner. No complaint goes unnoticed after being registered. The least that's done in every case is to ask for an ATR (action taken report) from the concerned department within a period of 21 days. In some cases of emergent nature like disappearance of a girl, the report is called for in a shorter time.

In cases of minor grievances, PGC has made effective intervention. It is also effective where inefficiency, delay or harassment has occurred at lower levels of the administrative machinery. In other words, the Commission is able to provide much needed relief to the poor and low income groups in their problems at the cutting edge of administration. If there is greater awareness of the positive role of the Commission in such cases, thousands of harassed citizens can get succour through its intervention.

A new initiative has been taken by the present Chairman of the Commission in mounting a publicity campaign for creating awareness about the simple and convenient process of redressing grievances of general public. Success stories of representative nature are also proposed to be publicized to instil confidence among the people of

Delhi. Holding public meetings in different areas of the city can be considered in this regard.

Where PGC finds itself relatively ineffective are cases of alleged organized malfeasance and in-built inefficiencies like encroachments, unauthorized constructions, poor quality of newly built roads, ill planned sewerage lines and inadequate water supply, police harassment etc. It can, however, be said that it is not possible to deal with wilful malfeasance in summary proceedings. Even Public Interest Litigations have not succeeded in such matters.

Another area needing greater attention is systemic improvement in the working of administrative departments. There have been very few cases of systemic improvements initiated by the Commission.

The Commission should make an attempt to study the grievance redressal mechanisms in the departments. It should take up such studies either directly or in collaboration with some research organization like IIPA, Institute of Social Studies etc.

The Commission should not leave loose ends in several cases of serious nature. It sometimes occurs because of pressure of casework, lack of trained manpower, long gestation period of redressal and non-computerisation of records. Cases are closed with departments assuring compliance of PGC's directions. No account of the final outcome is maintained. This can be corrected by computerisation of cases and online reporting of final action by the concerned department.

The perception of a sizeable number of respondents is that the Commission serves a very useful purpose for those citizens who do not have any other recourse to air their grievances. The response of complainants in several cases clearly shows that their grievances were resolved within a short time after approaching the Commission and that they would recommend others to go to the Commission in case of public grievances. Their level of satisfaction is very high.

On the other hand, the most uncharitable assessment of another section of respondents is that the Commission is merely an ornamental organization meant to publicize the people-centric character of the Government of NCT of Delhi. The complainants of some cases bring out their extreme dissatisfaction with the efficacy of the Commission. This view is also shared by some independent observers.

According to the findings of the Study, the truth lies somewhere between the two extreme contradictory views. While the Commission

is yet to become an ideal grievance redressal system, it has definitely made an impact on the working of several departments by its intervention. This is supported by the departmental heads of the departments in their conversations with the Study Team. Though they admitted that the Commission does not have the legal authority to ensure compliance of its decisions, they expressed the view that it brought cases of harassment and corruption to the notice of the senior officers in the departments.

It is unfortunate that there is not sufficient awareness among the people about PGC's existence and working. Not many people casually interviewed by the Team knew that there was indeed an institution that hears their felt grievances against public authorities. When asked where they would go to seek redressal of injustice from the government, they mentioned the ministers and other politicians, courts of law or vigilance set up.

The team strongly feels the need of a sustained public awareness programme to be initiated by the Commission and supported by the Delhi Government..

In addition to a concerted public campaign, the government departments should be asked to pay heed to directions of the Commission. Hoardings regarding the Commission should be put up in every department at vantage points to advise the public in case of a grievance not settled by departmental functionaries.

The present Chairman of the Commission should be complimented to have conceived a comprehensive publicity campaign, which may be launched soon. It is a well thought out mixture of advertisements in print and electronic media and display of attractive hoardings at metro stations etc. Some features of the new initiative are given in **Annexure VI**.

She has also introduced an innovative practice of entertaining complaints of serious nature affecting communities and localities. According to the new practice, the Commission takes *suo-moto* cognizance of news stories appearing in the daily newspapers regarding maladministration and harassment of citizens. Some of these recent cases are brought out in Chapter VI.

According to the Chairman of the Commission, the Commission has also initiated certain systemic reforms in the working of some departments over the years. A note on these systemic reforms is given in **Annexure VII**.

The resolution of 1997 promised UPSC like autonomy to the Commission. And indeed the Commission enjoys functional autonomy in a great measure regarding its treatment of grievances and other day to day working. But it does not enjoy financial autonomy related to its given functions. It has to look up to the government for any financial sanction. This is reflected in the limited awareness effort and delay in computerisation, which is vital to any public function in citizen domain. Till now, we cannot register a complaint online unlike the Directorate of Public Grievances established in 1999 in the Cabinet Secretariat of Government of India.

The Resolution also said that the Commission could take *suo-moto* action on any complaint received by it or which came to its notice from media etc. not many cases were instituted under this freedom by the Commission over the years. The present Chairmen has started to take cognizance of media reports and acting on them.

Another powerful provision of the Resolution, which could provide requisite sharpness to its effectiveness, relates to the Commission's authority to conduct research into systemic causes of complaints for bringing about reforms for greater transparency and responsiveness.

It is surprising that not much benefit has been taken of this provision. Only in exceptional cases has this provision been utilized.

An analysis of customers of PGC, who say that they are not satisfied with PGC, is interesting. As mentioned above about one third of the petitioners are not satisfied with the conduct and effectiveness of the commission.

The main reasons cited by them in personal interviews are;

- they did not get their desired relief
- the PGC is under the influence of the government departments
- it is unable to enforce its directions
- it is insensitive to the woes of the citizens.

Some of the comments made by these frustrated complainants are 'it is totally useless' or 'it should be closed to avoid wastage of public money' or plain 'rubbish'.

We feel it would be imperative to consider their views dispassionately and take remedial measures, wherever indicated by analysis.

A close analysis of the 'not satisfied' cases shows that most of them are annoyed either because of non-fulfilment of their unreasonable claims or because they wanted to use PGC for settling scores with their adversaries. The Commission had looked into their cases and concluded that their grievances were not genuine. In our view, such cases are not worth consideration. They should be treated as aberrations of a facility.

There are, however, some instances of real genuine grievances. We find that they have been dealt by the commission rather summarily. They have not received the attention they deserved.

One such case is of a public spirited individual who complained about three illegal industries functioning in a residential area.

Another genuine public interest complaint is total inaction by the authorities in the case of the death of three workers at a government construction site.

Yet another case relates to a widow, who pleaded for her name to be substituted for her deceased husband's in the allotment of a flat.

We suggest that these and such other complaints should be reconsidered by the commission.

There are a few cases of Delhi Jal Board's inability to ensure proper supply of drinking water and miserably deficient sewage disposal system. The residents of several localities keep complaining about shortage or absence of water supply. Perhaps these are larger issues and the government of Delhi and government of India together need to think of meeting the requirements of the steadily growing population of Delhi. The commission cannot be expected to solve these complex long gestation problems.

In respect of the number of complaints received, Delhi Police ranks only after the Municipal Corporation of Delhi. But It is surprising that unlike complaints filed with the Vigilance Branch of the Delhi Police & their District Public Grievances Cells, most of the complaints contain petty allegations except in very few cases.

Similarly, allegations against police officers are of very general nature and vague, mostly relating to their alleged inaction. Only in about a dozen complaints some specific allegations were made and in 6 cases complainants either named the police officers of Const/HC/ASI ranks or only mentioned their ranks. Most of these allegations could not be substantiated or were found incorrect. However, in two

or three cases, where the allegations were proved, action was taken or initiated against the defaulters.

In a number of cases, PGC issued some instructions or made recommendations to the Police department, but there appears to be no follow up action. However, it was gratifying to observe that the complaints were from all over Delhi including rural areas indicating a general sense of credibility about the functioning of PGC.

A rectifiable deficiency of the working of the Commission is regarding the inability of the Commission in ensuring compliance of its directions by the departments. During our interactions with PGC, this subject was repeatedly raised. The Chairman and members of the Commission are themselves concerned about the need to follow up the actions of the departments subsequent to the closure of the cases. But they find the present compliment of staff pitifully inadequate to keep a watch over a very large number of closed cases.

This raises a related question of the processing the ever increasing number of complaints by the Commission. A cursory examination of the level of disposal of cases by two full-time and two part-time members shows that the strength is woefully inadequate. No work-study has been conducted to examine the adequacy or otherwise of the number of members and staff required to handle the projected workload. We recommend that work-study be carried out by the Delhi government to determine the requirement of presiding officers and supporting staff of the Commission.

In addition to the enhancement of the strength of the Commission, there is a need to upgrade the technological competence of the Commission too. There are many instances of IT based solutions in other government institutions, which can be suitably incorporated in the working of the Commission. For example, the Directorate of Public Grievances in Government of India provides the facility of on-line registration and processing of grievances.

PGC can easily install a system of instituting grievances on its website. The complaints can then be sent online to the concerned departments for Action Taken Reports without any lapse of time. The complaints received by ordinary post can also be scanned and dealt with in the same manner. Suo-motocases can also receive the same treatment.

Cases where follow up is required can be kept in a separate folder to be monitored by the Commission at regular intervals.

The Project Team of IC CfG went through a large number of cases dealt with by the Commission. It was noticed by the Team that a substantial number of the complaints referred by it to the concerned departments evoked positive response from the departments and the complaints were acted upon without further proceedings. It was a welcome feature.

Similarly, in a number of cases, the Commission heard the petitioners and the departmental representatives with a view to bring about a mutually acceptable settlement. But the general practice was to go along with the rules and procedures of the department and leave the final resolution of the grievance to the natural process. While it was in accordance with smooth functioning of government, it was felt that a more proactive role of the Commission could improve the procedures.

Every chairman has made efforts to improve the working of the commission and quality of disposal of cases despite enormous work load. The procedures have been increasingly streamlined. Still, there is considerable room for improvement. It appears that the computerisation of records and proceedings has still not been accomplished. The expenditure on computerisation has not been meaningfully made.

Successive chairmen have added value to the outcomes of the redressal of grievances. The present chairman has issued detailed 'Standard Operating Procedures' in 2009.

PGC has been able to perform its functions because it does not have a turf to defend. It acts like a fair arbiter of people's grievances to the best of its capability and judgment.

Annexures

┌

┐

└

┘

Annexure I

PUBLIC GRIEVANCES COMMISSION

No. F.4/14/94-AR
Dated: the 25th Sept., 1997

RESOLUTION

After a careful consideration of the need for providing a comprehensive mechanism for

effective redressal of grievances of the public against the departments of the Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi (here-in-after referred to as "the Government of NCT of Delhi"), **Delhi Police* and local bodies, autonomous organizations/undertakings and other institutions owned or substantially financed by the Government of NCT of Delhi, the Government of NCT of Delhi, with the prior approval of the Government conveyed vide Ministry of Home Affairs D.O. letter No. 14011/40/95-Delhi-II dated the 26th June, 1997, have decided to set up a "Public Grievances Commission" in the National Capital Territory of Delhi to act as a functionally independent body responsible for speedy redressal of complaints of the public against acts of omission or commission on the part of public officials working in the said organizations and to recommend such action as considered necessary for removal of such grievances. The Commission shall, for the present, be attached to the Department of Administrative Reforms, Government of NCT of Delhi, but in the exercise of its powers and functions it will have the same measure of independence and autonomy as the Union Public Service Commission. The functions of the Commission shall be advisory in the same sense as those of the Union Public Service Commission.

2. The composition of the Commission, its powers and functions and the broad framework in which it shall function will be as follows:-

A. COMPOSITION

(i) The Commission shall consist of a Chairman and three Members (including two part-time Members) who shall be appointed by the Lt. Governor of the National Capital Territory of Delhi.

- (ii) *The Chairman of the Commission shall be a person who has, in the opinion of the Government of NCT of Delhi, distinguished himself in the field of public administration and was holding prior to his appointment in the Commission, a post in the rank of Secretary to the Government of India.

The Whole time member shall be a person who has been a Director General of Police of a State or has held an office of comparative status and responsibility. The two part-time Members shall be persons of Public eminence having special knowledge or practical experience in the field of education of science or Science or law or literature or social service or human rights. Of these two part-time members, at least, one shall be a lady.

- (iii) *The Chairman and the Members (including part-time members) shall hold office at the pleasure of the Lt. Governor of the National Capital Territory of Delhi, or till they attain the age of 65 years, whichever is earlier.*
- (iv) **The Chairman and Members (including part-time members) may resign their office by giving notice in writing to the Lt. Governor of NCT of Delhi and upon such resignation having been accepted they shall be deemed to have vacated their office.*
- (V) The Chairman shall be paid a fixed salary of Rs.8,000/- per month together with such allowances as admissible from time to time, provided further that if the Chairman at the time of his appointment is in receipt of pension (other than disability or war pension) in respect of any previous service under the Government of India or under the Government of State, his salary, irrespective of his service in the Commission, shall be reduced by the amount of that pension. The Whole-time Member shall be paid, subject to the same conditions, a fixed salary of Rs.7,500/-per month together with such allowances as admissible from time to time. The two part-time Members shall be paid a fixed fee of Rs. 7,500/-per month. The other terms and conditions of service of the Chairman and Members (including part-time Members) shall be such as are applicable to the officers of comparable status in the Government of India.
- (vi) A person shall be disqualified from being appointed as Chairman or Member (including part-time Member) if he (a) is not a citizen of India; or (b) is of unsound mind and has been so declared by the competent court; or (c) is adjusted as an undischarged insolvent; or (d) is convicted and sentenced to imprisonment for an offence which, in the opinion of the Government of NCT of Delhi, involves moral turpitude.

B. POWERS AND FUNCTIONS

- (vii) *The Commission shall consider, if it is satisfied that the circumstances of the case so warrant, complaints made by members of public against acts of omission or commission including cases of inaction or harassment or exlortion or corruption or abuse of power and authority on the part of the officials of the departments of Government of NCT of Delhi and local bodies, autonomous organizations/undertaking and other institutions owned or substantially financed by the Government of NCT of Delhi including Delhi Police. The advisory jurisdiction of the Commission shall not, however, extend to the Delhi Development Authority.”
- (viii) It shall be open to the Commission to take suo motu action in respect of any omission or commission on the part of the aforesaid public officials on the basis of information contained in media reports or received otherwise. The Commission shall also consider cases specifically referred to it by the Lt. Governor of the National Capital Territory of Delhi, the Chief Minister, Govt. of NCT of Delhi or the Chief Secretary, Government of NCT of Delhi. The Commission shall not, however, consider complaints, which are sub-judice.
- (ix) A person aggrieved by any act of omission or commission on the part of the said public officials may make an application to the Commission for the redressal of his grivance specific details of the case supported with a duly sworn affidavit. The applicant shall make a specific declaration to the effect that to the best of his knowledge and belief the subject-matter of the complaint is not sub-judice.
- (x) The Commission may conduct the hearing of the case singly or in benches consisting of the Chairman or the whole-time Member and one of the two part-time Members. The aggrieved person who has made the complaint shall himself represent the case before the Authority and will not be entitled to engage a legal practitioner for the purpose.
- (xi) *“The Commission, shall, on receipt of a complaint and if it is satisfied that it needs to be looked into, call for such records and summon such officials as considered necessary, hear them and come to a quick decision as to whether there is any dereliction on the part of the officials concerned. The Commission shall lay particular emphasis on the speedy disposal of the complaint. It shall be incumbent on the Chief Secretary of Government of NCT of Delhi, Commissioner of Police, Delhi and the Head of the Department concerned to ensure that the documents called for by the*

of Delhi for its being placed before the Legislative Assembly of National Capital Territory of Delhi.

The annual reports will be drawing particular attention to any recommendation made by it which had not been accepted or acted upon and the Government of NCT of Delhi will submit the same with a memorandum explaining the reason for non-acceptance of any of the recommendation(s) of the Commission to Delhi Legislative Assembly/Parliament, as the case may be."

ORDER

ORDERED that a copy of this Resolution be communicated to all Departments of Government of NCT of Delhi, local bodies, autonomous organizations/undertakings and other institutions owned or substantially financed by the Government of NCT of Delhi, etc. and also that the Resolution be published in the Gazette of Delhi.

**Substituted vide notification No. F.4/14/94/AR dated: 30th July, 1998*

(Published in Part-IV of Delhi Gazette Extraordinary dated 25th September 1997 and dated 30th July 1998)

APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN

No. F. 12/04/2001/AR/
Dated : 27.2.2002

NOTIFICATION

No.F.12/04/2001/AR - In pursuance of sub-clause A (i) of clause 2 of Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi Resolution No.F.4/14/94-AR dated 25.09.1997, as amended vide Resolution No.F.4/14/94-AR dated 30.07.1998 the Lt. Governor, National Capital Territory of Delhi is pleased to appoint Sh. P.S. Bhatnagar, I.A.S. (Retired) as Chairman, Public Grievances Commission of Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi. He shall be paid a fixed salary of Rs.26,000/- per month plus admissible allowances, subject to the terms and conditions stipulated in the above referred resolution as amended from time to time.

He shall hold office for a term of two years from the date of taking over charge as Chairman, Public Grievances Commission.

(B.V. SELVARAJ)

SECRETARY (ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS)

APPOINTMENT OF WHOLE TIME MEMBER

No.F. 12/2/2001/AR
Dated : 18.9.2001

NOTIFICATION

In pursuance of sub-clause A(i) of clause 2 of Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi Resolution No.F/4/14/94/AR dated 25-09-1997 as amended vide Resolution No.F/4/14/94/AR dated 30-07-1998, the Lt. Governor, National Capital Territory of Delhi is pleased to appoint Shri Gautam Kaul, IPS (Retd.) as Whole-time Member, Public Grievances Commission, Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi. He shall be paid a fixed salary of Rs. 7,500/- (per-revised) per month together with such allowances as admissible from time to time, subject to the terms and conditions stipulated in the above referred Resolutions.

Sh. Gautam Kaul shall hold office for a term of one year from the date of taking over charge as Whole-time Member or till he attains the age of 65 years, whichever is earlier.

(S.K. SRIVASTAVA)

SECRETARY (ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS)

APPOINTMENT OF PART TIME MEMBERS

No. F.12/7/97-AR

Dated: 8.11.2001

NOTIFICATION

No. F.12/7/97-AR :-In pursuance of sub-clause (i) of clause A of paragraph 2 of Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi Resolution No.F.4/14/94-AR dated 25-09-1997 as amended vide Resolution No.F4/14/94-AR dated 30-07-1998, the Lt. Governor, National Capital Territory of Delhi is pleased to appoint Sh. Hari Shanker Gupta and Ms.Anjana Kanwar as a Part-time Member of the Public Grievances Commission for a further period of one year.

Sh. Hari Shanker Gupta and Ms. Anjana Kanwar shall hold the office upto 23-11-2002 and 26-11-2002 respectively.

(S.K. SRIVASTAVA)

SECRETARY (ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS)

MOU BETWEEN PGC AND IC CENTRE
FOR GOVERNANCE

Agreement

THIS AGREEMENT is made on the 30th day of March 2010 between the President of India through PUBLIC GRIEVANCES COMMISSION, M-BLOCK, VIKAS BHAWAN, I.P. ESTATE, NEW DELHI-110110 (hereinafter called PGC which expression shall, unless excluded by or repugnant to the context be deemed to include its successor in office and assigns) of the one part AND IC CENTRE FOR GOVERNANCE, Niryat Bhawan, 3rd Floor, Rao Tula Ram Marg, Opp. Army Hospital (Research & Referral), New Delhi-110057 through Sh. Shanti Narain, Secretary General, ICCfG authorized, representative (herein after called ICCfG) which expression shall, unless excluded on repugnant to the context to include its/their heirs, successors, executors, administrators, representatives and assigns) of the other part under which the ICCfG will provide the study and the report thereon.

NOW THIS AGREEMENT WITNESSETH as follows:-

1. The terms of reference for study on the PGC to be conducted by the ICCfG would be on the following terms of references:-
 - (A) Role of PGC as a Grievances Redressal Mechanism of the Govt. of NCT of Delhi.
 - (i) Average processing time being taken after receipt of incoming complaint/grievance to commence dialogue with the concerned Department vide issue of a Communication (**Annexe-2**), from Public Grievance Commission.
 - (ii) Nature of incoming grievances and break up.
 - (iii) Feed back received from the complainants on (a) level of satisfaction/comfort in having their grievances redressed through the Public Grievances Commission; (b) whether redressal of grievance is within reasonable time; and (c) reasons for delay in the disposal of grievances.

- (iv) Analysis of instances of non-compliance by departments of the GNCT of Delhi, to the directions of PGC during 2008-09. and 2009-2010.
- (v) Systemic changes advised by PGC, and the feed back from the concerned Department.
- (vi) Analysis of recommendations made by the PGC but not complied with the concerned departments.
 - (B) Overall conclusions on the basis of the above.
 - (C) The study is to be completed within three months only.
- 2. The PGC will not be liable for any mishap directly or indirectly on the men/personnel engaged by ICCfG for the study.
- 3. All the consumables and disposals required in the study will be arranged by the ICCfG and whatsoever cost on that account would be all be borne by ICCfG.
- 4. The Secretarial assistant, overhead expenses etc. for the study would be only arranged by ICCfG and the cost thereof also will be borne all themselves i.e. ICCfG.
- 5. Cost of transportation of the field visits required in the study will also be borne by the ICCfG themselves and no arrangement will be made by PGC nor any cost will be borne by PGC.
- 6. The supervision of the men/personnel deployed for the study by ICCfG will also be theirs i.e. ICCfG's.
- 7. The men/personnel deployed have to be courteous in dealing with Staff/Officers and also during their field visits necessitated.
- 8. Necessary Income Tax applicable would be deducted from the amount to be released.
- 9. The fees/compensation for rendering the service of study under the terms of references would be in all for Rs. 4.50 lacs which would be based on deliverables as under:-
 - (i) Rs. 2.00 lacs (Rupees Two lacs Only) in advance, given as mobilization.
 - (ii) Rs. 1.50 lacs (Rupees One lac and Fifty Thousand Only) on submitting the report and conclusion of a deliberation/discussion between the parties i.e. PGC and ICCfG.
 - (iii) Rs. 1.00 lac (Rupees One lac Only) on final submission of the report.

10. The final report will have to be submitted by ICCfG within six months from the release of advance, given as mobilization.
11. A performance Security of Rs. 22,500/- (Rupees Twenty Two Thousand and Five Hundred Only) i.e. 5% of the total fee/compensation of Rs.4.50 lacs shall have to be furnished by the ICCFG, in the form of an Account Payee Demand Draft, FDR from a commercial Bank, Bank Guarantee from a Commercial Bank in an acceptable form in favour of PAO-X. GNCT of Delhi.
12. The performance Security should remain valid for a period of sixty days beyond the date of completion of all contractual obligations of ICCfG.
13. Any dispute and or difference arising out of or relating to this study will be resolved through joint discussion of the authorities' representatives of the concerned parties. However, if the disputes are not resolved by joint discussions, then the matter will be referred for adjudication to a sole Arbitrator appointed by the Principal Secretary/Secretary (of the Administrative Department) GNCT of Delhi and his award shall be final and binding on all the parties. Arbitration proceedings will be held at Delhi/New Delhi only and the cost of arbitration shall be borne by the respective parties in equal proportions.

In witness whereof the parties hereto have signed the agreement the day and the year first above written

Sd/- Shanti Narain

Name of the officer with
Stamp/Seal of the ICCfG
By the said
Sh. Shanti Narain, Secretary
General on behalf of the ICCfG

Name of the officer
Stamp/Seal of the PGC
By the said
Sh. G.C. Joshi, Secretary,
on behalf of the PGC

in the presence of :

S C Tyagi
Dr. Seey
PGC

in the presence of :

Xavier Anthony
AAO, PGC

Annexure III

LIST OF CASES STUDIED BY IC CENTRE FOR GOVERNANCE PROJECT TEAM

S. NO.		CASE NUMBER	DEPARTMENT	COMPLAINANT
1.	1	PGC/08/PWD/MFT/32	PWD	Dr. Ashok Jaiswal
2.	2	PGC/08/PWD/31/MFT	PWD	Rajeev Singh (CADAM)
3.	3	PGC/08/PWD/23	PWD	Kishan Prasad
4.	4	PGC/08/PWD/24	PWD	Pravir Chitre
5.	5	PGC/08/PWD/22	PWD	Virender Chandhok
6.	6	PGC/08/MCD/Central/942/26/PWD	PWD	M Madhavan
7.	7	PGC/08/PWD/MFT/28	PWD	Deepak Rawat
8.	8	PGC/09/UD/03	UD	Dr. Sudha Rai & R Rangarajan
9.	9	PGC/09/UD/02	UD	R Rangarajan
10.	10	PGC/08/TPT/21	TPT	Sukhwinder Singh Joda
11.	11	PGC/08/ATR/MFT	Transport	Md. Ghayur Alam Zahiri
12.	12	PGC/08/ATR/MFT/15/06-09	Transport	Sairan Gupta
13.	13	PGC/MFT/24/DTC/25012-015		S N Sharma
14.	14	PGC/08/CEO/06	Chief Electoral Officer	Gopinath
15.	15	PGC/10/EMP/103	Employment	Bharti Sharma
16.	16	PGC/May/08/070/46/DSW/3548	DSW	Smt Indu Bhatnagar
17.	17	PGC/08/Ind/15	Industry	M/s Prakash Industries
18.	18	PGC/08/PFA/01/MFT/15539-41	PFA	Raj Kumar
19.	19	PGC/DEC/08/070/55/DSW	DSW	S P Singh
20.	20	PGC/Apr/08/070/044/DSW	DSW	Smt Indramani Gupta
21.	22	PGC/08/NDMC/08	NDMC	Jai Vir Singh
22.	23	PGC/NDMC/09/08	NDMC	Vinod Kumar Gupta

S. NO.		CASE NUMBER	DEPARTMENT	COMPLAINANT
23.	24	PGC/Ind/19/08	Industries	Vinod Verma
24.	25	PGC/Sep/08/003/13/TTE	Training & Tech. Edn.	J. S. Bhatnagar
25.	26	PGC/Dec/08/070/56/DSW	DSW	M S Gupta
26.	27	PGC/Dec/Ind/21/08	Industries	Hazoor Sahib Chemicals Pvt. Ltd.
27.	28	PGC/08/MCD/South/1090	MCD	R. Sethuraman
28.	29	PGC/08/MCD/West/1015	MCD	Sr. Citizen Forum B F 6 to B K 15 Block Janakpuri, ND-58
29.	30	PGC/08/MCD/West/1103	MCD	Ashok Jain
30.	31	PGC/08/MCD/Sh(N)/993	MCD	Fazale Elahi
31.	32	PGC/08/MCD/Sh. (N)/935	MCD	M L Rahi
32.	33	PGC/08/MCD/Sh. (N)/1003	MCD	C B Sharma
33.	34	PGC/08/MCD/Work/958	MCD	Kuldeep Singh
34.	35	PGC/2008/MCD/NGZ/1066 [PGC/2008/DJB/217]	MCD	P S Rawat
35.	37	PGC/08/DJB/209	DJB	Amar Jha
36.	38	PGC/08/DJB/208	DJB	Budh Ram
37.	39	PGC/08/DJB/ 182	DJB	Col. T.R. Bhatia
38.	41	PGC/2008/DJB/154	DJB	Raj Kumar
39.	42	PGC/08/DJB/229/MFT	DJB	Girwar Singh
40.	43	PGC/08/DJB/204	DJB	R.N. Dhawan
41.	44	PGC/2008/DJB/168	DJB	Ms. Romela Dhawan
42.	45	PGC/08/DJB/221	DJB	Yash Pal Sehgal
43.	46	F.PGC/08/DJB/273	DJB	Saleem Khan
44.	47	PGC/08/DJB/241	DJB	Ms. Shipra Rastogi
45.	48	PGC/08/DJB/212	DJB	Gen Secy RWA Wazirabad
46.	49	PGC/08/DJB/25	DJB	Vipin Malik
47.	50	PGC/08/DJB/250	DJB	Ram Das Pushkar
48.	51	PGC/08/DJB/MFT/248	DJB	Vijay Kumar Gupta
49.	52	PGC/08/DJB/249	DJB	R N Tiwari
50.	53	PGC/08/DJB/263/MFT	DJB	V K Singh
51.	54	PGC/08/DJB/214	DJB	Asif Ali Khan
52.	55	PGC/08/DJB/176	DJB	B P Thakur
53.	56	PGC/08/DJB/171	DJB	S S Talwar
54.	57	PGC/08/DJB/201	DJB	Smt Chanderwati

S. NO.		CASE NUMBER	DEPARTMENT	COMPLAINANT
55.	58	PGC/09/DJB/322	DJB	Ajay Kumar
56.	59	PGC/09/DJB/325	DJB	Veebhan Singh
57.	60	PGC/09/DJB/324	DJB	Sarwan Singh
58.	61	PGC/09/DJB/326	DJB	Onkar Dixit
59.	62	PGC/09/DJB/327	DJB	Jagdish Ambedkar
60.	63	PGC/2009/DJB/329	DJB	Abhishek Chaurasia
61.	64	PGC/09/DJB/330	DJB	Laxman Dass
62.	65	PGC/09/DJB/331	DJB	Aman Sunder
63.	66	PGC/09/DJB/332	DJB	Tejwant Singh
64.	67	PGC/09/DJB/333	DJB	S.C. Agarwal
65.	68	PGC/09/DJB/334	DJB	Col. T.R. Bhatia
66.	69	PGC/09/DJB/337	DJB	Dayanand
67.	70	PGC/09/DJB/340	DJB	Naveen Chandra Pandey
68.	71	PGC/09/DJB/341	DJB	Manish Kumar
69.	72	PGC/09/DJB/302	DJB	SS Mudgal and Bharat Rathi
70.	73	PGC/09/DJB/342	DJB	Ram Avtar Aggarwal
71.	74	PGC/09/DJB/292	DJB	Raman Gupta
72.	75	PGC/2009/030/503	DJB	Arjun Arora
73.	76	PGC/2009/Grievance No./ DJB/293	DJB	Sanjeev Jindal
74.	77	F.PGC/09/DJB/289	DJB	Madhu Mohan
75.	78	PGC/09/DJB/288	DJB	B R Khurana
76.	79	F.PGC/09/DJB/286	DJB	Raghubir Singh
77.	80	F.PGC/09/DJB/320	DJB	Ambassador V B Soni
78.	81	PGC/09/Grievance No./ DJB/315	DJB	Sh. Prem Raj
79.	82	PGC/09/DJB/319	DJB	Prasenjit Roy
80.	83	F.PGC/09/DJB/312	DJB	M. R. Sharma
81.	84	F.PGC/09/DJB/311	DJB	SK Bose
82.	85	PGC/08/DP/23	DP	Sh Vishnu
83.	86	PGC/08/DP/241	DP	Vijay Kumar
84.	87	PGC/08/235/DP	DP	Nirmala Sharma
85.	88	PGC/08/238/DP	DP	Sudhir/Samir
86.	89	PGC/2008/233/DP	DP	Bhawna Chaudhry
87.	90	PGC/08/DP/236	DP	Shikha Gulati

S. NO.		CASE NUMBER	DEPARTMENT	COMPLAINANT
88.	91	PGC/08/237/DP	DP	Smt Vidya Devi
89.	92	PGC/08/DP/258	DP	Mrs. Meenu Verma
90.	93	PGC/08/DP/260	DP	Sanjeev Bhola
91.	94	PGC/08/DP/214	DP	Monica Sherawat
92.	95	PGC/08/231/DP	DP	Siraj Khan
93.	96	PGC/2009/DP/87	DP	Bhagat Singh
94.	97	PGC/09/DP/34	DP	Pawan Verma
95.	98	PGC/2009/DP/36	DP	Smt. Santosh w/ Late Sh. Tilak Raj Tuli
96.	99	PGC/09/DP/38	DP	Shanti
97.	100	F.PGC/09/DP/39	DP	Jamshed Khan
98.	101	PGC/2009/DP/40	DP	Sh Ram Khilasi
99.	102	PGC/09/DP/44	DP	Mohd. Yusuf
100.	103	PGC/2009/DP/41	DP	R P Jain
101.	104	PGC/09/DP/15	DP	Rakesh Grover
102.	105	PGC/2009/DP/46	DP	Desh Raj Jain
103.	106	PGC/09/DP/47	DP	Ramesh Pathak
104.	107	PGC/09/DP/48	DP	Narender
105.	108	PGC/09/DP/49	DP	Shri Krishna
106.	109	PGC/09/DP/138	DP	Amit Aggarwal
107.	110	F.PGC/09/DP/86	DP	Sunil Gaba
108.	111	PGC/2009/DP/85	DP	Nirmala
109.	112	PGC/09/DP/88	DP	Bhuvan Chand Kohli
110.	113	PGC/2009/89	DP	Kalyan Khasi? S/o Ramesh
111.	114	PGC/09/DP/91	DP	Praveen Kumar
112.	115	F.PGC/09/DP/92	DP	Mohd. Khaleel
113.	116	PGC/09/DP/97	DP	Suman
114.	117	PGC/09/DP & UD/95	DP	Kamlesh
115.	118	PGC/09/DP/94	DP	Poonam Tomar
116.	119	PGC/09/DP & UD/28	DP	Niranjan Singh
117.	120	PGC/09/DP &UD/25	DP	Suresh Chand Sharma
118.	121	PGC/09/DP/31/FTH	DP	Ms. Usha Anand
119.	122	PGC/09/DP/24	DP	Bharat Mitter
120.	123	PGC/09/DP/32	DP	Shishir Kumar
121.	124	PGC/09/DP/33	DP	Sushil Kumar

S. NO.	CASE NUMBER	DEPARTMENT	COMPLAINANT	
122.	125	PGC/09/DP/96	DP	Amit Aggarwal
123.	126	PGC/09/DP/97	DP	Smt. Suman Chaudhary
124.	127	PGC/09/DP & UD/95	DP	Kamlesh
125.	128	PGC/09/DP/112	DP	Pawan Kumar
126.	129	PGC/09/DP/110	DP	Mukesh Kumar
127.	130	PGC/09/DP/109	DP	T. Bansal
128.	131	PGC/09/DP/106	DP	Rajesh Kumar
129.	132	PGC/09/DP/105	DP	V K Bhardwaj
130.	133	PGC/09/DP/103	DP	Madan Singh
131.	134	PGC/2009/DP/102	DP	Rehman Khan + 8 Hawkers
132.	135	PGC/09/DP & UD/101	DP	Lalit
133.	136	PGC/09/DP/FTH/100	DP	Mohan Lal
134.	137	PGC/2009/DP/93	DP	M K Sharma
135.	138	PGC/08/043/202/Edn	Education	Pravata Kumar Sahoo
136.	139	PGC/Dec/08/043/285/Edn	Education	Mrs. Nirmal Bhatia
137.	140	PGC/July/08/043/250/Edn	Education	Usha Aggrawal
138.	141	PGC/08/043/216/Edn	Education	Azad Singh
139.	142	PGC/08/193/EDN	Education	D V Singh
140.	143	PGC/June/08/043/242/Edn	Education	Geeta Singh
141.	144	PGC/May/08/043/240/Edn	Education	Harsh Vardhan
142.	145	PGC/July/08/043/248/Edn	Education	J P Bhatnagar
143.	146	PGC/July08/043/249/Edu	Education	Bhupinder Singh
144.	147	PGC/Jan/09/043/288/Edn	Education	Ram Niwas
145.	148	PGC/09/Edn/345	Education	Ram Avtar Singh
146.	149	PGC/2009/Edn/376	Education	M.S. Anand
147.	150	PGC/09/Edn/379	Education	Smt. Usha Devi
148.	151	PGC/09/Edn/399	Education	Shiv Kumar Trivedi
149.	152	PGC/09/Edn/559	Education	Ms. Anuradha Dabas
150.	153	PGC/09/Edn/348	Education	Sh. KK Sarthi
151.	154	PGC/09/Edn/309	Education	Ms. Saroj Garg
152.	155	PGC/09/Edn/372	Education	Desh Raj
153.	156	PGC/10/EDU/414	Education	Ms. Rekha Sharma
154.	157	PGC/10/Edn/428	Education	Sh. Joginder Singh
155.	158	PGC/Jan/Edn/09/293	Education	Dinesh Sharma

S. NO.		CASE NUMBER	DEPARTMENT	COMPLAINANT
156.	159	PGC/09/Edn/357	Education	Ram Narain Singh
157.	160	PGC/09/Edn/301	Education	Mrs. Mahavati
158.	163	PGC/09/Edn/367	Education	S K Bindal
159.	164	PGC/2009/043/260	Education	Tek Ram Dahiya
160.	165	PGC/09/Education/360	Education	Kirpal Singh
161.	166	PGC/09/Edn/321	Education	Ashok Gupta
162.	167	PGC/09/Edn/351	Education	Tilak Ram Sharma
163.	168	PGC/09/F&S/156	F&S	Sh Dev Raj Singh
164.	169	PGC/09/F&S/137	F&S	R. K. Gupta
165.	170	PGC/09/F&S/126	F&S	Bharat Pathak
166.	171	PGC/09/F&S/216	F&S	Madan Sharma
167.	172	PGC/2009/F&S/214	F&S	Ms. Charan Kaur (son Hardev Singh)
168.	173	PGC/09/F&S/212	F&S	Manuj Kumar
169.	174	PGC/09/F&S/210	F&S	Shabir Ahmed
170.	175	PGC/2009/F&S/208	F&S	Chaman Lal
171.	176	PGC/09/F&S/203	F&S	Zaheer Ahmed
172.	177	PGC/09/F&S/201	F&S	Ms. Abida Begum
173.	178	PGC/09/F&S/200	F&S	Sayid Ahmad
174.	179	PGC/2009/F&S/186	F&S	Sanjay Kumar
175.	180	PGC/09/F&S/102	F&S	Girji Devi
176.	181	PGC/09/F&S/173	F&S	Sh. Harish Kumar
177.	182	PGC/09/F&S/174A	F&S	Sh. Rajendra Kumar Tewari
178.	183	PGC/09/F&S/174	F&S	Sh Phool Chand
179.	184	PGC/09/F&S/175A	F&S	Umar Khan & Irshad
180.	185	PGC/09/F&S/175	F&S	Jagdish Prasad
181.	186	PGC/09/F&S/161	F&S	Ms. Sunder Kaur Chadha
182.	187	PGC/F&S/2010/9(A II)	F&S	Ms. Bhagwan Devi
183.	188	PGC/2010/F&S/01	F&S	Sh. Munshi Ram Maurya
184.	189	PGC/2010/F&S/02	F&S	Shyam Lal
185.	190	PGC/2010/F&S/03	F&S	Ms. Nirmala Sharma
186.	191	PGC/2010/F&S/04	F&S	Virander Singh
187.	192	PGC/2010/F&S/10	F&S	Ravinder Nath
188.	193	PGC/09/F&S/179	F&S	Phool Chand
189.	194	PGC/09/F&S/178	F&S	Fateh Bahadur and Manish Sharma

S. NO.	CASE NUMBER	DEPARTMENT	COMPLAINANT	
190.	195	PGC/09/F&S/177	F&S	Sh. Maan Singh
191.	196	PGC/09/F&S/180	F&S	Mohd. Fazal
192.	197	F.PGC/09/F&S/163	F&S	Naimunisha w/f Taj Mohmd.
193.	198	PGC/09/F&S/164	F&S	Shish Ram and Others thru Vishwas Bhajan
194.	199	PGC/09/F&S/166	F&S	Ram Dhani
195.	200	PGC/09/F&S/167	F&S	Ramesh Chand
196.	201	PGC/09/F&S/168	F&S	Smt. Longshree
197.	202	PGC/09/F&S/169	F&S	Bhola Prasad
198.	203	PGC/09/F&S/171	F&S	Dharamveer
199.	204	PGC/09/F&S/172	F&S	Guddi
200.	205	PGC/09/F&S/170	F&S	Md. Ifran
201.	206	PGC/2008/MCD/WEST/1021/7/9?	MCD	Sukhvinder Singh Jauda
202.	207	PGC/2008/MCD/CLZ/1152	MCD	Praveen Sahni
203.	208	PGC/2008/MCD/CLZ/876	MCD	Ms. Angoori Devi
204.	209	PGC/2008/MCD/West/980	MCD	J S Sabbarwal
205.	210	PGC/2008/MCD/Central/1124	MCD	1. Sh.L.K.Jain, 2.Sh. Ravi Menon
206.	211	PGC/2008/MCD/HQ/1068	MCD	1. Ram Niwas 2. Krishna Chand Dutt
207.	212	PGC/2008/MCD/Central/917	MCD	RWA/Kotla Mubarakpur, ND-3
208.	213	PGC/2008/MCD/CLZ/955	MCD	PGC (suo moto)
209.	214	PGC/2008/MCD/SH(S)/907	MCD	Manish Bharadwaj
210.	215	PGC/2008/MCD/Sh.N/891	MCD	R N Anand
211.	216	PGC/08/MCD/S&JJ/1144	MCD	Smt Dayawati, Vidyawati,& Sh Umesh Sharma
212.	217	PGC/08/MCD/South/1126	MCD	Dr. R K Sachdev
213.	218	PGC/08/MCD/Sh.N/1102	MCD	Neha Jain
214.	219	PGC/08/MCD/South/1038	MCD	Ram Kumar Tokas
215.	220	PGC/08/MCD/West/1081	MCD	O P Baweja
216.	221	PGC/08/MCD/West/984	MCD	Naresh Kumar and Others
217.	222	PGC/08/MCD/South/1026	MCD	M L Ailawadhi/Mrs. Savtantra Ailawadhi

S. NO.		CASE NUMBER	DEPARTMENT	COMPLAINANT
218.	223	PGC/08/MCD/South/949	MCD	Bhagat Ram
219.	224	PGC/MCD/2010/NZ/1509	MCD	Om Singh Kataria
220.	225	PGC/MCD/09/WZ/1548	MCD	Surendra Singh
221.	226	PGC/2010/MCD/ HEALTH/1711	MCD	Mrs. U. G Gupta
222.	227	PGC/2009/MCD/West/1545	MCD	Gulshan Rai
223.	228	PGC/09/MCD/1550	MCD	Anonymous
224.	229	PGC/2010/MCD/City Z/1604	MCD	Niranjn Pujari
225.	230	PGC/09/MCD/1608	MCD	S S Chaddha
226.	231	PGC/MCD/2009/City Z/1385	MCD	Hamir Singh Raghuvanshi
227.	232	PGC/09/MCD/1437	MCD	Devi Sahai
228.	233	PGC/09/MCD/1420	MCD	A K Bhargave
229.	234	PGC/09/MCD/RZ1582	MCD	Ms. Kanta Verma
230.	235	PGC/2009/MCD/CLZ/1338	MCD	Sh. Manoj Kumar
231.	236	PGC/2009/MCD/SZ/1387	MCD	Suneeta
232.	237	PGC/2009/MCD/KBZ/1607	MCD	Sh. Jai Kishore
233.	238	PGC/2009/MCD/SPZ/1606	MCD	Sh Om Prakash
234.	239	PGC/2009/MCD/1566	MCD	Sh. Sanjeev Sikka
235.	240	PGC/MCD/2010/WZ/1609	MCD	Sh. D Kumar and Others
236.	241	PGC/2009/MCD/CZ/1556	MCD	Sh Sunil and Others
237.	242	PGC/09/MCD/SH(S)/1284	MCD	J.P. Gupta
238.	243	PGC/MCD/Amal Samachar /2009/1270	MCD	Editor, Amal Samachar
239.	244	PGC/09/MCD/SH(S)/1253	MCD	Rajesh Singh Rathore
240.	245	PGC/2009/MCD/KBZ/1217	MCD	Mukesh
241.	246	PGC/09/NGZ/1220	MCD	Arvinder Singh Chhatwal
242.	247	PGC/2009/MCD/CZ/1215	MCD	Ram Shanker Patel
243.	248	PGC/09/MCD/Central Zone/1231	MCD	Ram Shanker Patel
244.	249	PGC/09/MCD/Central Zone/1232	MCD	Anand Raj
245.	250	PGC/09/MCD/KBZ/1233	MCD	A.S. Chauhan
246.	251	PGC/09/MCD/NGZ/1240	MCD	Dr. Farhat Azeem Kamal
247.	252	PGC/09/MCD/CZ/1241	MCD	Bhushan Singh

S. NO.	CASE NUMBER	DEPARTMENT	COMPLAINANT	
248.	253	PGC/2009/MCD/NGZ/1248	MCD	Ajay Alberto
249.	254	PGC/09/MCD/NGZ/1249	MCD	Ramesh Babber
250.	255	PGC/09/MCD/CZ/1245	MCD	Tanveer Alam
251.	256	PGC/09/MCD/Sh(S)/1251	MCD	Vicky Sharma
252.	257	PGC/09/MCD/1479	MCD	Vijay Kumar Bansal
253.	258	PGC/09/MCD/SZ/1610	MCD	Hari Kumar Sharma
254.	259	PGC/09/MCD/SPZ/1344	MCD	Ramesh Kumar
255.	260	PGC/09/MCD/SZ/16	MCD	Laxman Das
256.	261	PGC/2009/MCD/SZ/1334	MCD	Payush Pandey (Pseudonym)
257.	262	PGC/2010/MCD/RZ/1682	MCD	Residents of Block E-1 Rohini, RWA E Block
258.	263	PGC/2009/MCD/RZ/1443	MCD	A K Chadha
259.	264	PGC/2009/MCD/SZ/1546	MCD	Residents of Durga Vihar, B-133 to B-146, ND-62
260.	265	11324120801306+B275	MCD	Arun Rai
261.	266	PGC/2009	MCD	Mangal Singh
262.	267	PGC/1185	MCD	Rajeev Goyal (R K Builders)
263.	268	PGC/2009/112/39	MCD	Vatsala Majestic Main Bus Stop
264.	269	PGC/1199	MCD	Harsh Kumar N?
265.	270	PGC/09/MCD/SZ/1184	MCD	Ms. Savita
266.	271	PGC/2008/POWER/33	Power	Har Preet Singh
267.	272	PGC/2008/POWER/25	Power	B.D. Dwivedi
268.	273	PGC/2008/POWER/37	Power	Smt. Anara Devi
269.	277	PGC/08/RCS/121	RCS	GGK Nair and Renuka Nair
270.	278	PGC/2008/RCS/123	RCS	M L Tuteja
271.	280	PGC/RCS/08/1181	RCS	Dr. Kavita Chowdhry
272.	281	PGC/2009/RCS/11	RCS	Sanjay Chirpal
273.	282	PGC/09/RCS/12	RCS	Rajinder Singh
274.	283	PGC/2010/RCS/A II-02	RCS	SC Sharma
275.	284	PGC/2009/RCS/111	RCS	Suman
276.	285	PGC/2009/RCS/133	RCS	Santosh(AQC)
277.	286	PGC/09/RCS/163	RCS	Mrs. Vinod Chauhan

S. NO.	CASE NUMBER	DEPARTMENT	COMPLAINANT	
278.	287	PGC/09/RCS/09	RCS	Prem Nath Nag
279.	288	PGC/2009/DC/South/297	Revenue	Sh. Laxmi Chand
280.	289	PGC/2009/DC/NW/299	Revenue	Sh Ram Bai
281.	290	PGC/2009/DC/SW/300/ 19217-223	Revenue Singh	Sh Ranbir s/o Suba
282.	291	?	Revenue	Pankaj Singh s/o Sh. M S Tomar
283.	292	PGC/2009/DC/SW/302	Revenue	Sh Raju Verma
284.	293	PGC/2009/DC/EAST/REV /304/21758-764	Revenue	Mrs. Balbir Kaur w/o Sh Balwant Singh
285.	294	PGC/2009/DC/NW/REV/303	Revenue	Sh Yudhvir Singh Dabas
286.	295	PGC/2009/DC/South/Rev/ 289/9222-28	Revenue	Ms. Sunita Rawat
287.	296	PGC/2009/DC/NW/290	Revenue	Sh. Ram Chander
288.	297	PGC/2009/DC/NW/291	Revenue	Sh Ishwar Singh Saini?
289.	298	PGC/2009/DC/W/293(?)/ 3411-16	Revenue	Sh. Ram Kumar Gupta Karta Ram Kumar Gupta (HUF)
290.	299	PGC/2009/DC/South/294	Revenue	Mahesh Chand Sharma
291.	300	PGC/2009/DC/NW/295/ 14457-461	Revenue	Sh. Rajpal
292.	301	PGC/2009/DC/South/296/ 14822-14828	Revenue	Munim Tanwar
293.	302	PGC/09/Rev/DC/NW/279	Revenue	Chandrakant Gaur
294.	303	PGC/Rev/09/DC/NW/275	Revenue	Sh. Karamvir Singh
295.	304	PGC/09/DC/N/284	Revenue	Sh. Kedar Singh and Others
296.	305	PGC/09/Rev/DC/S/282	Revenue	Shambhu Yadav
297.	306	PGC/Rev/09/DC/NW/278	Revenue	Sawjeet? Singh
298.	307	PGC/09/Rev/South/280	Revenue	Keshava Giri
299.	308	PGC/Rev/09/DC/NW/276	Revenue	K S Rano?
300.	309	PGC/09/DC/West/Rev/285	Revenue	Ajay Goel
301.	310	PGC/09/DP/108	DP	RWA Block 33. Shakti Nagar, Delhi-07
302.	311	PGCF4/14/94-AR	Power	Ms. Arti Choudhry

S. NO.	CASE NUMBER	DEPARTMENT	COMPLAINANT	
303.	312	PGC/2009/MCD/SH(S)1369	MCD	Smt. Manjit Kaur Sarna
304.	313	PGC/08/Nov/210/Rev	Revenue	Smt. Krishna Rani
305.	314	PGC/2008/Health/29	Health & Family Welfare	Moti Chand Verma
306.	315	PGC/2008/DC West/203/REV	Revenue	R. Sharma & R. Makkar
307.	316	PGC/08/DJB/160	DJB & MCD	Col. Jasbir Singh
308.	317	F.PGC/08/138/F&S/MFT	F&S	Mr. R. P. Rohilla
309.	318	PGC/2008/DP/275	DP	Ms. Seema Rani
310.	319	F.PGC/08/F&S/132	F&S	Mr. Bhagwat
311.	320	F.PGC/08/129/F&S	F&S, Power	Mr. Bhram Prakash
312.	321	PGC/2008/South/202/Rev	DP	Shri Avtar Singh
313.	322	F.4/14/94-AR	Revenu and DDA	Mr. R. Kumar
314.	323	PGC/09/MCD/FTH/1484	MCD/PWD/DJB	PGC (suo moto)
315.	324	PGC/2008/DP/282	DP	Mrs. Raj Kumari Devi
316.	325	PGC/08/DP/227	DP	Anoop Sagar
317.	326	PGC/2008/SW/208/Rev	Revenue	Pratap Singh Solanki
318.	327	PGC/08/NE/211/Rev	Revenue	PGC-Newspaper clipping-suo moto
319.	328	PGC/08/Revenue/DC/SW/212		R. Kumar
320.	329	PGC/09/7/8/MCD	Health	Puneet Rawat & Sumati Rawat
321.	330	PGC/08/213/West/Rev	Revenue	Harbans Singh
322.	331	PGC/09/Dev/07	Development	Dr. K.L. Khurana
323.	332	PGC/09/GGSIP/02	Education	H. K. Bansal
324.	333	PGC/2009/I&FC/15	Irrigation	Amal Samachar (newspaper)
325.	334	PGC/09/DCE/06	DCE	Ram Gyan
326.	335	DWB/04	DWB	Shaukat Ali
327.	336	PGC/08/32366-369	NDMC	G. R. Arora
328.	337	PGC/2008/DTC/22	DTC	B. S. Talwar
329.	338	PGC/08/DTC/231		Dharambeer Sharma
330.	339	PGC/2008/DP/265	DP	Ms. Joginder Kaur Bhatia

S. NO.		CASE NUMBER	DEPARTMENT	COMPLAINANT
331.	340	PGC/2008/DP/261	DP	Anoop Sagar
332.	341	PGC/2008/DP/220	DP	J. S. Sharma
333.	342	PGC/2008/DP/239	DP	Syed Zia Abbas
334.	343	PGC/08/NW/214/Rev	Revenue	Shri Balraj Singh
335.	344	PGC/08/NW/206/Rev	Revenue	Shri Kedar Nath Jha
336.	345	PGC/2008/DCWest/203	Revenue	Rajan Makkar & Ramesh Sharma
337.	346	PGC/2008/South/205/Revenue	Revenue	Ms. Kesari
338.	347	PGC/08/East/204/Rev	Revenue	Mrs. Mahinder Kaur
339.	348	PGC/08/South/243/Rev	Revenue	Ram Avtar Singh Yadav
340.	349	PGC/08/SW/244/Rev	Revenue	Ramjan(?) Rahim
341.	350	PGC/2008/DP/219	DP	Sh. Prem Prakash
342.	351	PGC/2008/DP/228	DP	Dharendra Kumar
343.	352	PGC/08/DJB/205	DJB	Sh. M. L. Goyal
344.	353	PGC/2008/IND/18	Industries	Ms. Simran Gupta
345.	354	PGC/DEC/08/070/57/DSW	DSW	Ms. Ram Devi
346.	355	PGC/Jan/09/West/Rev./246	Revenue	Vijay Kumar
347.	356	PGC/08/NE/245/Rev/18435	Revenue	Rameshwar Sharma
348.	357	?	Revenue	Sh. Satpal
349.	358	PGC/08/NW/241/Rev/15818	Revenue	Ms. Simran Gupta
350.	359	PGC/08/NW/201/Rev/24613	Revenue	R. K. Kadian
351.	360	PGC/2008/MCD/West/1131/16430-31	MCD	N. K. Khurana
352.	361	PGC/2008/MCD/NGZ/1121/15521-24	Revenue	MS. Romi Mago
353.	362	PGC/2008/DP/232/6022	Traffic Police	Kunal Bharadwaj
354.	363	PGC/08/DP/212	DP	Chintamani
355.	365	PGC/2008/Rev/North/200/24317	Revenue	Mohd. Mukim
356.	366	PGC/2008/South/202/Rev/24614	Revenue	Sardar Avtar Singh
357.	367	PGC/08/DP/223	DP	Yash Pal Chadha
358.	368	PGC/2008/MCD/Sh(S)/1077	MCD	J. C. Moona
359.	369	PGC/2008/MCD/South/1065	MCD	Narendra Sharma
360.	370	PGC/2008/MCD/Sh(S)/1093	MCD	S. N. Bhargava
361.	371	PGC/2008/MCD/NGZ/1050	MCD	Dalip Singh Yadav
362.	372	PGC/2008/MCD/West/915	MCD	J. C. Sharma

S. NO.		CASE NUMBER	DEPARTMENT	COMPLAINANT
363.	373	PGC/2008/MCD/HQ/1120	MCD	Vijay Shankar Nagar
364.	374	PGC/2008/MCD/HQ/1006	MCD	Rameshwar Kumar
365.	375	PGC/2008/MCD/HQ/1156	MCD	Urmila Devi
366.	376	PGC/2008/MCD/Sh(N)/1049	MCD	Shri Bhagwan
367.	377	PGC/Jan/09/EDN./345	Education	Keshab Chandra Dey
368.	378	PGC/Dec/08/043/281/Edn.	Education	Mohd. Sibte Hasan
369.	379	PGC/08/MCD/900	MCD	Raghubar Dayal
370.	380	PGC/2008/MCD/Sh(N)/937	MCD	Mohd. Ahsan
371.	381	F.PGC/2008/MCD/SPZ/1150	MCD	Khem Chand
372.	382	PGC/2008/MCD/Sh(S)/867	MCD	Vipin Jain
373.	383	PGC/2008/DP/270	DP	Beena Tyagi
374.	384	PGC/08/DP/263	DP	Ranbir Singh
375.	385	PGC/2008/DP/283	DP	Kamla Devi
376.	386	PGC/2008/DP/268	DP	Meenakshi
377.	387	PGC/2008/DP/248	DP	Anup Sagar
378.	388	PGC/2008/DP/257	DP	Jagdish Prasad Gupta
379.	389	PGC/2008/DP/224	DP	M. M. Sharma
380.	390	PGC/2008/DP/264	DP	Indu Kumaro
381.	391	PGC/2008/DP/243	DP	Vidhyadhar Shukla
382.	392	PGC/2008/DP/271	DP	Vijay Kumar
383.	394	PGC/2008/DJB/146	DJB	Anirudha Kumar Sharma
384.	395	PGC/08/DJB/219	DJB	R K Bhalla
385.	396	PGC/08/DJB/242	DJB	Brjesh Kumar Chauhan
386.	397	PGC/08/DJB/246	DJB	G M Mittal rep by K Chand
387.	398	PGC/2009/DC/South/283	Revenue	Ram Chand Gupta
388.	399	PGC/2008/MCD/RZ/1010	MCD	Dr. A.V.S. Gupta
389.	400	PGC/DEC/08/070/58/DSW	DSW	Dr. K. K. Sharma
390.	401	PGC/2008/MCD/Civil Lines/1098	MCD	V. C. Pandey
391.	402	PGC/08/DP/25623161-165	DP	Jasso Devi
392.	403	PGC/08/DP/266	DP	Rami Devi
393.	405	PGC/2008/DP/278	DP	Leela Singh
394.	406	F.PGC/2008/DP/277	DP	Sheikh Nishan
395.	407	PGC/09/MCD/19013-14	MCD	Ashok

S. NO.		CASE NUMBER	DEPARTMENT	COMPLAINANT
396.	408	PGC/2008/MCD/South/1073	MCD	H C Suman
397.	409	PGC/2008/MCD/South/1058	MCD	Hemant Kumar
398.	410	PGC/2009/MCD/19679	MCD	Veena Gupta
399.	411	PGC/09/July/10778-31	MCD	Sumit Rawat and Puneet Rawat

Annexure IV

LIST OF CASES IN WHICH COMPLAINANTS INTERVIEWED IN SOCIAL AUDIT

S. No.	S. No. From Annexure -3	DEPARTMENT	COMPLAINANT
1.	2	PWD	Rajeev Singh (CADAM)
2.	5	PWD	Virender Chandhok
3.	6	PWD	M Madhavan
4.	7	PWD	Deepak Rawat
5.	11	Transport	Md. Ghayur Alam Zahiri
6.	12	Transport	Sairan Gupta
7.	13		S N Sharma
8.	15	Employment	Bharti Sharma
9.	16	DSW	Smt Indu Bhatnagar
10.	17	Industry	M/s Prakash Industries
11.	20	DSW	Smt Indramani Gupta
12.	22	NDMC	Jai Vir Singh
13.	23	NDMC	Vinod Kumar Gupta
14.	25	Training & Tech. Edn.	J. S. Bhatnagar
15.	28	MCD	R. Sethuraman
16.	30	MCD	Ashok Jain
17.	31	MCD	Fazale Elahi
18.	32	MCD	M L Rahi
19.	33	MCD	C B Sharma
20.	35	MCD	P S Rawat
21.	37	DJB	Amar Jha
22.	42	DJB	Girwar Singh
23.	43	DJB	R.N. Dhawan
24.	44	DJB	Ms. Romela Dhawan
25.	45	DJB	Yash Pal Sehgal
26.	46	DJB	Saleem Khan
27.	50	DJB	Ram Das Pushkar
28.	51	DJB	Vijay Kumar Gupta
29.	52	DJB	R N Tiwari

S. No.	S. No. From Annexure -3	DEPARTMENT	COMPLAINANT
30.	54	DJB	Asif Ali Khan
31.	55	DJB	B P Thakur
32.	56	DJB	S S Talwar
33.	57	DJB	Smt Chanderwati
34.	58	DJB	Ajay Kumar
35.	60	DJB	Sarwan Singh
36.	61	DJB	Onkar Dixit
37.	62	DJB	Jagdish Ambedkar
38.	63	DJB	Abhishek Chaurasia
39.	64	DJB	Laxman Dass
40.	65	DJB	Aman Sunder
41.	66	DJB	Tejwant Singh
42.	67	DJB	S.C. Agarwal
43.	71	DJB	Manish Kumar
44.	74	DJB	Raman Gupta
45.	75	DJB	Arjun Arora
46.	77	DJB	Madhu Mohan
47.	78	DJB	B R Khurana
48.	80	DJB	Ambassador V B Soni
49.	82	DJB	Prasenjit Roy
50.	83	DJB	M. R. Sharma
51.	84	DJB	SK Bose
52.	85	DP	Sh Vishnu
53.	88	DP	Sudhir/Samir
54.	89	DP	Bhawna Chaudhry
55.	91	DP	Smt Vidya Devi
56.	92	DP	Mrs. Meenu Verma
57.	99	DP	Shanti
58.	107	DP	Narender
59.	109	DP	Amit Aggarwal
60.	110	DP	Sunil Gaba
61.	112	DP	Bhuvan Chand Kohli
62.	114	DP	Praveen Kumar
63.	118	DP	Poonam Tomar
64.	119	DP	Niranjan Singh
65.	121	DP	Ms. Usha Anand

S. No.	S. No. From Annexure -3	DEPARTMENT	COMPLAINANT
66.	123	DP	Shishir Kumar
67.	124	DP	Sushil Kumar
68.	129	DP	Mukesh Kumar
69.	131	DP	Rajesh Kumar
70.	132	DP	V K Bhardwaj
71.	136	DP	Mohan Lal
72.	142	Education	D V Singh
73.	143	Education	Geeta Singh
74.	145	Education	J P Bhatnagar
75.	147	Education	Ram Niwas
76.	149	Education	M.S. Anand
77.	150	Education	Smt. Usha Devi
78.	153	Education	Sh. KK Sarthi
79.	156	Education	Ms. Rekha Sharma
80.	157	Education	Sh. Joginder Singh
81.	159	Education	Ram Narain Singh
82.	166	Education	Ashok Gupta
83.	167	Education	Tilak Ram Sharma
84.	168	F&S	Sh Dev Raj Singh
85.	172	F&S	Ms. Charan Kaur (son Hardev Singh)
86.	173	F&S	Manuj Kumar
87.	175	F&S	Chaman Lal
88.	176	F&S	Zaheer Ahmed
89.	177	F&S	Ms. Abida Begum
90.	178	F&S	Sayid Ahmad
91.	179	F&S	Sanjay Kumar
92.	180	F&S	Girji Devi
93.	181	F&S	Sh. Harish Kumar
94.	183	F&S	Sh Phool Chand
95.	184	F&S	Umar Khan & Irshad
96.	185	F&S	Jagdish Prasad
97.	186	F&S	Ms. Sunder Kaur Chadha
98.	188	F&S	Sh. Munshi Ram Maurya
99.	190	F&S	Ms. Nirmala Sharma
100.	191	F&S	Virander Singh

S. No.	S. No. From Annexure -3	DEPARTMENT	COMPLAINANT
101.	192	F&S	Ravinder Nath
102.	194	F&S	Fateh Bahadur and Manish Sharma
103.	195	F&S	Sh. Maan Singh
104.	196	F&S	Mohd. Fazal
105.	197	F&S	Naimunisha w/f Taj Mohmd.
106.	199	F&S	Ram Dhani
107.	207	MCD	Praveen Sahni
108.	208	MCD	Ms. Angoori Devi
109.	214	MCD	Manish Bharadwaj
110.	215	MCD	R N Anand
111.	217	MCD	Dr. R K Sachdev
112.	219	MCD	Ram Kumar Tokas
113.	222	MCD	M L Ailawadhi/Mrs. Savtantra Ailawadhi
114.	224	MCD	Om Singh Kataria
115.	227	MCD	Gulshan Rai
116.	230	MCD	S S Chaddha
117.	240	MCD	Sh. D Kumar and Others
118.	241	MCD	Sh Sunil and Others
119.	247	MCD	Ram Shanker Patel
120.	254	MCD	Ramesh Babber
121.	255	MCD	Tanveer Alam
122.	256	MCD	Vicky Sharma
123.	259	MCD	Ramesh Kumar
124.	261	MCD	Payush Pandey (Pseudonym)
125.	269	MCD	Harsh Kumar N?
126.	271	Power	Har Preet Singh
127.	273	Power	Smt. Anara Devi
128.	278	RCS	M L Tuteja
129.	280	RCS	Dr. Kavita Chowdhry
130.	281	RCS	Sanjay Chirpal
131.	282	RCS	Rajinder Singh
132.	284	RCS	Suman
133.	294	Revenue	Sh Yudhvir Singh Dabas
134.	297	Revenue	Sh Ishwar Singh Saini?

Annexure V

PUBLIC GRIEVANCES COMMISSION (PGC)

PGC QUESTIONNAIRE FORM

(Please fill the necessary information and check the appropriate box)

Name:

Case Number:.....

Age Group: Below 50 years

Above 50 Years

Level of Education : Illiterate Up to 10th class Above 10th class

Occupation :.....

Annual Income: Less than Rs. 1 lacs Rs. 1 lacs to 5 lacs Above Rs. 5 lacs

Address:.....

Contact Number and email (if any)

1. Did you make a complaint to the PGC? Yes No

2. How did you come to know about the PGC?

Media (Print/Radio)

Government official

Hoardings

NGO

Other (please specify).....

3. Was the grievance resolved to your satisfaction?

Fully Satisfied

Partially Satisfied

Not Satisfied

4. Were you satisfied by the time taken for the disposal of the case by the PGC? Yes No
5. Were hearings held on the scheduled dates? Yes No
6. Did you attend the hearings? Yes No
7. Was it easy for you to understand the language of the letters/proceedings sent by PGC? Yes No
8. Did the Concerned Department follow the direction given by the Commission? Yes No
9. Was there a recurrence of your problem/grievance? Yes No
10. Did you withdraw your complaint? Yes No
11. In case you withdrew your complaint before the case was closed in PGC, what was the reason for it?
- The grievance was redressed
- Pressure to withdraw the complaint
- Money was offered to withdraw the complaint
- Other (please specify).....
12. Did you experience any problem/harassment from the Department after your complaint was redressed through the PGC? Yes No
13. Did you try to obtain information from the concerned Department through RTI? Yes No
14. Would you utilise the PGC again, in case of a grievance in the future? Yes No
15. Would you recommend the PGC to other people with grievances? Yes No

PUBLIC GRIEVANCES COMMISSION (PGC)

पी जी सी परियोजना की प्रविष्टि
(कृपया उचित बॉक्स में निष्ठाान लगाएं)

नाम

केस नंबर.....

उम्र 50 वर्ष से कम

50 वर्ष से अधिक

शिक्षा अशिक्षित 10 क्लास तक 10 क्लास से अधिक

व्यवसाय.....

वार्षिक आय 1 लाख 1-5 लाख 5 लाख
रुपये रुपये रुपयों से अधिक

पता

टेलीफोन नंबर और ई मेल.....

1. क्या आपने पी जी सी में कोई शिकायत की थी? हाँ नहीं

2. आपको पी जी सी के बारे में कैसे पता चला ?

विज्ञापन-समाचार पत्र/रेडिओ

सरकारी अधिकारी द्वारा

पोस्टर

गैर सरकारी संस्था

अन्य (कृपया विवरण दें)

3. क्या आप अपनी िकायत के समाधान से संतुष्ट हैं?
- पूर्ण रूप से संतुष्ट आंिक रूप से संतुष्ट अंसतुष्ट
4. क्या आप पी जी सी में अपनी समस्या के निस्तारण में लगे समय से संतुष्ट है?
- हाँ नहीं
5. क्या पी जी में सुनवाई नियत तारीखों पर हुई?
- हाँ नहीं
6. क्या आप सुनवायियों पर उपस्थित थे?
- हाँ नहीं
7. क्या आप ने पी जी सी के पत्रों तथा कारवाही की भाशा अच्छी तरह समझी?
- हाँ नहीं
8. क्या सम्बंधित विभाग ने पी जी सी के निर्देों पर उचित कार्यवाही की?
- हाँ नहीं
9. क्या आपकी समस्या/िकायत की पुनरावृति हुई?
- हाँ नहीं
10. क्या आप ने अपनी िकायत पी जी सी से वापस ली?
- हाँ नहीं
11. यदि आप ने अपनी िकायत वापस ली, तो क्या कारण था? हाँ नहीं
- आप समस्या हल हो गयी थी
- आपके ऊपर कोई दबाव था
- आपको पैसे का लालच दिया गया
- अन्य (कृपया विवरण दें)
12. क्या पी जी सी द्वारा समस्या के निवारण के बाद सम्बंधित विभाग ने आपको तंगकिया?
- हाँ नहीं
13. क्या आपने सम्बंधित विभाग से सूचना के अधिकार के अंतर्गत कोई सूचना मांगी थी?
- हाँ नहीं
14. यदि आपको भविश्य में कोई समस्या हो तो आप पुनः पी जी सी से निवेदन करेंगे?
- हाँ नहीं
15. क्या आप अन्य व्यक्तियों को समस्या के निवारण हेतु पी जी सी जाने की सलाह देंगे?
- हाँ नहीं

Annexure VI

MEDIA CAMPAIGN 2008-09

After joining of present Chairman (PGC), and as desired by her to replace the existing signage Boards/Hoardings installed around the Vikas Bhawan Complex being not attractive, fresh creatives were called from different agencies and after consideration of the Commission, the Following creative was selected and inserted in Board & Hoardings as well as in proposed print media:

1. Advertisement Released/published in the following News Papers (Dailies) on 29-09-2008:

Date of release : 29-09-2008

- a. English Daily : Times of India,
Indian Express,
Hindustan Times,
- b. Hindi Daily : Dainik Jagran ,
Nav Bharat Times
Punjab Kesari
- c. Urdu Daily : Milap

2. Bhagidari Sankalp Utsav (Held in Pragati Maidan, New Delhi on 21 & 22 February 2009)

Government of NCT had organized Sankalp Utsav on 21 & 22-02-2009 at Pragati Maidan, New Delhi wherein AR Deptt. had been allotted 45 Sq. M of space in Hall No. 4 & 5 to set up the Stall. PGC had also participated alongwith AR Deptt., . Accordingly, PGC deputed officers and officials to participate in Sankalp Utsav and distributed Booklet of Delhi Right to Information Act 2001, Citizen Charter and a Brochure of Public Grievances Commission as well as installed Boards/Hoardings having various information about PGC. Hon'ble Chief Minister Delhi also visited the space and appreciated the arrangements made by PGC.

**MEDIA CAMPAIGN
2009-10**

October 2009: Print Media

To generate the higher awareness with in the NCT of Delhi about the critical role of PGC among general public, creatives were called from various agencies and sent to DIP for the approval of competent authority. Director (DIP) informed that the following creative has been approved by the Hon'ble Chief Minister, Delhi for print media:

1. Advertisement Released/published in the following News Papers (Dailies) on 07-10-2009, 14-10-2009 and 21-10-2009

Date of release: 07-10-2009

- a. English Daily : Times of India,
- b. Hindi Daily : Amar Ujala,
- c. Urdu Daily : Jadid in Dinon

Date of release: 14-10-2009

- a. English Daily : Indian Express ,
- b. Hindi Daily : Dainik Jagran ,
- c. Urdu Daily : Milap

Date of release: 21-10-2009

- a. English Daily : Pioneer,
- b. Hindi Daily : Punjab Kesari ,
- c. Urdu Daily : The Economic Times

March 2010 : Outdoor Publicity/Print Media

Keeping in view the response from general public in respect of the media campaign (Print media) in October, 2009, the Commission has decided to utilize the media campaign again for mass publicity this time including out door publicity through Metro Trains, Bus Queue Shelters and Print Media. To this effect few creative were again sent

to DIP for its approval. DIP informed later that Hon'ble Chief Minister has approved the following creative for display in the Metro Trains, BQS and in print media. Accordingly PGC had taken up this campaign successfully in the month of March, 2010. Initially the advertisement panels were installed in 20 Metro Trains (400 Panels) & at 06 Bus Queue Shelters for the period 17-03-2010 to 16-04-2010. For Print Media Publicity, advertisement of PGC was published in 10 National Daily News Papers on 25-03-10 and 26-03-2010.

1. Advertisement Released/published in the following News Papers (Dailies) on 25-03-2010 and 26-03-2010.

Date of release : 25-03-2010

- a. English Daily : Hindustan Times ,
- b. Hindi Daily : Nav Bharat Times ,
Punjab Kesari
- c. Urdu Daily : Daily Milap
- d. Punjabi Daily : The Educator

Date of release : 26-03-2010

- a. English Daily : The Hindu,
The Times of India
- b. Hindi Daily : Dainik Jagran ,
Punjab Kesari
- c. Urdu Daily : Tej
- d. Punjabi Daily : Quami Patrika

2. Metro Trains: (Period 17-03-2010 to 16-04-10)

400 Metro Panels installed in 50 Metro Trains (eight panels in each train) Panel size : 514mm X 204mm

(20 Trains in Line-1, 8 trains in Line-2 and 22 trains in Line-3) as per detail hereunder:

Line-1 (Dilshad Garden to Rithala)

No of Metro Trains : 19

Stations covered : Dilshad Garden—Shahdara—Kashmere Gate—Tis Hazari—Inder Lok –Pitam Pura-Rohini—Rithala

Line-2 (Vishwavidyalaya to Central Sectt.)

No of Metro Trains : 20

Stations Covered : Vishwavidyalaya—Old Sectt.—Kashmere Gate—New Delhi Rly Station—Rajiv Chowk—Central Secretariat.

Line-3 (Dwarka to Indraprastha)

No of Metro Trains : 11

Stations Covered : Dwaraka—Uttam Nagar—Janak Puri—Rajauri Garden—Kirti Nagar—Karol Bagh—Rajiv Chowk—Barakhamba Road—Mandi House—Pragati Maidan—Indraprastha.

3. Bus Que Shelters (BQS): (Size: 4.2' X 4.8')

Period : 17-03-2010 to 16-04-10

Ambedkar Nagar

(at T-point M.B. Road and BRT Corridor (Ambedkar Nagar to Delhi Gate Road))

Pushp Vihar

(Towards Ambedkar Ngr on BRT Corridor (Ambedkar Nagar to Delhi Gate Road))

Chirag Delhi

(Towards Ambedkar Ngr on BRT Corridor (Ambedkar Nagar to Delhi Gate Road))

DPS Mathura Road

(Towards Ambedkar Ngr on BRT Corridor (Ambedkar Nagar to Delhi Gate Road))

ITO

(Near Red Light at BRT Corridor (Ambedkar Nagar to Delhi Gate Road))

Delhi Gate

(Near Red Light at BRT Corridor (Ambedkar Nagar to Delhi Gate Road))

MEDIA CAMPAIGN

2010-11

May-June, 2010

The creative selected by Competent Authority was again sent to DIP with certain modification and after getting approval, the modified creative in Hindi and Urdu were installed in Metro trains, BQS & Road side Boards/Hoardings. The approved creative are as under:

1. Metro Trains: (Period 12-07-2010 to 11-08-2010)

80 Panels installed in 10 Metro Trains (Eight panels in each train 04 Hindi & 04 in Urdu)

Panel size : 514mm X 204mm

Line-3 (Dwaraka to Noida/Anand Vihar)

Stations covered : Dwaraka—Uttam Nagar—Janak Puri—Rajauri Garden—Kirti Nagar—Karol Bagh—Rajiv Chowk—Barakhamba Road—Mandi House—Pragati Maidan—Indraprastha—Yamuna Depot—(i) Laxmi Nagar—Preet Vihar—Anand Vihar (ii) Akshar Dham—Mayur Vihar—Noida

2. Metro Stations :

Kashmere Gate (4.6.2010 to 3.7.2010)

Dilshad Garden (12.7.2010 to 11.8.2010)

Shahdara (12.7.2010 to 11.8.2010)

Seelam Pur (12.7.2010 to 11.8.2010)

Rithala (12.7.2010 to 11.8.2010)

Rohini West (12.7.2010 to 11.8.2010)

3. BQS :

(i) Venue : Jawahar Lal Nehru Stadium Flyover

Period : 05-06-10 to 04-07-10

Size : 30' x 8'

(ii) Venue : Nariana PVR
Period : 05-06-10 to 04-07-10
Size : 54' x 4'

4. Out Door:

(i) Venue : Shanti Path near Railway Museum
Period : 05-06-10 to 04-07-10
Size : 75' x 6'

(ii) Venue : Shadi Pur Flyover Panel
Period : 05-06-10 to 04-07-10
Size : 71' x 6'

**SYSTEMIC REFORMS REPORTED BY
PGC (2009-10)**

1. *Compensation to families of victims of the anti-Sikh riots of 1984*

**Smt. Mohinder Kaur vs. Deputy Commissioner (South West),
Revenue PGC/2009/Rev./DC/SW/274**

Mrs. Mohinder Kaur, w/o late Sh. S. Satnam Singh, r/o WZ – 502, Gali No. 17/B, Sadh Nagar, Palam Colony, New Delhi – 110045 complained in March, 2009 about the unnecessary harassment and mental torture caused to her for over six months, because the Office of Deputy Commissioner (South West), Revenue is unable / unwilling to release the widow pension @ Rs. 2,500/- per month owed to her as compensation, since her husband was killed in the 1984 anti-Sikh riots. The innumerable representations made by her to the Office of Deputy Commissioner (South West), Revenue, have elicited no response.

The Public Grievances Commission convened nine hearings, and during the course of these hearings the Deputy Commissioner (South-West) Revenue sanctioned the pension owed to the complainant w.e.f. May 2009, and this was released directly through ECS, into the bank account specified by the complainant. However, by September 2009, the complainant again drew the attention of the PGC to the ground reality in pursuance of that sanction by the Deputy Commissioner (South West), Revenue, she has received only one deposit of widow pension credited into her State Bank of India account, and that after this initial credit, the said widow pension has discontinued! The PGC persisted with their hearings and it transpired that the Office of Deputy Commissioner processes afresh each month the matter of release of widow pensions.

As a measure of **systemic reform**, Deputy Commissioner (South West), Revenue and Divisional Commissioner were advised to re-examine the systems put in place for disbursal of pension payments to the riot victims, because surely, a fresh sanction every month only perpetuates the delays. The PGC recommended that a single sanction for payment through the year should be enough, with provision for regular verification. The pensioners can be directed to provide quarterly / half yearly / annual Life Surviving Certificate as in the case of regular govt. pensioners. Since the crediting of widow pension

into the account of the complainant had resumed, and credits had been verified up to October 2009, the Public Grievances Commission closed the case in November 2009, with the specific directives for implementing the above cited systemic reform.

2. Registration of Marriage, Online

Sh. Ajay Goel vs. Deputy Commissioner (West), Revenue PGC/2009/DC/W/Rev/285

Sh. Ajay Goel, r/o B-18B, Mansarover Garden, New Delhi -110015 filed a complaint in June, 2009, being aggrieved about the difficulties encountered by him in obtaining a Certificate of Registration of Marriage from the Office of Deputy Commissioner (West), Revenue, GNCT of Delhi. The complainant stated that while it is a welcome and progressive initiative for the GNCT of Delhi to provide an online facility that would ensure a hassle free registration of marriage, however, the ground reality is that the staff in the Office of Deputy Commissioner (West) Revenue is not overly keen to implement the Scheme. He applied on-line for registration of marriage and received an automatically generated date (06/02/09), for the said registration. Having complied with all necessary pre-requisites, when he went to the Office of DC (West) on 6th February, 2009, with witnesses, his papers were scrutinized. After scrutiny, the complainant was asked to file an additional certificate in respect of the PAN card of the witnesses, and to produce three sets of photographs of the husband and wife. Sh. Goel contended that these requirements are not cited on the web-site, and as such he has come unprepared with these pre-requisites. The situation became ugly because the staff gave excuses for not registering the marriage, misbehaved with the complainant, insisted on typing again his entire application so as to generate a new application number with a fresh date for registration, after the complainant had waited for two hours.

The complainant stood his ground, and insisted that a test verification of this online facility be carried out in his presence. A test verification was carried out. It emerged that the revenue authorities had failed to update the online facility for registration of marriage with the now changed and modified requirements. The previous requirement of having one gazetted officer with two sets of photographs has been substituted with the current requirement of (i) one witness only, with PAN card and (ii) three sets of attested photographs of the married couple. The GNCT of Delhi had notified this amendment on 29/09/2005. However, the website accessed by the complainant did not carry the updated version of these requirements.

Eventually after intervention of the local police and heated arguments, the staff agreed to do the registration on the same day but with the freshly generated application number. This gr grievance was redressed in the first hearing itself and the case was closed in July, 2009 at the conclusion of one hearing. Sh. Ajay Goel thanked the Public Grievances Commission and was satisfied with personal hearing given to him by the Dy. Commissioner (West), Revenue and SDM (Patel Nagar).

As a measure of **systemic reform**, PGC issued directions that the Divisional Commissioner / ADM(HQ), Revenue, GNCT of Delhi should direct the regular updating of the website detailing requirements not only for marriage registration certificates, but for all other certificates issued by Deptt. of Revenue, GNCTD. The Offices of every Deputy Commissioner (Revenue) and of every SDM shall ensure that all such relevant such information is also displayed prominently on Notice Boards in English and Hindi, so that the citizen is fully informed about any requirements that he must fulfill without which the Certificate being sought, cannot issue. The ADM (HQ) must ensure that the staff at the cutting edge in the Offices of Deputy Commissioners (Revenue) and all SDMs are fully trained to handle the online facility wherever this has been provided, such that all responses to the public ought to provide clarifications where these are sought without being unduly aggressive. This will go a long way in increasing consumer confidence. The ADM (HQ) should convey to the PGC that all the necessary directions have been complied.

Thereafter, the ADM (HQ), Revenue Department reported compliance with the directions of the PGC, and forwarded to the Public Grievances Commission a communication conveying that now the website of the Revenue Department is being updated regularly and the specific modification in the requirements for registration of Marriage Certificate has also been updated. Further, he conveyed that training for officials in the Offices of SDMs handling the issue of Certificates within a stipulated time frame has been proposed. Here again, after the intervention of the PGC, not only was the immediate grievance redressed, but systemic improvement was achieved and corrective action was implemented.

3. Registration of properties in Delhi

**Sh. D. C. Tuteja vs. Deputy Commissioner (Central), Revenue
PGC/09/DC/Cen./Rev./320**

Sh. D.C. Tuteja, r/o 4/9(GF), Asaf Ali Road, New Delhi-110 002 filed a complaint in July, 2009 wherein he alleged that in the Office

of Sub-Registrar-III, Asaf Ali Road, the commercial properties were being registered as residential properties. This is causing loss of incoming revenues to government, recoverable as Stamp Duty and Transfer Duty. More specifically, the complainant cited documents # 4781 and 4782 dated 16/06/08 pertaining to property # 11/ 5 - B, Pusa Road, New Delhi; document # 4025 in respect of Sale Deed 4/06/09 for property # 2600, Gali # 4 & 5, Beadonpura, which has been registered as a residential property, although it is located in a commercial complex.

The SDM (Karol Bagh) filed a detailed report wherein the allegations made by the complainant were found accurate. All the three properties under reference had been declared as residential although located in commercial premises. Accordingly, lower Stamp Duty was levied, while the owners / occupants of these properties were clearly liable to pay enhanced Stamp Duty in respect of each of these properties. The Collector of Stamps imposed a penalty of Rs. 5,000/- each for making wrong declarations. Directions were issued to Office of Collector of Stamps / SDM (Karol Bagh) to take all coercive measures to recover both the deficient stamp duty and the penalties from the offenders, under intimation to the PGC. The case underwent two hearings and it was closed in January, 2010.

As a measure of **systemic reform**, the Inspector General Registration (Divisional Commissioner) was requested to examine whether a mandatory referral to Collector of Stamps u/s 47 of the India Stamp Act, 1899, by the concerned sub-registrar is warranted, especially in the areas where commercial / mixed land use has been allowed by MCD. A list of such colonies/roads can be obtained from MCD and circulated to all Sub-Registrars so as to curb the tendency of false declaration. This will enhance government revenues as well.

Accordingly, in this matter, government was able to recover the deficiencies in revenues owed to government through the Collector of Stamps. Additionally, the Public Grievances Commission recommended a specific systemic reform.

4. Facilities for the public in a Health Dispensary

Sh. Narendra Sharma vs. Directorate of Health Services PGC/2009/DHS/46

Sh. Narendra Sharma, r/o # 52, Jonapur, Mehrauli, New Delhi-110047 filed a complaint in October, 2009 stating that there was no water in the Health Centre at Jonapur Dispensary though a water

cooler exists in the dispensary. The officials-in-charge of the dispensary had informed him that several letters had been written to the concerned officials, but there has been no action on the ground. The complainant prayed for appropriate arrangements for water facilities inside the campus of the health dispensary so that the patients do not suffer. The Public Grievances Commission convened two hearings

In the first hearing the Zonal Office, Delhi Jal Board clarified that the water to the Jonapur health dispensary is being supplied by the Jaunapur Ratiawala Tube Well, and that the low discharge of water from the tubewell had led to this complaint, since the Jonapur dispensary is located at the tail-end of the distribution system. After the directives of the Public Grievances Commission at the conclusion of the second hearing, in a communication dated 01/01/10, the Delhi Jal Board (i) authorized the Medical Officer in charge of the Jonapur Dispensary to source the inflow of water into the Dispensary from the water main (a nearby source) which has adequate pressure; (ii) assured the Public Grievances Commission that the DJB would extend all possible help in this matter; and (iii) gave a further assurance that drinking water through tankers would be supplied to the Dispensary upon demand.

In this manner the grievance of the complainant was resolved, but as a matter of systemic reform, the persistent problem of water shortages in the Jonapur was possibly permanently addressed. To further ensure that similar problems do not persist in other health facilities, the Public Grievances Commission suggested that the authorities in the Directorate of Health Services should make periodic visits to all health dispensaries to ensure that the patients receive availability of water, and other facilities like clean toilets, adequate seating arrangements, and further that these periodic visits should include noting the punctuality and attendance of staff and doctors, availability and inventory of medicines.

5. Seeking Uniform Application of the Time Bound Promotion Scale

Sh. Mahendra Singh Saini vs. NDMC

Appeal No. 2524/2009/PGC/DRI/NDMC

Sh. Mahendra Singh Saini, r/o House No. 5, Village Lampur, PO Narela, Delhi-110040 filed an appeal under Delhi RTI Act, 2001 in May, 2009, seeking from the NDMC the Action Taken Report on his representation dated 14/06/08 addressed to Secretary NDMC. The Public Grievances Commission convened nine hearings. The appellant

was aggrieved because while his retirement benefits (fixation of pension) had been calculated on the basis of his salary @ Rs. 15,440/ per month, suddenly in the month of February 2009 his basic pay was shown as Rs. 14,880/ and some Rs. 23,061 had been recovered on account of over-payment. He had received no response to his representation seeking examination of this anomaly and asking for the return of the amount erroneously recovered from him.

The NDMC argued that the Third Time Bound Promotion Scale (TTBPS) granted to the appellant had been withdrawn and on this account, his salary was re-fixed. During the hearings, the appellant argued that the benefit of the TTBPS was awarded to numerous categories of NDMC employees, and that the same has not been withdrawn from these employees pending implementation of the Sixth Pay Commission recommendations, and a final decision of the New Delhi Municipal Council. The appellant wanted to know why he has been singled out for withdrawal of benefit while other employees continue to enjoy this benefit, and by implication why the Sixth Pay Commission recommendations have not been uniformly implemented for all entitled NDMC employees. The appellant drew attention to the fact that several personal secretaries in the NDMC (and he named some of the beneficiaries), were awarded the Time Bound Promotion even prior to the NDMC resolution authorizing the same dated 05/11/2007. He cited the case of one Sh. SP Singh appointed in the NDMC on the same date as the appellant and who was due to retire in November 2009, but his TTBPS had not been withdrawn. The Public Grievances Commission repeatedly directed the NDMC to file specific responses to clearly address these grievances and misgivings.

In each hearing, the NDMC maintained that there was no discrimination among the employees. However, in the fourth hearing (September, 2009) the Deputy Director NDMC stated that the specific case of the appellant for grant of the TTBPS wef 01/07/06 was now submitted to the Chairman NDMC for consideration and approval. In the fifth hearing (October 2009), the NDMC responded that with the approval of the Competent Authority an Anomaly Committee has been constituted which will consider individual representations and will also take up the numerous cases pending in courts, and that all matters will be finalized within six months. The Public Grievances commission directed that the Anomaly Committee should lose no time in addressing these simple but longstanding grievances, and further directed the NDMC to expedite all these decisions.

In the seventh hearing (December 2009) the NDMC conveyed that the current Assured (ACP) Scheme and the Time Bound Promotion Scheme have now been replaced by the Modified Assured Career Progression Scheme (MACPS) vide NDMC Office Order dated 10/11/09, and that now the TTBPS of the appellant would be reviewed after all modalities of the MACPS are decided. In the ninth hearing (February, 2010) the NDMC conveyed that the TTBPS for class C and D employees of the NDMC was approved by Chairman NDMC on 02/02/10, and that now the appellant will be granted the TTBPS earlier withdrawn on account of objections by the Audit Department, NDMC. It was admitted that this benefit was being given to other employees while the NDMC has chosen to withdraw the benefit from the appellant a few months prior to his retirement. The appellant thanked the Public Grievances Commission for its persistent efforts in resolving this matter.

In exercise of the "single window facility" that the Public Grievances Commission was designed to be, the PGC went way beyond merely providing information to the appellant under the Delhi RTI Act, 2001. The PGC resolved the grievance underlying the appeal against the NDMC. The appellant was granted the Third Time Bound Promotion Scale which was earlier withdrawn prior to his retirement, while his peers continued to retain the benefit of the TTBPS. Finally, this also brought about systemic reform within the NDMC as a whole category of C and D employees in the NDMC benefitted from the revised orders, and this completely opportunities for rent seeking and favoritism.

6. Medical Reimbursements

Dr. Bijan Kumar Dey vs. Directorate of Health Services PGC/2009/Health/46

Dr. Bijan Kumar Dey, r/o 45, Harit Niketan, West Enclave, Pitampura, New Delhi-110034 filed a complaint in October, 2009 about the non-reimbursement of his medical bills. The complainant was working as Chief Distt. Medical Officer (CDMO), Distt. West, DHS. Previously, the complainant used to get reimbursement of his medical bills from the Office of CDMO (West), but in February, 2007, his medical bills were returned with the comments of CDMO (West) that as his treatment is lifelong, he may purchase generic medicines of equal therapeutic value. Then in August, 2007, he was informed that his original bills were not traceable and that he may submit duplicate

bills. He was asked to produce empties of medicines. The complainant expressed his anguish that being a doctor in the DHS, he was made to suffer in this manner, the plight of other patients can be very well imagined.

Claims for medical reimbursement going missing after receipt is a very common problem across all departments. As a measure of **systemic reform**, The Public Grievances Commission convened two hearings, and succeeded in redressing the grievance.

As a measure of **systemic reform**, the PGC directed that the Office of CDMO (District West), DHS was directed to streamline the receipt of dak in his office, with appropriate systems for tracking papers, once received. In this manner it was ensured that (i) The Office of CDMO (District West), DHS issued necessary orders for streamlining the systems for receipt of dak in his office; (ii) claimants would not be required to purchase cheaper medicines of equal therapeutic value, since this is not stated in the Delhi Government Employees health Scheme (DGEHS) ; and (iii) claimants would not be required to submit empties of medicines purchased since the Delhi Government Employees health Scheme (DGEHS) does not prescribe this requirement, and Departments of the GNCT of Delhi must confine themselves to the stipulations contained in the DGEHS. case the medical bills of the claimant were reimbursed..

The Public Grievances Commission convened three hearings in this grievance, the complainant was fully satisfied, and the case was closed in January, 2010.

7. Providing facilities for hand wash in fast food

Sh. K. S. Gahunia VS. Health Department, MCD PGC/2010/MCD/MHO/1653

Sh. K. S. Gahunia, r/o 1E/1, Jhandewalan Extn., New Delhi filed a complaint in November, 2009 stating that many fast food joints in public places do not have any provision for washing of hands. He requested that it should be mandatory for all fast food joints etc. to have the basic provision of wash basin / soap. The grievance was successfully redressed in just two hearings and the grievance case was closed in February, 2010.

As a measure of **systemic reform**, the Health Department, MCD was directed to issue a Circular to all Zonal DHO's directing them to ensure that the Fast Food outlets comply with the technical instructions

laid down by the Health Department, MCD. Accordingly, in pursuance of directions of the Public Grievances Commission, the Municipal Corporation of Delhi issued a circular in February 2010. The MCD sought and obtained a compliance report from all 12 MCD Zonal Health Officers who have reported DHO's of MCD. All the Zonal DHO's reported that they have completed inspection visits of the Fast Food outlets in their respective zones, and that it was ensured that all such units are complying with the instructions of the MCD Health Department such as provision of wash basin, soap etc.

To implement the systemic reform as suggested by the Public Grievances Commission, the Medical Health Officer (Public Health) MCD was directed to ensure that all Fast Food Joints/ other public spaces where food is served are regularly inspected by the Zonal DHO's to ensure that the necessary instructions are being complied with, by all such units.

Especially in view of forth coming Common Wealth Games 2010, this exercise was needed to be taken up vigorously. With these directions this closed after two hearings.

8. Non-availability of dispensary in South Gamri

Sh. Moti Chand Verma vs. DHS / Health & Family Welfare Department

PGC/2008/Health/29

Sh. Moti Chand Verma, r/o A-227, South Gamri, Block-A, Delhi-110053 filed a grievance in October, 2008, on behalf of the RWA, South Gamri, Delhi-110053, aggrieved by non-availability of dispensary in the area of South Gamri, Delhi. He complained that (i) residents of South Gamri are required to travel to the health dispensary at Gokulpuri, which is at some distance; (ii) the inventory and availability of medicines and vaccinations in the Gokulpuri Dispensary is most unsatisfactory; and (iii) there is perennial non-availability of female doctor ;and (iv) patients encounter improper behaviour by the doctors and staff in the Gokulpuri Dispensary.

The Public Grievances Commission convened five hearings and organized a surprise visit at the Gokulpuri Dispensary by the PGC. In order to address the systemic failure behind this grievance, the PGC directed the Directorate of Health Services to :

- (i) pay heed to the grievances of the Resident Welfare Associations;
- (ii) examine the feasibility of opening a health dispensary at South Gamri / adjacent area;

- (iii) sort out all other irritants in the actual delivery of health services such as providing appropriate and speedy attention to patients, maintaining adequate inventory of medicines and vaccinations, and to ensure that all medical and non-medical staff is more responsive to the patients in the health dispensary at Gokulpuri.
- (iv) File an action taken report to the PGC within a period of one month on all of the above.

In compliance with the directions of the Public Grievances Commission, the DHS filed a reply in July, 2009 that a lady Doctor and ANM were posted at the Gokulpuri Dispensary, the tetanus injections were now available and the CMO of the Dispensary was directed to be more receptive and responsive to the grievances of the public and the RWA. Directions were issued to maintain adequate inventory of vaccines and improve the functioning of the dispensary. Finally, the Dte. of Health Services found that the demand for an additional health dispensary was actually wholly justified.

The complainant vide his letter dated 19/10/2009 was extremely thankful to the Public Grievances Commission. He confirmed the actions on the ground, taken by the Dte. of Health Services, GNCT of Delhi. Now, the staff and officials at the dispensary were rendering prompt and courteous service to the public. Also an additional dispensary in South Gamri would soon become operational. .

In this grievance case, the PGC not only redressed the grievance of the complainant but also brought about systemic reform in the functioning of the dispensary and help in getting one additional dispensary in that area.

SYSTEMIC REFORM

APPEALS

1. Sh. Ayodhya Prasad vs. Department of Transport

Appeal No. 2546/2009/PGC/DRI/TPT.

Sh. Ayodhya Prasad, L-36 C, DDA Flats, Saket, New Delhi-110 017 approached the Public Grievances Commission through an appeal under Delhi RTI Act, 2001 filed in August, 2009. The appellant sought extensive information on his Service Book, last payment of GPF, sanction of retirement benefits, and payment of provisional pension. While this information was being sought from the Department of Transport, GNCT of Delhi, it emerged that the underlying grievance of the appellant was he had not received his retirement benefits from the Transport, GNCT of Delhi. There was some departmental proceeding pending against the appellant. The Transport Department, GNCT of Delhi contended that the retirement benefits of leave encashment and CGEIS would not be cleared till the pending disciplinary proceedings were concluded.

As a measure of **systemic reform**, the Public Grievances Commission directed the Transport Department to seek a specific clarification from Finance Department, GNCT of Delhi regarding payment of retirement dues such as GPF, Leave Encashment, Insurance, etc. pending disciplinary proceedings against a retired employee. The Finance Department ruled in favor of the retired employee. The Department of Transport Department thereafter, sanctioned a payment of Rs. 1,98,740/- and Rs. 17,524/- in respect of Leave Encashment and CGEIS in favour of the appellant.

The appellant secured all the information sought by him, and also obtained relief in that his grievance behind this appeal was redressed by the Public Grievances Commission in three hearings. This appeal case was closed in November, 2009. Also, as a measure of systemic reform, now it is clear as per clarification from Finance Department that the retired employees against whom the disciplinary proceedings are pending are eligible for payment of retirement dues such as GPF, Insurance and Leave Encashment.

SUCCESS STORIES

1. *Addressing Noise and Air Pollution*

Sh. Ramesh Sharma & Rajan Makkar
PGC/2008/DC/West/Rev./203

Shri Ramesh Sharma and Shri Rajan Makkar, r/o WZ-1, Basai Darapur Road, Moti Nagar, New Delhi-110015 filed a complaint in January 2008, that the noise pollution and the nuisance created by a factory (M/s Venus Industries), functioning immediately adjacent to them, at WZ-1 Basai Darapur Road, Moti Nagar, New Delhi-110015, was unbearable. More specifically, their complaint was that when the heavy equipment in this industrial unit (factory) cuts, shapes and bends steel, then the entire structure of the building trembles and the glass window panes and other fixtures in their portion of the building get routinely shattered. The complainant approached the factory owner who paid no attention. He filed written complaints at the Police Station Moti Nagar, and in the Offices of ACP Patel Nagar, and Deputy Commissioner of Police Rajouri Garden. There was no response. A case under Section 133 Cr. Penal Code was instituted against the factory owner, in the Court of SDM (Patel Nagar). However, in the proceedings on 26th June 2007, the SDM Patel Nagar noted that he did not find any noise/ vibrations during his visit to the site.

Clearly, this grievance needed to be addressed by multiple Departments of the GNCT of Delhi i.e. Department of Industries, the Delhi Pollution Control Committee (DPCC), and the Municipal Corporation of Delhi (MCD). The Public Grievances Commission convened eighteen hearings, and all three Departments responded. The Industries Department submitted a site inspection report stating (i) that this factory is located on private land, is within the DLF Industrial Area, MotiNagar and therefore 'conforms' with the prescribed land use, and hence any shifting / sealing of the factory premises is not warranted; (ii) that in response to a specific query under the Right to Information Act, the DDA has communicated that as per the Master Plan of Delhi, 1962, and also as per the Draft Master Plan of Delhi 2021 the land use of this area falls in the category of 'manufacturing' which

includes 'light and services industry'; and (iii) that this unit is engaged in manufacturing of cutlery items since 1963, well before 1990. Hence, as per directions of Hon'ble Supreme Court, the unit cannot be closed.

In the circumstances, the Public Grievances Commission sought to bring in generic **systemic reform** that would usher in new standards to routinely guide and determine the functioning of small scale units causing noise and air pollution. The Delhi Pollution Control Committee and the Municipal Corporation of Delhi were directed to make repeated visits to the unit in order to implement the directions of the Public Grievances Commission. Chairman DPCC constituted a Special Inspection Team to assess and evaluate the pollution control devices in position at this industrial unit.

Noise Pollution

The DPCC was directed to inspect and verify whether the DG set of 63 KVA installed on the premises of this M/s Venus Industries has the mandatory acoustic enclosure, with adequate stack height. The DPCC informed that this industrial unit had violated several DPCC prescribed conditions. Although the industrial unit did have a DG set installed, but the acoustic enclosure had been removed by the unit holder. In the hearing on 25th February, 2009, the Executive Engineer filed a copy of the most recent inspection report (dated 18th February, 2009), alongwith a Noise Monitoring Report and conveyed (i) that now the DG set is being operated with acoustic enclosure and adequate stack height, and shock absorbers with power presses had been installed on the premises; and (ii) that the activity of polishing has been out-sourced, and all buffing machines had been removed from the premises of the industrial unit. This further reduced the noise pollution.

Air Pollution

Under the Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1981, Notices had issued to this industrial unit in January 2009 pointing out the deficiencies relating to air pollution observed during an inspection visit. The industrial unit had assured the DPCC that all deficiencies cited in the inspection report (such as the defunct emissions control system) would be rectified within two months. In view of this assurance the DPCC allowed the industrial unit to continue operations on condition that they furnish surety by way of a bank guarantee for Rs. 50,000/ only, for a period of one year, stipulating that this bank

guarantee would be forfeited in favor of the DPCC and further necessary action warranted under the law would be initiated if the industrial unit failed to install and operate the Emissions Control System (ECS) in future. The Venus Industries furnished the Bank Guarantee in February, 2009. In a subsequent inspection by the DPCC it became clear that while the buffing machines were found installed, there was no proper connection to the dust collector, and the emission control systems continued to be defunct. Clearly, the industrial unit had failed to comply with the conditions stipulated by the DPCC, and vide DPCC communication dated January 2010 the industrial unit was informed that its bank guarantee was forfeited in favor of the DPCC. Only thereafter, in a hearing dated 1st February 2009, the Executive Engineer DPCC reported that the ECS is now functioning and that the closure notice issued to this industrial unit has been revoked so that fresh inspections with close monitoring will continue before taking a final view in respect of the air pollution being caused. Eventually this industrial unit relented and out-sourced the activity of polishing of cutlery, and the buffing machines were removed from the premises. M/s Venus Industries achieved further reductions in the air pollution.

Violation of MCD conditions

The MCD was directed to ensure whether the unit had a valid MCD licence for running a factory, and further whether the unit is complying with all the terms and conditions prescribed by the MCD. The MCD reported that the industrial unit was functioning at the first floor, in complete violation of the conditions of the MCD factory licence. Following directions from the PGC, the unit was issued a show cause notice by MCD as to why the municipal factory licence should not be cancelled. The industrial unit functioning at the First Floor was closed and all machines and equipment were shifted to the Ground Floor. The unit holder applied for enhancement of power load from 40hp to 150hp to comply with all the DPCC and MCD requirements

The persistence of the Public Grievances Commission compelled the errant industrial unit to fully comply, step by step, with the directions issued. The MCD and the DPCC were fully co-operative as well. The complainant was satisfied with the action taken by the respondent departments and was extremely grateful to the PGC.

The Public Grievances Commission has redressed the grievance to the full satisfaction of the complainants, and succeeded in recommending systemic reform in that wherever the DPCC and the

MCD enforce their respective rules and regulations jointly, they will succeed in achieving compliance in letter and spirit, from habitual offenders.

2. Handling implementation of judicial orders

Sh. Lalit Narula vs. Deputy Commissioner (South), Revenue PGC/2008/Rev./DC/S/237

Complainant Sh. Lalit Nirula filed a grievance in the Public Grievances Commission, Delhi during September, 2008, stating that he is unable to obtain releases of final payments from the Office of Deputy Commissioner (South), MB Road, Saket, due to him vide Orders of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi dated 8th November, 2001. The said orders directed that the full payment of the enhanced value of land acquired by Government vide Notification dated 13/12/1971 is owed to the complainant. The Office of DC (South), Revenue took no action to implement these orders of the Delhi High Court, till three years later (2004), when the complainant drew their attention to this non-implementation. On 20/12/06 the then Deputy Commissioner (South) passed an order directing the release of payments owed to the complainant, and further directed the fixation of responsibility in respect of all persons responsible for the delay in implementing the orders of the High Court of Delhi. Even after this direction of the Deputy Commissioner (South), the system did not respond. The complainant is additionally seeking to ascertain the reasons for this unseemly delay, and to fix responsibility on persons responsible for this delay.

The Public Grievances Commission convened nine hearings. It became clear that over the years, at every stage, there has been an absence of the most basic supervision, in multiple offices, like the Land Acquisition Office, in the Land & Building Department, the DDA, and in the Office of Deputy Commissioner (South), Revenue, Govt. of NCT of Delhi. Essentially, this has led to the inordinate delays. Admittedly, the amount undisbursed to the complainant is negligible i.e. Rs.9,632/-, and this money was duly released by DDA in December 2008, in pursuance of orders of the Public Grievances Commission. However, the Public Grievances Commission directed an inquiry that would begin to clarify that typically what is it in such matters that causes unnecessary and avoidable harassment. Accordingly, an inquiry was conducted and six officials were identified, who were issued notices by the Office of Deputy Commissioner (South), Revenue to explain

their conduct. In July 2009, the SDM (HQ), South District, Revenue file in the PGC the Final Report of this Inquiry.

It emerges that from November 2001 onwards the Court Registry from the High Court of Delhi omitted to despatch the Court order to the GNCT, Department of Revenue, Collector of Land Acquisition. The Office of Deputy Commissioner (South), Land Acquisition Collector became aware of this matter only when the complainant submitted an application alongwith a copy of the High Court orders, on 28th January 2004. After that, this matter was passed from the Office of the LAC to the land & Building Department, to the DDA and so on.

To bring about more **systemic reforms** in the working of the Office of the Land Acquisition Collector, the Public Grievances Commission directed that a set of Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) be drawn up, inclusive of a Check List for time-bound tasks. This Check List is to be complied with in the event of land acquisition and the payment of compensation thereof.

3. All India Kashmiri Samaj vs. Dte. of Education Department PGC/2009/Edn./295

Shri M.K. Kaw, former Secretary, Govt. of India & past President, All India Kashmiri Samaj (AIKS), r/o D-90, Sarojini Nagar, New Delhi forwarded a representation in December, 2008 conveying the grievances of the Kashmiri Pandit Migrant Teachers that the teachers are being paid consolidated salaries, much lower than emoluments drawn by regular employees and the question/matter of regularization of their services has been under examination for a long period.

The PGC took up the matter with Dte. of Education and held seven hearings in this grievance case with the intention to bring a **systemic reform** in the system wherein at present the term of Kashmiri Pandit Migrant Teachers was not even extended beyond 1/4/2009 as the matter was undecided. The contractual period was going to expire in March, 2009. These matters needed Cabinet approval. In pursuance of Cabinet Decision No. 1554 dated 3/8/2009, the term of appointment of Kashmiri Migrants contractual teachers was extended for a further period of three years w.e.f. 1/4/2009 to 31/3/2012. The services of all such teachers in the Govt. schools of Dte. of Education shall continue to be governed / regulated by the prevalent terms & conditions. Though the Cabinet did not approved any revision of salary, but the PGC was able to bring about a systemic reform as now the Kashmiri Migrants Contractual Teachers got an extension upto March, 2012, and

the grievance case was closed in the Public Grievances Commission in August, 2009.

A favourable decision on the extension of services for a further period of three years in respect of Kashmiri Migrants contractual teachers, was taken by the Cabinet of GNCT of Delhi.

IC CENTRE FOR GOVERNANCE

Niryat Bhawan, Rao Tula Ram Marg, New Delhi-110057

Tele: 91-11-26146236

E-mail: iccfg@yahoo.co.in