

(DATE OF LAST INSPECTION. 12.09.2008)

**HARYANA URBAN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
PANCHKULA**

(REPORT OF SUBSEQUENT INSPECTION)

SECTOR = 14

URBAN ESTTE: Rohtak

1.	Name & Designation of the Inspecting Officer	Sanjay Rai, H.C.S. Estate Officer, HUDA .Rohtak.	
2.	Date of Inspection	06.11.2008	
3.	Date of last inspection (s)	12.09.2008	
4.	Are there any sites in respect of which possession has not been offered? It so give details.	Nil	
5.	Is there any change in plot details since last inspection? If yes, give details	Nil	
6.	No. of plots/sites in respect of which litigation is going on. Full details may be given by means of Annexures.	6 Annexure-A attached	
7.	Whether registered RWA exists. If yes, names of president and General Secretary.	Registered RWA exists with registration no 1133 Sh. O.P. Nandal, president, Sh. A.S. Kalra, General Secretary and Sh. Kalam Singh Nehra, Executive Member	
8.	Whether advance notice given and RWA representative present at the time of inspection.	Yes	
9.	Action taken to improve deficiencies noted during last inspection.		
	Sr. Infrastructure No. activities	Deficiencies Noted	Steps taken to improve
	1. Roads.	--	--
	2. Water supply	--	--
	3. Sewerage	--	--
	4. Storm water	--	--

	5. Parks	--	--
	6. Street Lights	--	Lighting system improve & Sh. Kalam Singh JE (E) checked regularly in morning & evening
	7. Sineages	--	--
	8. Cleanliness	--	--
	9. Removal of encroachment	--	--
	10. Unplanned area	--	--
	11. Entries of the sector	--	--
	12. Maintenance of Community Building	--	--
	13. Reduction in litigation	Yes	Dharampal Nandal Vs. HUDA H.N. 32 Sec-14 is dismissed.
10.	Whether Assessment Form filled up by RWA is enclosed or Not?	Enclosed	
11.	Total time taken for inspection of the Sector.	One day	
12.	Names of the officials who accompanied the E.O. during inspection.		
	(a) JE (Civil)	Sh. Arun Dangji	
	(b) JE (Electrical)	Sh. Kalam Singh	
	(c) JE (Horti.)	Sh. Mahender Singh	
	(d) JE (Estate Office)	Sh. Rampal Yadav	
13.	<u>Overall Assessment:</u> Whether physical condition and maintenance of Sector helps in improving image of HUDA?	Yes	

Signature of the Inspecting officer.

ASSESSMENT FORM TO BE FILLED UP BY RESIDENT WELFARE ASSOCIATION.

DATE OF INSPECTION 12.09.2008

:

1.	Name of RWA.	RWA, HUDA, Sector-14 Rohtak
2.	Registration number, Act under which registered & date of registration.	Regd. No. 1133 Regd. Under Societies Registration Act xxi of 1860 Date of registration 16.11.94
3.	Name & Address, Mobile No., e-mail address of the President and General Secretary.	Sh. O.P. Nandal, president, H.N. 406 Sec-14 Rohtak. P.H.N. 9812217238 Sh. A.S. Kalra, General Secretary H.N. 532 Sec-14 Rohtak P.H.N. 9896020567 and Sh. Kalam Singh Nehra, Executive Member P.H.N. 9996033496
4.	Name(s) of the representative present during last inspection.	Sh. O. P. Nandal president & Sh. Kalam singh Nehra Executive member
5.	Assessment out of 10 marks in respect of:	
(a)	JE (Civil) for water supply, sewerage & storm water.	9
(b)	JE (Electrical) for Street light.	9
(c)	JE (Horti.) for Parks	10
(d)	JE (Estate Office) for cleanliness, maintenance of open spaces, sineages, prevention & removal of encroachments.	10
(e)	Steps taken to improve deficiencies noted during the last inspection	There is remarkable improvement.

Signature of President/Gen.Secy./
Authorised Representative of RWA.

TO BE FILED UP BY THE INSPECTING OFFICER:

Whether the Inspecting Officer agrees with the above Assessment done by RWA? If not, then what is his Assessment and reasons therefore.	Yes
---	-----

Name & Signature of the Inspecting Officer.

Annexure-A

List of case pending

S · N o ·	Title of case	Plot/ Boo th	Co urt in wh ich ca se pe ndi ng	Brief History of the Case	State of the case	Next date	Advo cate Nam e
1	Jaya nty Vs. State	425/ 14	C J	Suit for declaration & mandatory injunction directing defendants no. 1&2 to enter & record the plaintiff in there record as owner in possession of the suit property	Repli catio n	24.11.200 8	R a j e s h S h a r m a
2	Krish ana Vs. HUD A	467P /14	D C F	The complainant is seeking the completion certificate and challenged the penalty of Rs. 5000/- imposed by the HUDA as he applied for occupation certificate on 2.11.1999, but at that time the house was not complete and he again applied on 9.11.1999, but on the inspection, various irregularities were found in the construction and a notice in this regard was sent to the	Resp onde nts Evide nce	12.11.200 8	R a j e s h S

				complainant			h a r m a
3	Smt. Rakesh Vs. HUD A	Booth 72/1 4	D C F	The present complaint for getting the T. P. for booth no. 72 as the original allottee got executed the C. Deed of 136 Sq. ft. and refund of administrative charges of Rs. 5000/- and to directed not to get execute the supplementary sale deed/C. Deed of remaining 26 Sq. ft. The complaint challenged the act of the department.	Com plaint s Evide nce	27.11.200 8	R a j e s h S h a r m a
4	HUD A Vs. Anita	70/1 4	St at e C o m m .	Appeal	Appe al filed	Decided copy sent to H.Q.	A m a n d e e p
5	HUD A Vs.	SCF 9/14	St at e	Appeal	Appe al filed	Decided but order of Hon'ble	A m

	Sushi la		Co m m.			High Court not received till date	a n d e e p
6	HUD A Vs. Omp arkas h	411/ 14	D J	Appeal against the judgment and decree of lower court dated 22.09.2007 vide which the suit of the plaintiff was decreed	Decid ed	Decided copy sent to H.Q.	R a j e s h S h a r m a