



# Cases Heard by Commission during 2021-2022

S. NO.	File No., Name and address of Petitioner, Date of hearing	Brief of the case	Decision of the Commission
1.	<p><b>M/DL/207/5/2019</b></p> <p><b>Shri Anwar Khan,</b> S/o Shri Munshi Khan, Village Chawla, P.O. Chawla, Delhi.</p> <p><b>Date of Hearing:</b> <b>18.03.2021, 18.08.2021</b></p>	<p>The Commission took cognizance of the representation dated NIL received on 09.11.2019 of Shri Anwar Khan regarding illegal and forceful termination of his service as Asst. Sub. Inspector (ASI) on false ground. He alleged that the department forcefully terminated his service just after two months eleven days on 20.12.2000 at the age of 47 years. He further informed the Commission that the Department has not offered any opportunity of hearing before termination of his service. He also informed that despite representations to the concerned authorities his case was not considered.</p> <p>In view of the above, the Commission decided to hold another hearing.</p>	<p><b>18.03.2021</b></p> <p>The Commission after hearing the parties is of the view that the respondent was not able to satisfy that there was no discrimination against the petitioner and the petitioner was not even party to the proceeding against him. The Commission directed the respondent to allow the petitioner to work with them to which the respondent fairly agreed but requested the Commission to give an advisory to the petitioner to work properly and not to indulge in any activity that may cause hindrance. The Commission advised petitioner to conduct himself appropriately as per work norms and work diligently.</p> <p><b>18.08.2021</b></p> <p>The Commission after hearing both the sides and material placed on record is of the view that the grievance of the petitioner was decided by the Hon'ble High Court of Rajasthan and the State Civil Services Tribunal, therefore the petition of Anwar Khan cannot be considered further on legal ground in the Commission.</p>





S. NO.	File No., Name and address of Petitioner, Date of hearing	Brief of the case	Decision of the Commission
2.	<b>M/DL/112/00015/2021</b>  Ms. Samira Ali, D/o Syed Aftab Ali, H. No. 144, 1st Floor, Pocket-II, Jasola Vihar, New Delhi-110028.  <b>Date of Hearing :</b> <b>12.04.2021</b>	<p>The Commission took cognizance of the representation dated 2.11.2020 of Ms. Samira Ali regarding demand of dowry against her husband and her in-laws and attempt to rape by the husband. Shri Syed Aftab Ali, father of petitioner submitted that the complaint filed by the petitioner with the police has been registered against the husband, Shayan Ahmed Siddiqui and father-in law, mother-in law, son-in law. The court has issued NBW against the accused persons. He further informed that the Police has issued LOC against Shayan Ahmed Siddiqui. But the husband Shayan Ahmed Siddiqui has not been attending investigation and the police is not taking action. He informed the Commission that Shayan Ahmed Siddiqui has fled from India and is residing in Germany.</p> <p>In view of the above, the Commission decided to hold the hearing.</p>	<p>The Commission after hearing the parties is of the view that the petitioner has filed complaint and FIR has been registered against the accused persons and also the husband has approached the Hon'ble High Court in the same matter. The matter is sub-judice before the competent court of law in view thereof, no action is required in the matter by NCM and, decided to close the case.</p>
3.	<b>B/MH/319/34/2019</b>  <b>Shri Prafulla S.W. Hadekar,</b> Sindhi Colony, Dhamangaon Railway Colony, District Amravati, Maharashtra.  <b>Date of Hearing :</b> <b>12.04.2021</b>	<p>The Commission took cognizance of the representation dated 17.06.2019 of Shri Prafulla S.W. Hadekar. The petitioner in his representation alleged that he is victim of serious irregularities in the selection procedure of Assistant Technician (Electrical) in ONGC's Advt. No. 01/2013 WOU, Mumbai. The petitioner submitted that though he fulfilled the qualification of the advertisement for the Assistant</p>	<p><b>12.04.2021</b></p> <p>The Commission after hearing both the sides suggested respondent to engage the petitioner as an isolated case on humanitarian ground on outsourced basis as the petitioner is a poor person and the ONGC has very good track record under the Corporate Social Responsibility. More so when prima facie some officials at the time of interview had committed</p>





S. NO.	File No., Name and address of Petitioner, Date of hearing	Brief of the case	Decision of the Commission
		<p>Technician (Electrical) and submitted all the required documents with ONGC and qualified the examination but he was denied appointment.</p> <p>In view of the above, the Commission decided to hold the hearing.</p>	<p>lapses in allowing relaxation in essential eligibility criteria, change of crucial dates of eligibility. The Commission recommended ONGC to take action and inform the Commission within 4 weeks.</p>
4.	<p><b>M/TR/104/00001/2021</b></p> <p><b>Shri Anowar Hossen</b> R/o Ward No. 01, PO Kamal Nagar, R.D. Block, Boxanagar, GP Anandnagar, Anandpur, Sepahijala, Tripura.</p> <p><b>Date of Hearing :</b> <b>22.06.2021, 2.7.2021, 20.12.2021</b></p>	<p>The Commission took cognizance of the representation dated 06.04.2021 received in the Commission on 09.04.2021 from Shri Anowar Hossen as representative of nine complainants mentioned in the memo of parties. Shri Anowar Hossen submitted that the nine complainants who are members of the Minority community, took admission with Gramin Mukta Vidhyalaya Shiksha Sansthan (GMVSS) through their authorized representative in Class 10<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> in the year 2017-18 session for spread of education in the Minority people and children. Shri Anowar Hossen further submitted that he was appointed by Gramin Mukta Vidhyalaya Shiksha Sansthan (GMVSS) as Coordinator of the drop out students from backward and Minority community in Tripura. He also stated that all the students are from financially poor families and living in remote areas of Tripura. Shri Hossen stated that Gramin Mukta Vidhyalaya Shiksha Sansthan (GMVSS)</p>	<p><b>22.06.2021</b></p> <p>The Commission took the non-appearance of the respondent No.2 seriously, that too when the future of about two hundred students are at stake. The Board it appears is not serious about the carrier of the students. In the circumstances the Commission decided to adjourn the hearing for 10 days and summons Hon'ble Chief Minister of Tripura and Chief Secretary Government of Tripura to be physically present on the next date of hearing.</p> <p><b>2.7.2021</b></p> <p>The Commission was not satisfied with reply on behalf of the respondent no.2. It appears that Shri Sen was not properly briefed by the Secretary, Tripura Board of Secondary Education. The Secretary on the last date of hearing was neither present nor given any intimation.</p>





S. NO.	File No., Name and address of Petitioner, Date of hearing	Brief of the case	Decision of the Commission
		<p>had announced to conduct examination and sent date sheets to students and conducted practical examination for both the classes but has not conducted written examination. He alleged that despite several efforts regarding written examination for the session 2017-18 with the Sansthan no satisfactory response was received.</p> <p>In view of the above, the Commission decided to hold another hearing.</p>	<p>In light of the submissions, the Commission adjourned the hearing for 07.07.2021 and directed Secretary Board to file a reply in writing before the next date of hearing.</p> <p><b>20.12.2021</b></p> <p>The Commission in view of the submission of petitioner and respondent no.1 and reply of the respondent no.2, recommends Respondent no.2 Tripura Board of Secondary Examination to permit Respondent No.1 Gramin Mukta Vidhyalaya Shiksha Sansthan GMVSS to conduct examination of the students attached with GMVSS of class 10th and 12th who have completed their first year, in the interest of justice as the students are not at fault but are the sufferers. The Board being a State Instrumentality cannot be ignorant of the fact that students could not be made scapegoat in the fight between two institutions. It is recommended that the examination process be completed within 30 days and accordingly certificate be issued to students and to send report to the Commission.</p>
5.	<p><b>M/UP/700/304/2019</b></p> <p><b>Mohd. Saqlain</b> R/o 4/415, Bakery Wali Gali, Johra Bagh, District-Aligarh, Uttar Pradesh.</p> <p><b>Date of Hearing:</b> <b>22.06.2021</b></p>	<p>The Commission took cognizance of the representation received in the Commission from Shri Mohd. Saqlain regarding illegal construction on the Waqf land in village Pilakhana, District Aligarh.</p>	<p>The Commission in view of the submission of the ADM, directs Shri Saqlain to visit ADM office along with all the necessary files and documents in support of his contentions for resolution of his grievance within 15 days. The matter stands disposed off in the Commission.</p>





S. NO.	File No., Name and address of Petitioner, Date of hearing	Brief of the case	Decision of the Commission
		<p>The petitioner in the representation alleged that Shri Qasim S/o Hasan Qasim and others, of village Pilakhna are encroaching into about 20 feet of Waqf land adjacent to their property.</p> <p>In view of the above, the Commission decided to hold the hearing.</p>	
6.	<p><b>MISC/MH/82/2017</b></p> <p><b>Sh. Saleem Shaikh</b> Office No. 95 First Floor East Street Galleria, 2421, East Street Camp, Pune, Maharashtra - 411001.</p> <p><b>Date of Hearing:</b> <b>23.06.2021</b></p>	<p>The Commission has received several representations from Shri Saleem Shaikh, for issuance of policy guidelines for accepting unregistered Hiba (Oral Gift) /Hibanama under Muslim Law for grant of loan/security by the Banks in the light of the Supreme Court judgment in Hafeeza Bibi &amp; Ors Shaikh Farid by L.Rs &amp; Ors. (AIR 2011 SC 1695). Shri Saleem Shaikh alleged that despite his letter dated 04.11.2020 to the Chairman, State Bank of India regarding issuance of policy guidelines for acceptance of unregistered Hiba (Oral Gift) under Mohammadan Law for grant of loan/sureties in the light of judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of Hafeeza Bibi &amp; Ors vs. Shaikh Farid &amp; Ors. {AIR 2011 SC 1867} no reply has been received.</p> <p>In view of the above, the Commission decided to hold the hearing.</p>	<p>The Commission in view of the response of the parties decided to recommend to RBI (i) to issue guidelines to all the Nationalized Banks similar to that of Punjab National Bank, (ii) all the nationalized Banks in turn to direct all its branches all over India to follow the same and disposed off the representation</p>
7.	<p><b>UP/113/00162/2021</b></p> <p><b>Ms. Shehla Tahir,</b> Chairperson, Nagar Palika Parishad, Nawab Ganj, District Bareilly, Uttar Pradesh.</p> <p><b>Date of Hearing:</b> <b>25.06.2021</b></p>	<p>The Commission took cognizance of the representation from Ms. Shehla Tahir, Chairperson Nagar Palika Parishad, Nawab Ganj, District Bareilly.</p>	<p>The Commission directed the Addl. District Magistrate to file a report within 7 (seven) days and chairperson's room should be occupied by her free from any interference from any</p>





S. NO.	File No., Name and address of Petitioner, Date of hearing	Brief of the case	Decision of the Commission
		<p>inter alia alleging that she was removed from post of Chairperson of Nagar Palika Parishad without any reason and harassed by Deputy District Magistrate, Nawab Ganj. It is further alleged that the Officer has been humiliating her for the works legally done and to tarnish the reputation of her family in the city. It is further stated that her husband Dr. Mohammad Tahir was implicated under the provisions of Goonda Act.</p> <p>In view of the above, the Commission decided to hold the hearing.</p>	<p>quarter to dis-charge her work freely. It is also recommended to provide separate toilet for the lady Chairperson of Nagar Palika.</p>
8.	<p><b>M/UP/112/00108/2021</b></p> <p><b>Dr. Shamim</b> R/o SRA 3A, Gyan Khand III, Indirapuram, Ghaziabad, Uttar Pradesh.</p> <p><b>Date of Hearing:</b> <b>05.07.2021</b></p>	<p>The petitioner Dr. Shamim submitted that she was unlawfully suspended from the post of Officiating Head of the School at Rashtriya Virjanand Andh Kanya Vidyalaya, Vikas Puri and harassed by the Secretary of the School Society. She stated that she was suspended by the school society which was not initially approved by the Director of Education. She alleged that she has not been paid salary since November, 2020.</p> <p>In view of the above, the Commission decided to hold the hearing</p>	<p>The Commission after hearing the parties directed the respondent authority to revoke the suspension as the petitioner has been under suspension even after 6 months without any cogent reason and the Management is apparently biased against the Petitioner. The Commission further ordered that Director, (Education) may ensure that the petitioner is re-instated and she gets all her pending dues and the intervening period when she was not allowed to enter the school be treated as on duty.</p>
9.	<p><b>S/JK/103/00012/2020</b></p> <p><b>Shri Tejinder Jit Singh Brar</b>, Sewa-II Power Station, Mashka Kathua, P.O. Bag No. 2, Samleu-176325, Dist. Chamba, J&amp;K.</p> <p><b>Date of Hearing:</b> <b>01.07.2021, 09.07.2021</b></p>	<p>The Commission took cognizance of the representation dated 09.11.2020 received from Shri Tejinder Jit Singh Brar, working as Sr. Manager (Mechanical) in NHPC at Sewa-II, Power Station, Kathua, Jammu.</p>	<p><b>1.7.2021</b></p> <p>The Commission after hearing the parties was, however, not satisfied by the explanation given by Shri Sarbhoy and directed him to furnish the information on given four points along with supporting documents within a week and adjourned the hearing.</p>





S. NO.	File No., Name and address of Petitioner, Date of hearing	Brief of the case	Decision of the Commission	S. NO.
		<p>He submitted that he was transferred to Power house Operation and Maintenance Division with reporting officer Shri Mahesh Bajaj, Senior Manager- In-charge, Power-house through General Manager, Shri Lakshmi Chand. He alleged that unlike other six officers who were reporting to Shri Mahesh Bajaj, he was not given clear mutually agreeable targets for a year, but his requests for fixing targets were turned down by Shri Mahesh Bajaj and Shri Lakshmi Chand on the ground that Shri Rajan Kumar, Chief General Manager is not giving clear directions. He further alleged that despite his good performance, his marks were downgraded to lower band in KPA for attributes, like Competency, Value, and Potential with total score to 62 due to bias and discrimination. He submitted that review of PAR was done by an officer against whom a complaint was made. He informed that the annual rating has a direct impact on promotion and other benefits.</p> <p>In view of the above, the Commission decided to hold another hearing.</p>	<p><b>9.7.2021</b></p> <p>The Commission after hearing the parties suggested NHPC to review the matter of the petitioner and find ways to improve the marks of the petitioner. The petitioner was also advised to improve his inter personal relations with the officials and try to meet the expectation of his co-workers.</p>	11.
10.	<p><b>M/UP/60/0166/2010</b></p> <p><b>Shri Rafiq Ahmed</b> R/o Moh. Banjaran, Nawabganj, District Bareilly, Uttar Pradesh.</p> <p><b>Date of Hearing:</b> <b>12.07.2021</b></p>	<p>The Petitioner approached the Commission that despite his representation to various authorities the order dated 14.11.2019 was not complied with.</p>	<p>The Commission after hearing both the sides observed that it was not within the ambit of Commission to facilitate possession of the property in favour of Shri Rafiq Ahmed and hence decided to dispose off the petition.</p>	





S. NO.	File No., Name and address of Petitioner, Date of hearing	Brief of the case	Decision of the Commission
		<p>In the representation dated 09.01.2021 the petitioner stated that he took possession of the said property. He alleged that Inspector in charge of Police Station Nawabganj called him on 07.01.2021 and abused and physically assaulted him. He also submitted that a challan under section 151 of Cr.PC was issued against him.</p> <p>In view of the above, the Commission decided to hold the hearing.</p>	
11.	<p><b>J/DL/104/00014/2021</b></p> <p><b>Shri R.C. Jain</b> A-50, 1st Floor, Gate No.-3, Gali No.1, Mahendru Enclave, Delhi-110033,</p> <p><b>Date of Hearing:</b> <b>19.07.2021</b></p>	<p>The Commission took cognizance of the representation dated 23.03.2021 of Shri R.C Jain regarding harassment and discrimination by Central Bank of India, Karol Bagh, Branch, New Delhi. The Petitioner stated that he took loan 20 years back from the respondent Bank. He alleged that bank has wrongly made his account as Non- Performing Account (NPA). He also stated that a detailed clarification was given by him but no one from the Bank is ready to listen. He further alleged that in 2017, two crore was sanctioned by the Bank as Working Capital Limits but the same was not released on time. The Petitioner further alleged that in one of his accounts, overdraft limit was 50 lakhs but the same was unilaterally reduced to 24 lakhs without any reason.</p>	<p>The Commission after hearing the parties and on the request of the petitioner and oral acceptance thereon given by the Bank's representative, recommended that the Bank be granted three months' time to Petitioner to settle the account and in case the petitioner brings a customer, the Bank may co-operate in showing the property, during which process, proper record along with video clipping may be maintained.</p>





S. NO.	File No., Name and address of Petitioner, Date of hearing	Brief of the case	Decision of the Commission
		<p>The Petitioner further alleged that the Bank has several schemes for settlement of NPA accounts under Non- Discretionary / Non- Discriminatory (NDND) but the Bank in connivance with dealers/ brokers is bent upon to sell his property mortgaged with the Bank. The Petitioner stated that he tried to submit a letter dated 22.3.2021 to the Bank's authorities but they refused to accept the letter. It is also stated that in the letter that he is willing to repay the bank's dues in terms of Bank's Non-Discretionary/ Non-Discriminatory Scheme but the Bank manager is not ready to listen.</p> <p>In view of the above, the Commission decided to hold the hearing.</p>	
12.	<p><b>M/UP/110/00037/2021</b></p> <p><b>Shri Qutubuddin</b> R/o Harijan Basti, Nawabganj, District Bareilly, Uttar Pradesh.</p> <p><b>Date of Hearing:19.07.2021</b></p>	<p>The Commission received a representation on 14.01.-2021 from petitioner, Shri Qutubuddin regarding encroachment of his land by land mafia. The petitioner stated that he along with his relatives is co-owner of the property measuring 6 Bighas out of Gata No. 340 of an area of 2.153 hectare in Village Mundia Jagir purchased from Shri Mohd. Azhar and Mohd. Athar, both sons of Anwar Hussain on 03.11.2012, duly registered with the concerned authority. The petitioner further submitted that thereafter the (co-owners of the above property viz.</p>	<p>The Commission directed the Revenue Authority to demarcate the property measuring quarter to 6 bigha in Gata No. 340 of an area 2.153 hectare in Village Mundia Jagir, Tahsil Baheri, Bareilly and handover possession of the land to Petitioner which is registered in his name. The Commission also decided to visit the site in due course.</p>





S. NO.	File No., Name and address of Petitioner, Date of hearing	Brief of the case	Decision of the Commission
		<p>Nasiruddin, Qutubuddin, Hanif Khan and Mohd. Irfan) purchased a property measuring 5 Bigha, 10 Biswa.</p> <p>He also informed that Nasiruddin died due to accident and Khusruddin, father of Nasiruddin and Hanif Khan have become dishonest and refused to get the property transferred in his name. He alleged that Mohd. Hanif and Khusruddin fraudulently sold part of the property to Sh. Gaus Mohammad &amp; others. The petitioner further submitted that proceeding under section 116 of Revenue Act. has been filed before the Deputy District Magistrate, Bahedi in 2020, which is pending. The petitioner alleged that Shri Gaus Mohammad and others with the help of land mafia are trying to encroach portion of land and are carrying illegal construction. He also stated that a complaint was filed with the concerned Police Station and alleged that Police Inspector, Shri Daya Shankar, has demanded bribe of Rs. 2 lac to maintain status quo.</p> <p>In view of the above, the Commission decided to hold the hearing.</p>	
13.	<b>M/DL/113/00118/2020</b> <b>Shri Amiruddin</b> S/o Mohd. Ilyas, K-311,	The Commission took cognizance of the representation dated 01.12.2020 of Shri Amiruddin,	<b>27.07.2021</b>  The Commission in view of the contradiction as





S. NO.	File No., Name and address of Petitioner, Date of hearing	Brief of the case	Decision of the Commission
	<p>Kathaputli Colony, Pandav Nagar, Delhi-110008</p> <p><b>Date of Hearing:</b> <b>27.07.2021, 14.12.2021</b></p>	<p>S/o Mohd. Ilyas regarding harassment and torture by DDA officials. The Petitioner has stated that in pursuance to notice dated 31.05.2017 of DDA, he has deposited all the documents for allotment of Jhuggi in his name in Katpulti JJ Colony with the department. He alleged that despite providing all relevant documents such as Ration Card, Aadhar Card, Driving Licence, Punjab National Bank Pass-book, HDFC Bank Passbook, UCO Bank Pass book, Copy of Passport and Voter ID issued by Election Commission, showing his possession and address at K-311, Kathputli J.J. Colony and filing photographs of his Jhuggi, the DDA officials due to malafide are not allotting Jhuggi in his name.</p> <p>In view of the above, the Commission decided to hold another hearing</p>	<p>pointed out directed DDA to verify its record pertaining to Election ID of the petitioner and submit report within 15 days. The petitioner was directed to file its rejoinder to the reply of DDA. Further, the Commission will also verify the genuineness of the Election ID submitted by the petitioner from the Election Commission of India.</p> <p><b>14.12.2021</b></p> <p>The Commission after hearing both the parties is of the view that there is prima facie error while conducting the process of identification as the documents such as Voter ID Card -of 2009 besides Pass Port dated 17.06.2014, Pass Book of Bank, Driving License of 2012 issued by the Transport Authority are that of the address of K-311. The Commission without going into allegation and counter allegation made by the parties, recommended DDA to allot flat as per scheme for the legitimate claim of the petitioner and also the petitioner may not have impression that he was deprived of his rights because he belongs to a Minority community. A report in this regard may be submitted by the DDA within 30 days</p>





S. NO.	File No., Name and address of Petitioner, Date of hearing	Brief of the case	Decision of the Commission
14.	<p><b>C/KL/801/22/2019</b></p> <p><b>Mr. Junior John</b> S/o Late K.M. John, R/o Kaniyamkunel House, Village &amp; PO Kannakary, Taluk- Meenachil, District-Kottayam, Kerala</p> <p><b>Date of Hearing:</b> <b>10.08.2021</b></p>	<p>The Commission took cognizance of the representation dated 09.08.2019 of Mr. Junior John, District Kottayam, Kerala. The petitioner has stated that he joined Kerala police on 01.04.1993 as a constable but due to back pain he couldn't continue further training. He submitted a leave application on medical grounds. He was forced to undergo medical examination before the Medical Board in Trissur without considering his application. He submitted a medical certificate but that was rejected because it was issued by a private doctor. He was removed from service on the basis of the medical certificate issued by the Medical Board. Later on, he approached court and court directed to Govt. Secretary for his personal hearing. He again went through the medical examination conducted by Special Medical Board referred by State Medical Board and in the report it was cleared that his illness can't be cured.</p> <p>In view of the above, the Commission decided to hold the hearing.</p>	<p>The Commission after hearing the respondents directed the respondents to file their reply so that same can be sent to the Petitioner for filing rejoinder. The matter was adjourned.</p>
15.	<p><b>269/VC/AR/10/2021-NCM</b></p> <p><b>Mohd. Hanif</b> R/o 7571, Quresh Nagar, Sadar bazar, Delhi.</p> <p><b>Date of Hearing:</b> <b>14.12.2021</b></p>	<p>The Commission took cognizance of the Representation of Shri Mohd. Hanif regarding alleged denial of treatment of Mohd Aamir by Manipal Hospital, Dwarka. It is stated that he belongs to economically weaker section</p>	<p><b>14.12.2021</b></p> <p>The Commission after hearing both the sides is of the considered view that the Hospital is not sensitive to the health and life of the petitioner and despite their own recommendation</p>





S. NO.	File No., Name and address of Petitioner, Date of hearing	Brief of the case	Decision of the Commission	S. NO.	Fi of
		and is under treatment since 2019 in Manipal Hospital, Dwarka. He further submitted that as per advice of the doctor he has to undergo kidney transplant. He alleged that despite doctor's recommendation for operation, the Hospital has not conducted operation so far. He also submitted that donor for operation is also available but for the reason best known to the hospital he has not been operated upon so far and he apprehend for his life. In view of the above, the Commission decided to hold hearing.	recommendation for transplant in 2019 even in last month of 2021, the hospital is taking plea regarding patient's eligibility and that transplant will be done in due course. The Commission recommended Hospital to complete the due process and admit the petitioner within 10 days to start the process of transplant and report to the Commission.		
16.	<b>M/UP/319/727/2018</b>  <b>Shri Jawad Ahmed</b> S/o Shri Abdul Gaffar, R/o 209, Tank Road, 7th Cross, N.R Mohalla, Mysore, Karnataka.  <b>Date of Hearing:</b> <b>05.10.2021, 23.11.2021</b>	Petitioner Shri Jawad Ahmed submitted a comp-laint dated 11.02.2021 stating that Shri Sunil Kumar, Forest Guard filed a complaint on 19.11.-2020 at P.S. Bhopa. In the complaint it is alleged that Smt. Nazia Afridi and her son in-law Sufi Jawad Ahmed (Petitioner) and others have destroyed part of reserved forest land by raising construction, changing and altering position of public land and pruning/cutting trees on 19.11.2020. He further stated that on the date of incidence he was at village Bhaicondi Sharif Dargah, District Rampur. At the time of occurrence as mentioned in the report filed by the Forest Employee, he was about 200 KM away	<b>5.10.2021</b>  The Petitioner urged that no construction has been raised by him, as alleged by the Respondent, since he is not a permanent resident and any construction made would have been made earlier. In view of the above submissions the Commission decided to call the officials from the Forest Department and the IO who has conducted the enquiry/ investigated the matter, and, decided to adjourn the Hearing.  <b>23.11.2021</b>  The Commission in view of the submission of both the parties recommended Senior Superin-tendent of Police	17.	





S. NO.	File No., Name and address of Petitioner, Date of hearing	Brief of the case	Decision of the Commission
		<p>from village Biharigarh at Toll Plaza Naimatpur. He also stated that he filed an affidavit with SSP Muzaffarpur stating whole facts. The Petitioner further stated that cases at Civil Judge, Senior Division, Muzaffarnagar and at Uttar Pradesh Waqf Tribunal, Lucknow are pending with regard to dispute against Forest Authority. The petitioner requested the Commission that Police may be directed to enquire the case properly.</p> <p>In view of the above, the Commission decided to hold another hearing.</p>	<p>Muzaffarnagar to get the matter reinvestigated and proceed in accordance with law against those who are involved in the alleged offences. The Police should ensure that no innocent person is harassed and face rigors of criminal proceedings.</p>
17.	<p><b>S/DL/319/36/2018</b></p> <p><b>Shri M.S. Randhawa</b> 222, Rashpati Board Cabinet Apartments, Plot No. -3, Sec.-10, Dwarka, New Delhi</p> <p><b>Date of Hearing:</b> <b>11.10.2021 - 09.11.2021</b></p>	<p>The Commission took cognizance of the petition dated 09.03.2018 of Shri M.S. Randhawa. The Petitioner submitted that he is the owner of property at khasra No. 1/18, measuring 1008 sq. yds. in village Dhulsiras, New Delhi. The said plot is situated under high tension wire, where no construction is allowed. He alleged that some anti-social elements such as Raj Narain constructed two storied building on the part of land of his plot and on DDA land. He alleged that despite several complaints filed before the Municipal Authority, Police, and Electricity Department, no action has been taken by the authorities. He further submitted that despite order dated 24.05.2018 to demolish the offending portion illegally occupied,</p>	<p><b>11.10.2021</b></p> <p>The Commission after hearing the petitioner and the respondent and perusing the record, directed respondent to get the property of the petitioner vacated as per the SDM's report dated 21.01.2021 and to demolish/remove the encroachment with the help of the concerned Police authorities within 3 weeks and submit compliance report at least three days prior to the next date of hearing i.e. 09.11.2021. It was further decided to write to the Commissioner of Police, Delhi with a copy to the Dy. Commissioner of Police, South-West to provide necessary police assistance to the Respondent Authority for vacation of the property of Shri M.S. Randhawa.</p>





S. NO.	File No., Name and address of Petitioner, Date of hearing	Brief of the case	Decision of the Commission
		<p>the order was not complied by the concerned Authority.</p> <p>In view of the above, the Commission decided to hold another hearing.</p>	<p><b>09.11.2021</b></p> <p>The Commission after hearing the petitioner and the respondent recommended that no action be taken on those properties on which stay orders have been given by Hon'ble Delhi High Court and Appellate Tribunal, MCD. However, appropriate action may be taken by respondent Authority on the remaining properties not covered under the Stay orders.</p>
18.	<p><b>M/UP/101/00445/2020</b></p> <p><b>Smt. Parveen Begum</b> W/o Shri Haji Aafaq, R/219, Guljare Ibrahim, Bhumia ka Pul, Distt. Meerut, Uttar Pradesh.</p> <p><b>Date of Hearing:</b> <b>25.10.2021, 07.12.2021,</b> <b>03.01.2022</b></p>	<p>The Commission took cognizance of the Complaint dated 04.09.2020 received on 10.09.2020. Shri Suhail, son of the petitioner Smt. Parveen Begum submitted that his father, Haji Aafaq had purchased a property No. 220 twenty years back at Bhumia ke Pul and he was running a restaurant on part of the property. He also submitted that his father had appointed Mohammad Qadir as Munshi in the restaurant. In 2015 his father was admitted in Pant Hospital, Delhi due to heart problem and had undergone heart operation. Due to ill health of his father, Shri Qadir started looking after the business of restaurant on a commission basis. He further stated that after Covid lockdown the restaurant was closed as the business had badly affected. He informed the Commission that his father thereafter decided to construct a new Complex and demolished the old building</p>	<p><b>25.10.2021</b></p> <p>The Commission after hearing both the sides recommended that inquiry should be conducted by a Senior IAS Officer of the Government of UP particularly when there is allegation against the then SP, City. It is also recommended that if the Petitioner's claim on property is true, the possession should be given to them as that of 28.07.2020 and the property of the petitioner should be protected. It is also recommended that FIRs of theft registered against the petitioner and her family may be examined in view of the observation made in the report of the SDM( City). A report in this regard should be submitted to the Commission by December, 2021.</p>





S. NO.	File No., Name and address of Petitioner, Date of hearing	Brief of the case	Decision of the Commission
		<p>He alleged that Shri Qadir on 24.06.2020 came and insisted to run the restaurant and if he will not be allowed, threatened for the life of his father and family members and to implicate them in false cases. He further informed the Commission that his father due to fear of Qadir filed a case before the Civil Judge, Senior Division, Meerut. In the suit the Hon'ble Court was pleased to pass status quo order on 28.07.2020. He further alleged that on 14.08.2020, at around 6 P.M., Qadir along with 10-12 Police persons of Police Station Lesadi gate and 20-30 criminal elements (Gundas) came to his place and disregarding the status quo order of the Hon'ble Court started beating them and damaging their belonging and house hold items. He further alleged that when he tried to show the status quo order passed by the Court to the police, they said that such orders are thrown in the dustbin in the Police station. He further alleged that the Police, Lesadi gate came to SSP Office and took them to Police station and lodged them in police custody and on the next day the Police registered a false case against him, his father and uncle and arrested them. He alleged that the Police is helping the accused Shri Qadir.</p> <p>In view of the above, the Commission decided to hold hearing.</p>	<p><b>7.12.2021</b></p> <p>The Commission after hearing both the sides recommend that the petitioner should be called in the inquiry proceeding by the Chief Development Officer, District Meerut and the report of the Chief Development Officer may be provided to the Commission as well. It is also recommended that GST Department and Nagar Nigam may start appropriate proceeding against Mohd. Qadir for obtaining GST by filing false documents.</p> <p>The matter is adjourned to 03.01.2022.</p> <p><b>3.1.2022</b></p> <p>The Commission after hearing both the sides recommended that the petitioner should be called in the inquiry proceeding conducted by the Chief Development Officer, District Meerut. The District Magistrate is also recommended that other police officers as mentioned in the report of the Ld. ADM City, who were involved in harassing petitioner and her family members on the basis of false cases filed against them by Mohd. Qadir, be also included in the inquiry before the Chief Development Officer. The report of the Chief Development Officer may be provided to the Commission as well. It is further recommended that</p>





S. NO.	File No., Name and address of Petitioner, Date of hearing	Brief of the case	Decision of the Commission
			<p>Electricity Department may take action to remove the electricity meter got installed by Mohd. Qadir in the premises of the petitioner on the basis of forged documents.</p> <p>The GST Department and Nagar Nigam may expedite appropriate proceeding against Mohd. Qadir for obtaining GST by filing false documents.</p> <p>The District Magistrate and SSP, Meerut are also recommended to be personally present on the next date of hearing. The matter is adjourned.</p>
19.	<p><b>M/UP/110/00305/2021</b></p> <p><b>Shri Shabih Ahmad</b> Mutawalli and Mohd. Khalid S/o Shri Ehsaan Ahmad, R/o Moh. Gher Munaf, Amroha, Uttar Pradesh.</p> <p><b>Date of Hearing:</b> <b>22.11.2021</b></p>	<p>The Commission took cognizance of the representation of Shri Shabih Ahmad, Mutawalli, Mohd. Khalid S/o Ehsaan Ahmad, Amroha regarding in action in demolishing and sealing of unauthorized under construction shops in Waqf No.951, Amroha by few influential/powerful persons. The petitioner has stated that the under construction shops in front of Waqf no.951, were demolished by the some powerful persons. The matter was registered with the District Magistrate on 4.6.2021.</p> <p>Report was sought from District Managing and Senior Superintendent of Police, District Amroha, vide letter dated 16.7.2021 followed by reminders dated 9.8.2021, 24.9.2021 and 20.10.2021. The reply/report was not been received.</p> <p>In view of the above, the Commission decided to hold the hearing.</p>	<p>The Commission after hearing the parties recommended the police to implement the order passed by the Competent Authority i.e. Civil Court as there is no stay in the appeal. It is also recommended that the appeal filed by the opposite party may be decided by the District Magistrate at the earliest as the same is pending since long.</p>





S. NO.	File No., Name and address of Petitioner, Date of hearing	Brief of the case	Decision of the Commission
--------	---	-------------------	----------------------------

20. S/UP/319/727/2019

**Shri Mohan Singh**  
S/o Shri Amreek Singh,  
R/o Village Hathmana  
Pargana Choumala, Tehsil  
Bahedi,  
Dist. Bareilly, Uttar Pradesh.

**Date of Hearing: 22.11.2021**

The Commission took cognizance of the representation dated 13.8.2019 received from Mohan Singh inter alia stating that Gurudwara Baba Budha Saheb Uttam Nagar, Tehsil Bahedi is situated at NH74. He alleged that the authorities deliberately gave curve to the road and trying to demolish the Gurudwara. The petitioner placed a report dated 02.08.2017 in which it is mentioned that if the road was not curved the Gurudwara could have been saved from demolition. Shri Singh also placed a letter dated 11.11.2019 of the Addl. District Magistrate, Bareilly stating that if the acquisition was done from both sides of the road, the Gurudwara and school could have been saved.

In view of the above, the Commission decided to hold the hearing.

The Commission after hearing contentions of the both parties decided to visit Gurudwara Baba Budha Saheb Uttam Nagar, Tehsil Bahedi on 11.12.2021. The Commission in the meanwhile decided to obtain the technical opinion of concerned department of IIT Roorkee, whether the road can be aligned without demolishing the buildings in existence as claimed by the petitioner and without going into long drawn procedure as submitted by the NHAI. The site plan submitted by both the parties may be provided to IIT Roorkee for its technical opinion. A reply has been received from IIT Roorkee stating that (i) As such road can't be aligned without demolishing either the existing buildings (School and shops of Gurudwara Sahib) OR buildings on other side of road. (ii) If instead of school and shops of Gurudwara Sahib, buildings on other side of road are to be demolished, the proper procedure of NHAI is to be followed along with compensation. (iii) Presently there is no traffic congestion on the road. However, in future, traffic may increase and congestion may occur.

In view of the reply of IIT, case has been disposed of.





File No., Name and address of Petitioner, Date of hearing	Brief of the case	Decision of the Commission
<p>1. <b>M/UP/110/00277/2021</b></p> <p>Shri Saeed Ahmad S/o Shri Khalil Ahmad, R/o Moh. Godam Kasba &amp; Thana Baheri, District Bareilly, Uttar Pradesh.</p> <p><b>Date of Hearing: 23.11.2021</b></p>	<p>The petitioner Shri Saeed Ahmad in his representation inter alia stated that he is owner of property at Gata No. 407 measuring 0.238 Hectare situated at Village Bahedi MBA, Tehsil Bahedi, District Bareilly, UP. He alleged that Zahiruddin and Nizamuddin both sons of Khalil Ahmad, R/o Moh. Islam Nagar, Vill. &amp; PS Bahedi have encroached upon his land of above Gata No. 407. He has stated that measurement of the land was done by the former SDM on 18.6.2020 but above encroachers have not removed the encroachment. He alleged that several complaints were filed against them but no action have been taken. He alleged that present SDM Shri Rajesh Chandra has connived with Zahiruddin and Nizamuddin.</p> <p>In view of the above, the Commission decided to hold the hearing.</p>	<p>As both the parties are not present and the petitioner has not communicated about his absence it appears he is not interested in pursuing his grievance, hence the Comm-ission decided to close the matter.</p>
<p>2. <b>M/UP/110/00577/2021</b></p> <p><b>Shri Arif</b> Shri Ikram, R/o Village Nanheda, Buddhakheda, P.S. Naagal, Tehsil Deoband, District Saharanpur, Uttar Pradesh.</p> <p><b>Date of Hearing: 29.11.2021, 7.12.2021</b></p>	<p>The Commission took cognizance of the representation of Shri Arif. The petitioner stated that on 22.12.1995 he alongwith his wife Smt. Imrana purchased agricultural land measuring 0.0170.85 hectare out of Khasra no. 221 rakba 0/207 from Shri Kartar Singh against consideration. The petitioner submitted that one Shri Alamghir fraudulently got his name mutated on the basis of Bainama allegedly executed in 1994.</p>	<p><b>29.11.2021</b></p> <p>The Commission in view of the submission of the parties, recommended Tehsildar to initiate appropriate action against Shri Alamghir under the relevant provision of Cr. P.C. within one week.</p> <p>The Commission also recommended that matter of Shri Arif may be decided and inform the Commission on the next date of hearing on 07.12.2021.</p>





S. NO.	File No., Name and address of Petitioner, Date of hearing	Brief of the case	Decision of the Commission
		<p>The petitioner further submitted that he obtained a document from the concerned revenue department establishing that Shri Kartar Singh has not executed any Bainama in the year 1994. There after mutation done in favour of Alamghir was cancelled but the department has not mutated property in his favour.</p> <p>In view of the above, the Commission decided to hold another hearing.</p>	<p>The Commission in view of the submission of the parties, recommended as follow:</p> <p>(i) The District Magistrate Saharanpur to initiate appropriate action against Shri Alamgir under the relevant provision of Cr. P.C. within 10 days as he had filed sale deed of 1994 which was found fabricated by the Competent Authority and his sale deed was cancelled;</p> <p>(ii) The Commission further recommend that the bar of section 168A of UP Z A L R Act, taken by the Tehsildar does not arise as the land falls within the Aabadi Area and not an agricultural land as claimed by petitioner. In view of the decision in the case of Ram Kali Vs. State of UO &amp; Ors. [2006 (101) RD7(H)], the process of mutation of the property in favour of Shri Arif and his wife Smt. Imrana may be decided within 10 days and to inform the Commission thereafter, failing which another hearing may be fixed.</p>
23.	<p><b>M/UK/104/00020/2020</b></p> <p><b>Smt. Anjum</b> W/o Shri Aleem, Village Sikrodha, P.S. Bhagwanpur, District, Haridwar, Uttarakhand.</p> <p><b>Date of Hearing: 29.11.2021</b></p>	<p>The Commission took cognizance of the representation of Smt. Anjum, wife of Shri Aleem. In the representation it is alleged that the Police has falsely implicated the husband of petitioner in false criminal</p>	<p>The Commission in view of the submission of the respondent decided to close the matter in NCM.</p>





File No., Name and address of Petitioner, Date of hearing	Brief of the case	Decision of the Commission
	<p>case. It is alleged that on 03.06.2020 police in civilian dress came to her house and forcibly took her husband. It is also stated that on 04.06.2020 she came to know through social media that her husband was taken to Saharanpur and was shot at his leg in fake encounter.</p> <p>In view of the above, the Commission decided to hold the hearing.</p>	
<p><b>M/OR/113/00002/2021</b></p> <p><b>Mohd. Moijibullah Khan</b> R/o Plot No.-9, Indraprastha, Phase-1, Pokhariput, Bhubaneshwar, District Khordha, Odisha.</p> <p><b>Date of Hearing: 07.12.2021</b></p>	<p>The Commission took cognizance of the representation dated 22.02.2021 of Mohammed Moijibullah Khan, R/o Plot No-9, Indraprastha Phase-1, Pokhariput, Bhubaneshwar, District Khordha, Odisha. The petitioner stated that he is a permanent employee of National Informatics Centre in the present post of Scientist-E. NIC conducts yearly Promotion Review for the employees of different posts. In his post, after the Residency Period of five years is over, an employee becomes eligible for in-situ promotion to next higher grade in accordance with the Flexible Compensatory Scheme (FCS). Accordingly, he became eligible for promotion to higher grade i.e. Scientist-F on 01.1.2018. Since the aforesaid policy allows only three consecutive chances of Promotional Review, he appeared in three consecutive Promotional Reviews in the year 2018, 2019 and 2020 and was not given promotion without</p>	<p>The Commission decided to write a letter to Ministry of Electronic and Information Technology, Government of India to relax the existing policy to minimize the chances of discrimination, giving the benefit of doubt to the Petitioner and his allegation that assessment was not done properly. The petitioner's case should be considered as an exceptional case and provided one more chance of assessment. NIC may provide copy of the letter sent to Ministry regarding relaxation in the policy to enable the Commission to write to MIETY. The case is therefore closed in the Commission.</p>





S. File No., Name and address NO. of Petitioner, Date of hearing	Brief of the case	Decision of the Commission
	<p>assigning any reason to him by NIC till date. Now as per FCS policy, there is no more chance available to him for promotion and he has more than 5 years to retire and his carrier prospect will be hampered. He alleged that he was deprived of promotion for being a Minority. He also alleged that those persons who got promoted in his place have less contribution, achievement, award, appreciation etc.</p> <p>In view of the above, the Commission decided to hold the hearing.</p>	
<p>25. <b>M/UP/110/00353/2021</b></p> <p><b>Shri Jahid Hasan</b> S/o Sayyed Hasan, Address House no. 67, Mohalla Qazi ZadGan, Chandpur, District Bijnaur, Uttar Pradesh.</p> <p><b>Date of Hearing: 27.12.2021</b></p>	<p>The Commission took cognizance of the representation of Shri Jahid Hasan regarding illegal encroachment on the land of ancestors of the petitioner by Shri Shamshool Haque, Aadil, Aatir and others. Shri Nadeem Ahmad appearing for Jahid Hasan submitted that land of khasra no. 1528 and 1531 at Mohalla Mufti Saray (Satila Wali Chungi) are NZA land. He submitted that his forefather Ghulam Mustafa had purchased the same on 4th February 1880. According to Sale Deed Khasra Nos. 910, 911, 913, 912 are at present comes under Khasra No. 1528 at Satila wali Chungi. He alleged that Shri Shamshul Haque, Adil, Atir and others in connivance with the Lekhpal, Chandpur encroached upon his land. He further alleged that accused persons based on a Hiba Nama of 1918 in favour of</p>	<p>The Commission after hearing both the sides recommends that District Magistrate, Bijnaur should shift the Lekhpal from the case and thereafter seek fresh report about the possession of the land in Khasra Nos. 1528 and 1531. The District Magistrate should also direct an enquiry against the Lekhpal why he has given four different reports in respect of the land under Khasra Nos. 1528 and 1531 on four different dates i.e. 19.04.2018, 18.07.2018, 03.05.2019 and 20.10.2021. The SDM is recommended that while considering the case pending before him, should consider fresh report of Lekhpal and should not take cognizance of the different reports submitted by the earlier Lekhpal while passing orders in this case.</p>





S. NO.	File No., Name and address of Petitioner, Date of hearing	Brief of the case	Decision of the Commission
		<p>their great grandmother, Tarifun Nisa managed to show possession on the above khasra numbers by misleading the Lekhpal. It was further alleged that Ashok Kumar, Lekhpal has given four different reports in respect of same property at the behest of the accused persons.</p> <p>In view of the above, the Commission decided to hold the hearing.</p>	
26.	<p><b>S/HP/801/3/2018</b></p> <p><b>Shri Parvinder Singh,</b> R/o Plot No.8, Dhalpur, Kullu, District Kullu, Himachal Pradesh.</p> <p><b>Date of Hearing:</b> <b>29.12.2021</b></p>	<p>The Petitioner in his representation dated 02.09.-2021 has stated that in pursuance to the Commission's decision and visit of Hon'ble Vice Chairman dt. 28.11.2020, he was allotted a shop near Banga Traders Dhalpur, Kullu measuring 14*40 sq.ft on ground floor in lieu of plot no.8 Municipal Council, Dhalpur Bazar main market measuring 13*35 sq. ft. He further stated that he applied and got water connection and electric connection. The Petitioner alleged that according to the decision dated 28.11.2020 it was assured that size of the plot will be 14*40 (560 sq.ft.) but the size of the allotted shop is less than 560 sq.ft i.e.442 only. It was also stated that just besides his shop there is a public urinal and the surrounding area are not conducive and unhygienic and without ventilation. He requested the Commission that he may be allotted space situated just behind his shop</p>	<p>The Commission after hearing both the sides, recommended Shri Ashutosh Garg, Deputy Commissioner, Kullu to look into the matter personally keeping in view the agony and harassment suffered by the Petitioner and his family due to wrath of the 1984 riots coupled with devastating fire of 1992 in which the Petitioner suffered loss of his livelihood. The case of the Petitioner should be considered sympathetically and he may be compensated as per law and as recommended by the Commission. The Commission also recommended that in case backside shop due to some reason cannot be made available for Petitioner an alternative place may be allotted to him and report to Commission within 30 days. The matter is adjourned.</p>





S. NO.	File No., Name and address of Petitioner, Date of hearing	Brief of the case	Decision of the Commission
		<p>unused and lying vacant since long.</p> <p>In view of the above, the Commission decided to hold the hearing.</p>	
27.	<p><b>NCM/81/101/2021</b></p> <p><b>Shri Raghubir Singh Gill</b> President Shri Guru Singh Sabha (Regd.) Dadar, Mumbai &amp; Ors.</p> <p><b>Date of Hearing:</b> <b>29.12.2021</b></p>	<p>It has been brought to the notice of the Commission that Sikh's characters in movies, T.V serials etc. are often not portrayed in the right perspective, respecting the philosophy, history and culture of the Sikh Minority Community. The negative projection of Sikh Community hurts their religious sentiments. The petitioners requested the Commission that prior to giving permission for viewing, the Censor Board should ensure that members from the Minority communities have representation so that movies and or TV serials may not contain material which could be offensive to their religious sentiments. In view of the above, the Commission decided to hold the hearing.</p>	<p>The Commission recommends/advises the respondents that when members are selected in the Committee, it should be kept in consideration that they are having knowledge of philosophy, history and culture of the respective religions as well so that they may be responsible for their decision and at least two members from each community should be appointed. Due care should be taken while projecting image of the Minorities Community related to film scenes. The respondent No.1 Ministry is left to take a decision and report to the Commission as early as possible.</p>
28.	<p><b>S/DL/801/2018</b></p> <p><b>Smt. Amarjit Kaur</b> W/o Late Sh.Ved Prakash, Alottee of CRT No.23 at Baird Road/Doctor Lane, New Delhi.</p> <p><b>Date of Hearing:</b> <b>23.02.2022, 23.03.2022</b></p>	<p>The Commission took cognizance of the representation dated 17.01.2018 of the petitioner regarding long delay of almost 22-23 years in transfer of cycle repair shop- CRT No. 23 at Baird Road/ Doctors Lane in favour of the petitioner, after the death of her husband Shri Ved Prakash, being his legal heir by the NDMC.</p>	<p><b>23.02.2022</b></p> <p>The Commission was not at all convinced by the reply of the Respondent, NDMC and was of the view that since 2018 when the Petitioner approached the Commission, the NDMC has not done justice with her for the last four and half years and the officers nominated/ present were not able to satisfactorily reply to the queries of the Commission.</p>



# NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR MINORITIES

File No., Name and address of Petitioner, Date of hearing	Brief of the case	Decision of the Commission
	In view of the above, the Commission decided to hold another hearing.	<p>The Commission after hearing the parties recommended Respondent, NDMC to decide the case of the Petitioner within 3 weeks and file action taken report on the next date of hearing on 23.03.2022. Secretary, NDMC is directed to be present during the next hearing.</p> <p><b>23.03.2022</b></p> <p>The Commission accepted the undertaking that the status quo of the position will be maintained and the Petitioner will not be disturbed of its possession. The Commission recommended the NDMC to place the case of the Petitioner before the Town Vending Committee and report to the Commission before the next date of hearing i.e. 22.04.-2022. The Petitioner was allowed to file her reply to the Speaking Order of NDMC dated 22.03.2022.</p>
<p><b>M/HR/319/59/2019</b></p> <p><b>Shri Ishaq</b> S/o Shri Hurmat, Multan Khand Nagina, District Nuh-Mewat, Haryana.</p> <p><b>Date of Hearing :</b> <b>23.03.2022</b></p>	The Commission took cognizance of the representation of Shri Ishaq s/o Shri Hurmat, Multhan Khand Nagina, Nuh-Mewat Haryana regarding the matter of removal of the illegal encroachment on his land. A report was called from District Magistrate on 24.10.2019 and followed by subsequent reminders dated 5.6.2021 and 26.8.2021 by the Commission. But no reply was received so far.	<p><b>23.03.2022</b></p> <p>The Commission after hearing both the parties and after perusing the documents submitted by the Petitioner during the hearing, decided not to proceed with regard to dispute of Petitioner and Mr. Amin as both the parties have gone to the Civil Court and any further remedy, lies with competent court of law and advised the Petitioner to approach the Court.</p>

S.  
NO.

30.





S. NO.	File No., Name and address of Petitioner, Date of hearing	Brief of the case	Decision of the Commission
		In view of the above, the Commission decided to hold the hearing.	As the Respondent apart from the report dated 17.03.2022 and Memo submitted dated 23.03.-2022 reiterated that the Gram Panchayat has vacated the land as per the Survey Report 02.07.2016 and 19.07. 2016 no further action is required. Regarding conducting fresh survey/ measurement of Petitioner's property in Khasra No. 362/1, recommended Respondent to carry out survey/ measurement afresh at its own cost in the presence of the Petitioner and all other interested party and to submit a report to the Commission before one month.
30.	<b>M/HR/700/9/2019</b>  <b>Shri Mukesh Khan</b> S/o Shri Ranjeet Khan, Village : Baladi, District- Karnal, Haryana  <b>Date of Hearing :</b> <b>23.03.2022</b>	The commission received a representation dated 24-.01.2019 from the petitioner, Shri Mukesh Khan inter alia stating that in village Baldi there exists a Qabristan in Khewat No. 267, Min, 245, Khatoni No. 292, Khasra No. 43 measuring 6 kanal and 5 Marla. This is a running Qabristan, which is in the control/ record of the Haryana Waqf Board. He further stated that there are 20/ 25 Muslim families in that village and dead are buried in the Qabristan from last several years. The petitioner informed that in Newspaper Indian Express an advertisement was issued by the Haryana Wqf Board to allot 1286.80 Sq. Yds land for commercial purpose.	<b>23.03.2022</b>  The Commission after hearing the respondent and also in view of the fact that the Petitioner has filed a writ petition in this regard in the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, which is pending in the Court of Law and mor-e-over the Petitioner was neither present nor information was received in the Commission for not appearing before the Commission despite the summon being issued to both the parties including Petitioner on 09.03.2022, decided to close the case in NCM.