

● RIGHT TO SERVICE IN INDIA



Kuljit Singh*

Abstract

The Right to Service in India brings about transparency, hassle-free delivery of Public Services and reduces the corruption in providing the Public Services. Not only this, it provides speedy delivery of Public Services and Public Services should be quality services. In India, Right to Service is statutory right for the people of many States, but, at National Level, obtaining the Public Services by the people of India is not a statutory right so far. Government of India is providing Public Services on the basis of Citizens' Charter that is not legally enforceable. Besides, various States have not yet enacted legislation for providing the Right to Service to the people of the States.

Key words

Right to Service, Delivery of Public Services, Citizens' Charter, Designated Officer and Grievance Redress Officer.

I. INTRODUCTION

“Administration is meant to achieve something and not to exist in some kind of an ivory tower, following certain rules of procedure and Narcissus-like, looking on itself with satisfaction. The test after all is the human beings and their welfare”.

Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru¹

Right to Public Services legislation in India comprises statutory laws which guarantee time-bound delivery of various public services rendered to citizens and provides mechanism for punishing the errant public servant if they are deficient in providing the stipulated services. Hence, Right to Service legislation ensures delivery of time bound services to the public. If the concerned officer fails to provide the service in time, he will have to pay a fine. Thus, it is aimed to reduce corruption among the government officials and to increase transparency and public accountability.

Public Service means a commodity or service which is non-rivalrous and non-excludable in nature, and is supplied in public interest regardless of income, jurisdiction by the

*Asst. Professor, Law College Dehradun, Uttaranchal University, Dehradun (U.K.).

¹ Address delivered at the Inaugural meeting of the *India Institute of public Administration (IIPA)* on March 29, 1954, available at: unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public./cgg/upan045780.pdf (last visited on July 20, 2016).

government to its people who have by a social consensus, democratically elected the government and vested it with the power to do so. The service could be publicly funded, contracted, commissioned or procured.

The public services law in India derives its origin from the Citizens Charter of UK, promulgated in 1991. Though it is not a legal document in the strict sense of law, being an agreement of contract entered into between the citizens and the public servants, providing for competent and time bound delivery of services. It sought to add consumer rights to those citizens' rights, equipping users with the means of seeking personal redress if the services they received were inadequate. The objective of the charter was to make public services accountable.

That idea arose from a simple question in UK that if the public service which people have paid for is not good, why should they not get their money back, as they would have the right to purchase it with any shop or service provider in the private sector. The then Prime Minister of UK, John Major explained the intention of the Citizens' Charter in the various ways.²

It will work for quality across the whole range of public services. It will give support to those who use services in seeking better standards. People who depend on public services – patients, passengers, parents, pupils, benefit claimants – all must know where they stand and what service they have a right to expect.

The twelfth report of session 2007- 08 of the Houses of Commons was third on the series off public administration reform in UK. The first of that was the fifth report of session 2007-08, " When Citizens Complain" and the second was the sixth report of the session on " User Involvement in Public Services." Following the sixth report, a volume of oral and written evidence were published as "Public Services: Putting People First."³

In the meantime, in 1997, the right to services moved from "Citizens Charter Programme" and its impact on how public services were viewed, to Charter Mark, in 1997, with the inception of the government headed by Tony Blair. The Charter Mark stuck upon quality of services in ensuring that public services focus on the needs and views of service users, followed by its successor scheme, the Customer Service Excellence Standard. By 2002, that shifted to 'Public Service Guarantees,' which like the national charters introduced under the citizens' charter, was intended to act as a mechanism for setting out the standards of service provision that people can expect from public services utilities.

The Public Service Committee, 2007-08, finally recommended that there should be clear, precise and enforceable statements of people's entitlements to public service. That should be in the form of 'Public Service Guarantees'. The guarantees should specify the minimum standard of service provision that service users can expect, and set out the arrangements for redress, should service providers fail to meet the standard promised.⁴

² Speech by John Major MP at the Conservative Central Council Annual meeting on Mar.23, 1991, referred in the Twelfth Report of the House of Commons Public Administration Select Committee, From Citizens Charter to Public Service Guarantees; Entitlements to Public Services United Kingdom, July 15, 2008 at para 6.

³ *Ibid.* para1.

⁴ *Id.*, para 45.



The scenario was thus shifted from 'Citizens Charter' to 'Public Service Guarantees' in UK. The institution of the guarantees was taken to be a very strong case by the committee to empower users by allowing them to claim their services. It was also clearly indicated that in the provision of public services, it genuinely intended to put "people first."⁵

The Citizens Charter of UK aroused interest worldwide leading to establishments of such initiatives in Belgium (Public Service Users Charter, 1992), Canada (Service Standards Initiative, 1995), Australia (Service Charter, 1997), India (Citizens' Charter, 1997) and so on.

The citizens charters were introduced in India in 1997, which was voluntary in character. That was based on the logo "services first" as in UK. The charters gradually spread through central to state ministries and to their local bodies and organisations. In 2002, a website was launched by the Department of Administrative Reforms and Public Grievances (DARPG) towards consolidating the write up on the progresses and improvements resulted out of citizens charters. The instance of implementation of charters by the Regional Transport Office, Hyderabad, the Jan Seva Kendras in Ahmadabad and Chennai Metro Water Supply and Sewage Board are noteworthy during 1997-2004. In 2005, the service excellence models "Servottam" was initiated to give a new thrust to the implementation of the citizens' charter, both at the central and state levels. The Centralised Public Grievance Redress and Monitoring System (CPGRAMS), a web based portal was launched for lodging complaints by the public in 2007. In 2009, the Report of the Administrative Reforms Commission of Citizen Centric Governance recommended for making citizens charters effective through implementing charter for each unit with redress mechanisms and periodic evaluation of charters.⁶ It also recommended for holding officers accountable for results. It too suggested for suitable mechanism assuring citizens participation in administration.

In view of the above circumstances, the Government of India and of the states felt it necessary to legislate upon such a contingency. They were to make law on entry 8 of concurrent list, viz. actionable wrongs. Public Service Guarantee Acts have been passed by nineteen States and one National Capital Territory of Delhi till the Date.⁷

II. RIGHT TO SERVICES LAW IN INDIA

The Right of Citizens for Time Bound Delivery of Goods and Services and Redressal of their Grievances Bill, 2011, that has recently been introduced in Parliament, confers on every individual citizen, the right to time bound delivery of goods and services, and for redressal of grievances.

It is a welcome step that the governments in India have embarked on law-making on right to services at the centre and in some of the states. The Madhya Pradesh Lok Sewaon Ke Pradan ki Adhinyam, 2010, is the first in that category, which has been followed by enactments in the States of Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Delhi, Himachal Pradesh,

⁵ *Id.*, para 79.

⁶ See also "Statement of Object and Reasons" to the Central Bill, 2011.

⁷ Available at: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Right_to_Public_Services_legislation (last visited on July 21, 2016).

Jammu and Kashmir, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Punjab, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh and Uttarakhand.⁸ Not only this, now, more States have enacted the Right to Service Act. The centre has introduced the Right to Redressal of Grievances Bill, 2011 in the Lok Sabha on the 20th of December 2011, but it did not pass finally. The list of States is given below, which enacted the Right to Service law.

State	Act title
Punjab	The Punjab Right to Service Act, 2011.
Uttarakhand	The Uttarakhand Right to Service Act, 2011.
Madhya Pradesh	The Madhya Pradesh Lok Sewaon Ke Pradan Ki Guarantee Adhiniyam, 2010.
Bihar	The Bihar Lok sewaon ka adhikar Adhiniyam, 2011.
Delhi	The Delhi (Right of Citizen to Time Bound Delivery of Services) Act, 2011
Jharkhand	The Right to Service Act, 2011.
Himachal Pradesh	The Himachal Pradesh Public Services Guarantee Act, 2011.
Rajasthan	The Rajasthan Public Service Guarantee Act, 2011.
Uttar Pradesh	The Janhit Gurantee Act, 2011.
Kerala	The Kerala State Right to Service Act, 2012.
Karnataka	The Karnatka Guarantee of Services to Citizens Act, 2011.
Chhattisgarh	The Chhattisgarh Lok Seva Guarantee Act, 2011.
Jammu and Kashmir	The Jammu and Kashmir Public Services Guarantee Act, 2011.
Odisha	The Odisha Right to Public Services Act, 2012.
Assam	The Assam Right to Public Services Act, 2012.
Gujarat	The Gujarat (Right of Citizens to Public Services) Act, 2013.
West Bengal	The West Bengal Right to Public Services Act, 2013.
Goa	The Goa (Right to Time-Bound Delivery of Public Services) Act, 2013.
Haryana	The Haryana Right to Service Act, 2014.
Maharashtra	The Maharashtra Right to Public Services Act, 2015.

III. A COMPARISON BETWEEN THE STATE PUBLIC SERVICES ACTS⁹

The state government have provided for nodal department for the supervision and monitoring of the implementation of right to public services within states. The only state

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ Sindhu Thulaseedharan, "Right to Public Services in India –A New Legal Scenario" 55*JLI* 59 (2013).



that has a department for that is Madhya Pradesh, where the Department of Public Services Management (DOPSM), controls and co-ordinates the public service delivery mechanism. The states of Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Rajasthan and Delhi respectively has revenue, general administration reforms, and information technology departments as nodal departments.

The officer in the machinery include the designated officers, or their subordinate officers charged with the delivery of services.¹⁰ The appellate authority would be the first appellate authority and the second appellate authority. In some states designated officers from outside the public authority concerned are appointed the appellate authority.¹¹ A notified officer/competent officer or a commission is also appointed by the government for the purpose of implementation of the Acts, as in Chhattisgarh, Karnataka and Punjab. An officer nominated by the government is entrusted with the power of revision upon final under or decision of the second appellate authority.¹²

The designated officer (DO) or the grievance redress officer (GRO) is the lowest in the hierarchy of the state machinery. They are required to provide the service applied for in the 'stipulated time limit' of 30 days. They may reject the application within the time limit with reasons recorded in writing. An eligible person, whose application is either rejected or who is not provided the service within the time limit may file an appeal to the first appellate authority within thirty days from the date of rejection or on the expiry of the given time limit as the case may be. Within the time frame of thirty days, the aggrieved citizen may file a second appeal from the order of first appellate authority, or within 30 days from the date of rejection of his first appeal and pass an order either accepting the appeal or directing the DO to provide the service or reject the appeal, within sixty days from the date of receipt of appeal, the second appellate authority also determines the penalty to be imposed on the DO or GRO, or upon the first appellate authority. The person aggrieved by the final order may make an application for revision of the said order to the commission or an officer nominated in that respect within a period of sixty days from the date of such order. Citizen having applied for such services shall be entitled to seek compensatory cost from the erring officer, say the DO or his subordinating public servant, in case of delay or default in the delivery of such services beyond the stipulated time limit. The government shall appoint by notification, a competent officer to impose cost against the failing public servant concerned.¹³

The state Acts contain similar provision regarding notifying "services" and "stipulated time limit".¹⁴ The "right to service" is defined as the right to obtain service within the

¹⁰ The Acts uniformly provides for designated Officers(Dos), which ought to be 'notified' by the respective states, for every unit of administration with an organizational state head for overall supervision.

¹¹ See the provision of the Acts for first and second appellate authorities. The Delhi Karnataka and Chhattisgarh Acts provide for "Appellate Authority", to be appointed from outside by the government.

¹² For instance, in Rajasthan a nominated officer exercises the power of revision and in Jammu and Kashmir; it is entrusted with a special tribunal.

¹³ See sec. 2 of the Act for definitions of "Designated Officer", "Eligible person", "first Appeal Officer", "Second Appellate Authority", "service", "state government" "stipulated time limit", "right to service", "public Authority"; see also definitions clause for "appellate Authority", "commission", "competent officer", "citizen related service", "designated public servant", in the Punjab, Karnataka, Chhattisgarh, Delhi and Bihar Acts, respectively

¹⁴ See sec. 3 of the Acts. See also, sec. 4 of the Karnataka Act, 2012.

stipulated time limit. Penalty is provided for delay or default in providing service within the time prescribed in the Act. There are similar provisions on appeal, appellate authorities, revision, protection of action taken in good faith, bar of jurisdiction of courts, power to make rules and power to remove difficulties, if any, arising in giving effect to the provisions of the Act, by order by the state government.¹⁵

Apart from similarities, each Act varies significantly in the number of notified service, in the provision for compensation, monitoring mechanism and in the use of technological tools in the process of implementation. The individual Acts too differ slightly in setting up the hierarchy of officials entrusted or designated to deliver services in hearing appeals, for revision and for receiving of orders. The provision for fixing the quantum of penalty imposed on delay or default in delivering services and in deciding appeals, within the stipulated time limit, shows little differences.¹⁶ Among the state Acts, Karnataka Act covers 151 services from 11 departments; Rajasthan spreads over 124 services from 15 departments including power, police, health and revenue and in Bihar, as many as 50 services in 10 departments, up to the lowest of 15 services in Uttar Pradesh. In Jammu and Kashmir, it covers 45 services from departments and in Jharkhand 54 services from 20 departments. In Madhya Pradesh and Delhi each includes 52 services from 16 and 18 departments respectively. The government of Kerala has proposed to notify 13 public services, and nine services separately from the police department.¹⁷

The provision for compensatory costs awarded to the citizen applicant is cast on the competent officer nominated by the by the state government in accordance with the Karnataka, Delhi and Chhattisgarh Acts. It is imposed on the government servant after issue of show cause notice as to why that amount should not be recovered from the officer concerned. In the state Acts of Himachal Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir and Uttarakhand, the second appellant authority shall award compensation as it may deem fit, out of a penalty imposed on the DO or public servant. In the monitoring mechanism, e-governance has been incorporated in the Delhi and Karnataka Acts. The State of Delhi has implemented it through e-state level agreement- software, Adhikaar, in the monitoring and tracking of applications system. In Karnataka, the e-governance scheme Sakala has come into applications since April 2, 2012, the online tracking and monitoring system has been in full application the state of Madhya Pradesh and Bihar as well. In the other states, the complete utilisation of ICT tools has yet to be made.

In the hierarchy of officials notified as DOs, first appellate officer, second appellate authority and nominated officers by state government for revision, the legislation vary considerably there occurs uniformity as to the DO, who is required to provide "service" to the applicant¹⁸ in Karnataka, Chhattisgarh and Delhi, there is a nominated officer

¹⁵ *Supra* note 13.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ *Infra* note 35., Refer the Report on National Consultation, 2011, for notified services in the state, see also T.K. Devasia, "Kerala Introduces Law on Right to services" *The Hindu*, July 25, 2012; Girish Menon, "no fee plea under right to services Act" *The Hindu*, Oct 23, 2012.

¹⁸ See *supra* note 8, for "service" see "Definitions" clause in sec.2 of the Acts.



competent to impose cost on the DO, for default or delay¹⁹ in the delivery of service. The public servant as well as the citizen has the right to go in appeal to a single appellate authority against the order of competent officer.²⁰ In Bihar the DO is called the designed public servant.²¹ The other state Acts provide for the DO and in Appeal to the first and second appellate authorities.²²

The authorities entrusted with power of revision are either an officer nominated by the state government or by a commission constituted by the state government.²³ The nominated officer exists for all state other than for states of Punjab, and Uttarakhand, where right to services commission are constituted for exercising the power of revision. In Uttarakhand, an officer nominated shall suffice. A special tribunal is entrusted with the revision power in Jammu and Kashmir.²⁴ There is no provision for revision in the states of Karnataka., Delhi, and Chhattisgarh, where the competent officer fixes the liability on the erring official.²⁵ The decision of the appellate authority shall be final in these states. The state of Bihar has a revising authority for modifying the orders of the appellate authority and to impose penalty upon the appellate authority, if it is of the opinion that the authority has failed to decide the appeals from the decisions of the appellate authority or on an appeal filed by the application directly upon non-compliance of order by the DO.²⁶

The penalty provision are fixed by the final appellate authority on the DO and the first appellate authority.²⁷ In majority of states, the Acts prescribe fixed amount ranging between Rs. 500 to Rs. 5000 for default and between Rs. 250 to Rs. 5000 for delay upon the DO. The first appellate officer would be penalized in the range between Rs. 500 to Rs. 5000 for failure in deciding the appeal or rejecting it without reasonable cause. In Jammu and Kashmir, the penalty for delay in delivery of service range between Rs.250 per day or Rs. 5000 whichever is less. In case of deficiency in service, the penalty would be Rs. 2000, lump sum. For defaulting FAA the quantum of penalty range between Rs. 500 to Rs. 5000.²⁸

In the State of Chhattisgarh every officer responsible for delivering loksewa, fail to do so, shall be liable to pay cost at the rate of one hundred rupees per day up to a maximum of one thousand recoverable from him towards payment to the applicant citizen.²⁹ In

¹⁹ See ss. 10 & 11 of the Karnataka Act, 2012; ss 9 & 10 of the Delhi Act 2011; and ss 4 & 5 of the Chhattisgarh Act 2011.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, ss. 12, 13 and 7 of the respectively.

²¹ The Bihar Act, 2011, sec. 4.

²² *Supra* note 18.

²³ Sec. 8 of the Act generally. See also The Punjab and Chhattisgarh Acts, sec. 10.

²⁴ The Jammu & Kashmir Act, 2011, sec. 15

²⁵ See ss. 11, 10 & 4 of the Acts respectively.

²⁶ *Supra* note 21, sec.6.

²⁷ See sec. 7 of the Acts. See also Punjab Act, 2011 sec.9 (1) (a); The Jammu and Kashmir Act, 2011, ss. 10, 11 & 12.

²⁸ *Ibid.* For quantum of penalty, see the provisions for imposing penalty.

²⁹ The Chhattisgarh Act, 2011, sec. 4(4). Apart from penalty the Act of Jammu & Kashmir too provides for compensation to be determined by the second appellate authority, as it may deem fit. For detail, see The

Karnataka, apart from the compensatory cost at the rate of twenty rupee per day up to a maximum of rupee five hundred per application, imposed by the competent officer,³⁰ penalty shall be imposed as per the service rules as applicable to the employees of the government or public authority concerned.³¹ There is only liability to pay cost by every government servant for failure of delivery of service at the rate per day up to a maximum of two hundred rupees per application in Delhi.³² In Bihar, the appellate authority impose penalty upon the designed public servant as notified by government by rules from time to time.³³ The penalty is recoverable from the salary of the defaulting officer in Rajasthan.³⁴ Such penalty so imposed shall be in addition to that prescribed in any Act, rules, regulation and notification already existing.

IV. SHORTCOMINGS IN STATE PUBLIC SERVICES ACTS

In the wake of the enactment of the right to information and right to services, globally, as hallmarks of corruption-free and accountable governance, the Government of India set out for administrative reforms initiatives towards complementary capacity building. One such endeavour was the “Pathways for Inclusive India Administration (PIIA)” Project in collaboration with United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) aimed at citizen centric administration. As a part of that project, a two day national consultation was convened by the Government of Madhya Pradesh and UNDP on “Strengthening Accountability Framework under Public Service Guarantee Acts” in Bhopal on 8-9 December, 2011.³⁵ The purposes of the consultation was to share the progress of the state public service guarantee Acts, (PSGAS) also known as right to services Acts, enacted by various states of India by then, as a key administrative reform. The consultation provided a common platform for interaction among states, for exchange of ideas and for evolving consensus on the key areas of concern in the implementation of the Acts. The Challenges identified at the NC were:

- Defining the scope of the Acts (i.e. the number of services covered in a scenario where complaints and grievances were also added).
- Demands side sensitization and awareness among citizens about the provisions of the Acts and its functioning/ application.
- Supply side sensitization, awareness and training of service providers.
- Addressing capacity related challenges- shortage of manpower and financial resources.

Jammu & Kashmir Public Services Guarantee Act, 2011, sec. 13 see also , the Punjab and Uttrakhand Acts.sec. 9(2); the Delhi and Karnataka Acts, sec. 8; the Himachal Pradesh Act, 2011, sec. 8(2) and the Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan Acts, sec.7(3)

³⁰ The Karnataka Act, 2012, sec.9.

³¹ *Ibid.*, sec.16.

³² The Delhi Act, 2011, sec. 6.

³³ See *Supra* note 26, sec. 7.

³⁴ The Rajasthan Act, 2011, sec. 7(1)(c); see also the Karnataka Act, 2012, sec.11(2).

³⁵ See, the Report of National Consultation. available at: http://www.undp.org.in/sites/default/files/PIIA_Facts_sheet.pdf (last accessed on July 20, 2016).



- Lack of availability of an efficient management information system (MIS) with ready access to government records and data for monitoring and tracking of applications.
- Reduction of complexity in procedures and clarification on identification and documentation requirements for a particular service for the purpose of eliminating subjectivity.
- Incentives and disincentives for government officials including, but not limited to penalties, impact on performance assessment, promotions, and rewards.
- Grievance redressal mechanisms/ appeal mechanisms.
- Technology options and business models for efficient and timely service delivery/ tracking/ monitoring of service requests.
- Consistency of the legal framework.
- Consistency with state decentralization agenda and local self-government responsibilities.³⁶

The national consultation evolved consensus on the fact that the PSGAs have gone one step ahead of the UK Public Services Guarantee Reforms through including the provision for time bound delivery of services, failing which the erring public servant would be penalized as well.

Overall, the participants formed a general consensus that the Acts should not be punishment-centric, but motivation-oriented in order to facilitate attitudinal changes and to offer sustained reforms. The need to create awareness among citizens as well as strengthening the capacity of service providers was also highlighted. Further the use of public private partnership (PPP) business models for providing services and use of information and communication technology (ICT) based tools for tracking and monitoring service provisions was also encouraged for bringing about transparency, accountability and efficiency in public services.³⁷

Addressing legal concerns, the members of the group accentuated the need to re-examine the legal framework of the right to service Acts. They expressed apprehensions about the varied nomenclatures of the Acts in various states, the scope of those Acts, redressal mechanisms, institutional provisions and control Mechanisms. As a suggestion it was advocated that the oversight mechanism for public service guarantee should be internal because a self-corrective, self disciplining bureaucracy was the need of the hours³⁸

The Government of India's Citizens Right to Grievance Redress Bill, 2011 was looked at by the participants as the overarching framework within which one has to look at the provisions of the state Acts were harsh and could affect the motivation of service providers, which need to be reviewed. There was also a suggestion that the applicants should not be allowed to file a case else there would be a surge of litigation possible. It

³⁶ *Ibid*, Summary of key challenges and recommendations.

³⁷ *Id.*, Annexure 111.

³⁸ *Id.*, "Addressing Legal Concerns".

was further recommended that the States would explore creating a trust fund (e.g. Torrens compensation fund in Australia) to compensate applicants in case of systemic delays.³⁹ As highlighted during the closing remarks by the representatives of the states, Central Government and UNDP, administrative reforms and governance improvements were to be necessitated. Thus citizen centric administration has to become citizen participatory as well. Establishing entitlements based approach in public service delivery not only empowers citizens to demand service but also offers an opportunity to the governments to provide service effectively. The consultation ended with the vision that the move to make public service provision legally binding on the government displayed a political will to make citizens, active agents within administrative processes rather than as mere recipients of service.

V. CONCLUSION

Now, in nutshell, to analyse, the States of Delhi, Karnataka, Chhattisgarh and Bihar have enacted their right to services Acts, comprehensively by including any public servant of government, of any department of government, or of its local bodies, or of other public authorities covered by article 12 of the constitution of India. The public services law of those states are intended to provide the citizen, his right to obtain time bound delivery of services notified, within the time limit. The intention is not to penalize the government servants but to sensitize the public servants towards their duty towards the citizen and to enhance and imbibe in them a culture to deliver services promptly. The state laws are thus opting for reward mechanism so as to encourage and motivate the public servants in their rendition of services to citizen in the stipulated time period rather than introducing disincentives.

The other state Acts are in essence, mostly punishment- centric to achieve the object of time bound guaranteeing of services to citizen. They provide for penalizing the officer or for recovery of compensation from his salary. Thus public servants are punished a second time through disciplinary action in accordance with the service rules. The state would treat default as an offence only to the extent of assuring the citizens of an accountable and responsive public service. In pursuance of which the state government shall aim at a more participative democracy through facilitating the direct involvement of citizenry in the administration processes.

Most of States have enacted the legislation for right to public services to the people of States in India , but some States ,in India, have not enacted the legislation for such right so far. Not only this, unfortunately, there is no any legislation at National level for right to public services. Now, it can be said that there are three categories in India, first, the States which are providing public services to the people of States as a matter of right, second, the States, which are not providing such services as a matter of right, at present, third, Govt. of India through its ministries or departments, is providing public services to the people by way of citizen's charter, but not as a matter of right, because it cannot be legally enforced .Now, time has come to make law by Govt. of India and some States ,which have not made law so far, to provide public services to the people as a matter right.