



Sh. Karan Singh, S/o Sh. Shyam Singh,
79, High Land Society,
Baltana, Zirakpur.

...Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
State Transport Commissioner,
Sector-17, Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority,
State Transport Commissioner,
Sector-17, Chandigarh.

.Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1751 of 2018

Present: None for the Appellant
Sh.Gurpal Singh, APIO-STC for the Respondent

ORDER:

This order should be read in continuation to the earlier order.

The case has earlier been heard on 29.08.2018, 17.10.2018, 22.01.2019, 24.04.2019, 12.06.2019, 06.08.2019, 29.11.2019, 04.03.2020, 05.08.2020 & 02.09.2020.

At the hearing on 29.11.2019, **the** respondent PIO-STC, Punjab brought a reply in which they stated that the appellant had inspected the record on 05.09.2019. The appellant who was absent at the hearing turned up late and informed that he is yet to receive the information that he had detailed during the inspection.

The order of the Commission was in two parts. The first part of the order was regarding the logbooks, which had been settled as the appellant had inspected the record and the department was to send the detailed information to the appellant, which the department was directed to send within 10 days.

The second part of the order to the Transport Department was to proactively publish and upload the information available under its custody regarding monthly fuel expenses, kilometers, travelled of all the ministers of Punjab, in the format in which they are maintained by the public authority, subject to the proviso of the exemptions to be applicable to the vehicles used by the security wing as notified by the Govt. under section 24 of the RTI Act. The information was to be uploaded from 1st of January 2012 onwards to the present, with a provision to upgrade it every quarterly.

The department was ordered to provide a roadmap, which it failed to provide in the last two hearings. The Commission directed the State Transport Commissioner to ensure compliance of the order before the next date of hearing.

Appeal Case No. 1751 of 2018

On the last date of hearing on **04.03.2020**, the respondent present informed that the complete information had been provided to the appellant and the appellant had acknowledged having received the information on 14.02.2020. The respondent submitted a copy of acknowledgement of the appellant. Regarding part-2 of the information, the respondent submitted a reply, which was taken on the file of the Commission for consideration.

The appellant was absent. The case was adjourned.

On the date of hearing on **05.08.2020**, the respondent was present. The appellant was absent. The case was adjourned.

On the date of last hearing on **02.09.2020**, the respondent PIO was present. The appellant was absent.

The hearing was done to consider the reply of the PIO of the State Transport Department citing reasons for not implementing part B of this bench's order of 12.06.2019. Part A of the order was implemented earlier, and was no longer a matter of consideration of this bench.

The part B of the order was reproduced. The latest communication dated 03.02.2020 the PIO in the office of the State Transport Commissioner, Punjab had endorsed a copy to the commission of the reply sent to the appellant. It enclosed a copy of the opinion procured by the respondent from their law officer. It was also reproduced.

Having gone through the reply of the PIO and the legal opinion of their law officer, which had been accepted by the respondent as an argument to escape the directions passed by the Commission, it was made clear to the respondent that the very denial to implement the order is a contempt of the order of the Punjab State Information Commission since the commission had clearly asked for the order to implemented and not sought reasons whether this order can be implemented or not.

Further, the commission found; "that the legal opinion is totally off the mark and does not even tangentially consider upon the spirit and provisions under which the commission has passed the directions. The order has been passed by the commission suo-moto by invoking the powers vested in Section 19/8 of the RTI Act to ensure the disclosures under section 4 of the Act to promote transparency and accountability in public life. The information by no stretch of imagination attracts exemptions as envisaged in section 8 & 9 of the Act. The law officer has needlessly dragged it into the discussion.

The vital issue is as to whether the information pertains to a public authority which has been taken out of the ambit of Act under section 24 or not? The fact is that the repository of information is the office of the State Transport Commissioner, which is not a security or an intelligence agency and cannot escape the obligations set forth in the RTI Act. The said information clearly does not pertain to the record prepared, maintained and held by the Intelligence wing, Armed Police, Commando & IRB, Security Wing etc. under the Department of Home Affairs and Justice but that which is held by the Punjab Transport Department."

The logical corollary is that the legal opinion taken by the department is of no avail and was rejected accordingly.”

The respondent was directed to ensure the compliance of the directions passed earlier, else face the penal consequences.

Principal Secretary, Transport Department, Punjab and State Transport Commissioner were hereby directed to ensure the compliance of this order.

On the date of last hearing on **18.11.2020**, the respondent was present and had sought adjournment. The appellant was absent. The case was adjourned.

Hearing dated 05.01.2021:

Sh.Gurpal Singh, APIO-STC is present.

The case is adjourned.

To come up for compliance on **18.01.2021 at 11.00 AM.**

Chandigarh
Dated:05.01.2021

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

CC to:Principal Secretary,
Deptt.of Transport, Pb
Chandigarh.

UNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden, Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in
Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Sh Yogesh Mahajan S/o Sh Kuldeep Raj Mahajan,
Opposite Water Tank,
Municipal Market, Mission road,
Pathankot.

Appellant

Public Information Officer,
O/o XEN, Water Supply and Sanitation,
Division No-3, Bathinda.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o SE, Water Supply and Sanitation
Circle, Bathinda.

....Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1276 of 2020

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 06.01.2020 has sought information regarding works undertaken/carried out in Sub Divisions i) Bhagta Phika 2) Mour 3) Bathinda – work order book of all subdivisions – comparative statements for which no tender called, from the office of Executive Engineer, W/S & Sanitation Division No.3, Bathinda. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 05.02.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 28.09.2020 through video conferencing at DAC Bathinda.

The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 03.03.2020. The appellant was absent and vide email informed that the PIO has not provided the information.

The PIO was directed to resend the information to the appellant within a week with a copy to the Commission.

On the date of next hearing on 03.11.2020, both the parties were absent. The appellant vide email informed that the PIO has not provided the information.

The PIO was directed to comply with the earlier order of the Commission and provide the information to the appellant within a week with a copy to the Commission and explain the reasons for delay in providing the information.

Hearing dated 05.01.2021:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Bathinda. Both the parties are absent. The case is adjourned.

To come up for further hearing **26.04.2021 at 11.00 AM** through the video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Bathinda. The appellant to attend a hearing in DAC Pathankot.

Chandigarh
Dated:05.01.2021

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh Yogesh Mahajan S/o Sh Kuldeep Raj Mahajan,
Opposite Water Tank,
Municipal Market, Mission road,
Pathankot.

Appellant

Public Information Officer,
O/o XEN, Water Supply and Sanitation,
Division No-3, Bathinda.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o SE, Water Supply and Sanitation
Circle, Bathinda

Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1278 of 2020

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 06.01.2020 has sought information regarding grants received/utilized in division from 07.01.2019 to 06.01.2020 –copies of comparative statements approved by competent authority for works by e-tendering/online – work by tender/offline undertaken – sanction letter issued for work of CSR to all SDE from the office of Executive Engineer, W/S & Sanitation Division No.3, Bathinda. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 05.02.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 28.09.2020 through video conferencing at DAC Bathinda. The respondent present pleaded that some of the information has been provided to the appellant and remaining will be sent within a week.

The appellant was absent and vide email informed that the PIO has not provided the information. The PIO was directed to provide complete information to the appellant within a week and send a compliance report to the Commission.

On the date of next hearing on 03.11.2020, the appellant vide email has informed that the PIO has not provided the complete information. The respondent was absent.

The PIO was directed to comply with the earlier order of the Commission and provide the information to the appellant within a week with a copy to the Commission and explain the reasons for delay in providing the information.

Hearing dated 05.01.2021:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Bathinda. Both the parties are absent. The case is adjourned.

To come up for further hearing **26.04.2021 at 11.00 AM** through the video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Bathinda. The appellant to attend the hearing at DAC Pathankot.

Chandigarh
Dated:05.01.2021

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh.Satpal Goyal,
H No 102, Model Town,
Phase-1, Bathinda.

...Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o EO, BDA,
Bathinda.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Addl, Chief Administrator,
BDA, Bathinda.

.....Respondent

Appeal Case No. 2102 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Satpal Goyal as the Appellant
Sh.Jagmeet Singh, Clerk O/o EO-BDA for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on 22.10.2019. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent was absent. The PIO was directed to provide the information to the appellant as per RTI Act within 15 days and send a compliance report to the Commission. The PIO was also directed to explain the reasons for not attending to the RTI application within the time prescribed under the RTI Act.

The case was again heard on **23.12.2019**. The appellant informed that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent was absent on 2nd consecutive hearing. The PIO was issued a show **cause notice under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 and directed to file a reply on an affidavit**. The PIO was again directed to provide the information to the appellant within 10 days of the receipt of this order.

The case was again heard on **16.06.2020** through video conferencing at DAC Bhatinda. Ms.Saloni, clerk O/o EO-BDA appeared on behalf of the PIO and pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 10.01.2020. The appellant was not satisfied and stated that the information is incomplete. Having gone through the RTI application and hearing both the parties, the following was concluded:

- | | | |
|-----------|---|--|
| - Point-1 | - | To relook and reply appropriately – if the information is not available, to give in writing that no other reward is available. |
| - Point-2 | - | Provided during the hearing |
| - Point-3 | - | Provided |
| - Point-4 | - | PIO to relook and send complete reply |
| - Point-5 | - | Provided |

The respondent did not bring reply to the show cause notice. The PIO was absent. The respondent pleaded that when the RTI was filed, Sh.Amarjit Singh was the PIO who has since retired.

However, the Commission was of the view that the appellant had to suffer undue inconvenience to get the information, the PIO was directed to pay an amount of **Rs.5000/-** via demand draft as compensation to the appellant and submit proof of having compensated the appellant. The PIO was also directed to provide the remaining information to the appellant within 10days.

Appeal Case No. 2102 of 2019

On the date of hearing on **03.09.2020**, the appellant claimed that the PIO neither provided the complete information nor had paid compensation amount as per order of the Commission. The respondent was absent nor had sent any reply to the show cause notice.

The present PIO-cum-EO, BDA was again absent nor had complied with the order of the Commission.

Keeping the above-mentioned facts of the case, the present PIO-EO, BDA was issued **show cause notice under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 for not complying the order of the Commission and directed to file reply on an affidavit.**

Since the PIO was continuously absenting from appearance, his next absence would lead to a warrant being issued to secure his presence.

On the date of last hearing on 03.11.2020, the appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the remaining information nor has paid the compensation amount as per order of the Commission.

The respondent was absent nor had sent any reply to the show cause notice issued on 03.09.2020. As per information from the BDA through email and in appeal case No.2018 of 2019, Sh.Udaydeep Singh Sidhu, PCS was the EO-cum-PIO for the period from Jan.2019 to July,2019 and Sh.Vinod Bansal, PCS from 1.10.2019 to Dec.2019 and presently Sh.Amrinder Singh Tiwana, PCS was the PIO from 29.07.2020 to till date. As per information, Sh.Vinod Kumar Bansal was to retire on 30.09.2020. However, there was no information on who was the PIO when the RTI application was filed.

From the above, it was clear that Sh.Amrinder Singh Tiwana was the PIO when the last show cause was issued on 03.09.2020. However, the PIO was again absent nor had sent any reply to the show cause notice.

Sh.Amrinder Singh Tiwana, PIO-BDA Bathinda was given one last opportunity to file reply to the show cause notice otherwise it will be presumed that the PIO has nothing to say in the matter and the Commission will act as per provisions of the RTI Act against the PIO.

Hearing dated 05.01.2021:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Bathinda. As per respondent, the compensation amount of Rs.5000/- has been paid to the appellant and the appellant has received the same. However, as per appellant, the information is incomplete.

The Commission has also received an affidavit from Ms.Harjot Kaur, PIO-cum-EO BDA which has been taken on the file. In the last order, Sh.Amrinder Singh Tiwana, PIO-BDA was directed to file a reply to the show cause notice. The Commission has received a copy of reply which is not in proper format. Sh.Amrinder Singh Tiwana, PIO is given one last opportunity to submit a reply on an affidavit and in a proper form.

It is also observed that the appellant is continuously showing dissatisfaction on the information that has been provided. In the interest of justice, I direct the present PIO to call the appellant in the office and resolve the matter and provide the information whatever available on record. And for the information that is not available, the PIO is directed to provide an affidavit.

To come up for further hearing on **26.04.2021 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Bathinda

Chandigarh
Dated:05.01.2021

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden, Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - psic30@punjabmail.gov.in
Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Smt.Rupinder Kaur, W/o
Late Sh.Joginder Singh,
C-27, Civil Lines,
Bathinda.

Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Commissioner, MC,
Bathinda.

Respondent

Complaint Case No. 155 of 2020

PRESENT: Smt.Rupinder Kaur as the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER:

The complainant through RTI application dated 04.10.2019 has sought information regarding details of property No.C-28 MC No.MCB Z-2-09103 Civil Line Bhatinda – map approved for the purpose of residential/commercial/school and other information concerning the office of Commissioner, MC Bhatinda. The complainant was not provided the information after which the complainant filed complaint in the Commission on 05.02.2020.

The case first came up for hearing on 03.09.2020 through video conferencing at DAC Bhatinda. The complainant claimed that the PIO had denied the information. The complainant further informed that since a school named Little Kingdom Nursery School is being run in her neighbour, she wants to prove if any permission has been granted by the competent authority.

The respondent was absent. The Commission received an email from the PIO stating that the appellant was asked to specify the file number and date but the complainant did not specify the same. Further the information sought was in question form.

The PIO had denied the information on two grounds;

- i) Had asked to specify;
- ii) That it is personal information and cannot be provided under section8(1)

Having gone through the case the Commission found that there is a larger public interest involved in this particular RTI application. As much as I agree that the personal information such as building plan etc. of other party should not be shared, Section 10 of the RTI Act however, gives the benefit in cases where there is disclosable and non-disclosable information on the same page.

Given the above, the PIO was directed to provide that part of the information which denotes the purpose of which the map has been sanctioned and severe rest of the information.

On the date of hearing on 03.11.2020, the respondent present pleaded that since the information sought by the appellant is personal information, it cannot be provided. This view of the respondent did not hold merits as the order had already been passed by the Commission to provide the information.

Since there has been an enormous delay in attending to the RTI application, the PIO was issued a **show cause notice under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 and directed to file reply on an affidavit**. The PIO was directed to provide the information as per the earlier order of 03.09.2020 within a week from the receipt of this order.

Hearing dated 05.01.2021:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Bathinda. The appellant claims that the PIO has not provided the information. The PIO is absent.

The Commission has received a reply of the ATP-cum-PIO, MC Bathinda which has been taken on the file of the Commission. In the reply, the PIO has mentioned that since the record relating to building branch is maintained in accordance with file number and date, the appellant was asked to provide file number and date but the same was not supplied by the appellant.

The PIO has further mentioned in the reply that now they have asked the concerned school to provide building map, file number and date but the same has not been provided by the concerned school.

The Commission observes that since the information has been sought by the appellant from the PIO-MC Bathinda and the order to provide the information has already been passed by the Commission, I find the reply of the PIO wishy washy as the PIO has put the onus on the school whereas the information has to be provided by the respondent.

Since the order has already been passed by the Commission after hearing all the above arguments previously, I find this plea of the PIO to be vague and direct the PIO to provide the information to the appellant as per order dated 03.09.2020. The PIO is given one last opportunity to file an appropriate reply to the show notice otherwise it will be presumed that the PIO has nothing to say in the matter.

The Commission further observes that the appellant to collect the information has had to suffer undue inconvenience, thus I find it to be a fit case for awarding compensation to the appellant u/s 19(8)(b) of the RTI Act.

The PIO-MC Bathinda is directed to pay an amount of **Rs.2500/-** via demand draft drawn through Govt. Treasury as compensation to the appellant for the loss and detriment suffered by him of having to file the appeals and not getting information in time. The PIO is directed to duly inform the Commission of the compliance of the order and submit proof of having compensated the appellant.

The PIO is directed to comply with the earlier order of the Commission within ten days of receiving this order. The decision on the show cause notice will be taken at the next date of hearing.

I am also marking this case to Commissioner, MC Bathinda to ensure timely compliance of this order.

To come up for further hearing on **26.04.2021 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Bhatinda.

Chandigarh
Dated:05.01.2021

Sd/-
(KhushwantSingh)
State InformationCommissioner

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in
Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Sh. Baljinder Singh, S/o Sh. Darshan Singh,
Daan Singh Nagar, Gali No-1,
Back Side Guru Nanak Public School,
Goniana Mandi, Distt. Bathinda.

.....Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o EO, MC, Goniana Mandi
Distt. Bathinda.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Joint Deputy Director,
Local Govt, Mini Secretariat,
Bathinda.

.... Respondent

Appeal Case No. 538 of 2020

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER: Facts of the case-

That the appellant RTI application dated 29.10.2019 has sought information regarding details of clerks promoted from the post of peon and the documents submitted by them in NC Goniana Mandi and other information concerning the office of EO-MC Goniana Mandi. The appellant was provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 02.12.2019.

That the PIO sent a reply to the appellant vide letter dated 31.12.2019 stating that the information sought is in question form, it cannot be provided. The First appellate authority also disposed off the appeal on 03.01.2020 directing the PIO to provide the information as per the RTI Act and within time.

That on the date of first hearing on 03.09.2020, the PIO was absent. Sh. Subhash Chander, Clerk representing the PIO appeared and pleaded that the information has been supplied to the appellant on 02.07.2020 with a copy to the Commission. The respondent further informed that Sh. Sita Ram and Sh. Subhash Chander were promoted as clerk from the post of peon and the documents submitted by them to the office had been supplied to the appellant.

That as per appellant, the information had been provided with a delay of more than ten months.

Having gone through the record, the Commission observed that the PIO had earlier denied the information and provided the sought information only after receiving the notice of the Commission. The denial of information was sent by the PIO on 31.12.2019.

That the First Appellate, while disposing off the appeal passed no instruction except an observation that the PIO should attend the RTI applications in the true spirit of the RTI Act, and attend future hearings in person.

That having gone through the facts of the case, it was observed that the PIO had tried to stonewall the information and the intention of the PIO was pointing towards not providing the information.

Appeal Case No. 538 of 2020

Given the facts, the PIO-cum-EO MC Goniana Mandi was issued a **show cause notice under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 and directed to file a reply on an affidavit.**

That on the date of the last hearing on 03.11.2020, the PIO was absent nor had a filed reply to the show cause notice. The PIO was given one more opportunity to file a reply to the show cause notice. In case of failure to file it, it was observed that the commission would presume that the PIO had nothing to say in the matter and take action accordingly.

That the case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Bathinda. The PIO is absent on 3rd consecutive hearing nor has complied with the order of the Commission.

Observing the above-mentioned facts of the case, it is clear that the PIO-cum-EO MC Goniana Mandi is flouting the spirit of the RTI Act continuously. The PIO has not only shown utter disregard for the Commission's repeated orders to provide the information but has shown willful stubbornness in not replying to the Show Cause and not appearing before the commission despite various orders of the Commission.

To secure an erring PIO's presence before the commission the Information Commission is empowered to issue warrants to Under Section 18(3) of the RTI Act. Aailable Warrant of the **EO-cum-PIO, MC Goniana Mandi** is hereby issued through Senior Superintendent of Police, Bathinda for his presence before the Commission on **26.04.2021**.

The case is adjourned. To come up further hearing on **26.04.2021 at 11.00 PM**.

Chandigarh
Dated:05.01.2021

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

**BAILABLE WARRANT OF PRODUCTION
BEFORESHRI KHUSHWANT SINGH
STATE INFORMATION COMMISSIONER, PUNJAB AT
CHANDIGARH**

**In case:Baljinder Singh V/s Public Information Officer-cum-Estate
Officer, Municipal Council, Goniana Mandi, District Bathinda**

APPEAL CASE NO.538/2020

UNDER SECTION 18 OF THE RIGHT TO INFORMATION ACT, 2005

Next Date of Hearing :26.04.2021

To

**The Senior Superintendent of Police,
Bathinda**

Whereas Estate Officer-cum-PIO, Municipal Council, Goniana Mandi has failed to appear before the State Information Commissioner, Punjab despite the issuance of notice/summon in the above mentioned appeal case. Therefore, you are hereby directed to serve this bailable warrant to the Estate Officer-cum-PIO, Municipal Council, Goniana Mandi to appear before the undersigned at Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden, Sector 16, Chandigarh on **26.04.2021 at 11.00 A.M.**

**Chandigarh
Dated:05.01.2021**

**(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner**

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose
Garden, Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in
Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Sh Yogesh Mahajan S/o Sh Kuldeep Raj
Mahajan, Opposite Water Tank,
Municipal Market, Mission road,
Pathankot.

Appellant

Public Information Officer,
O/o XEN, Water Supply and Sanitation,
Division No-1, Bathinda.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o SE, Water Supply and Sanitation
Circle Bathinda.

Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1268 of 2020

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
Sh.Manpreet Singh Xen, O/o Water Supply-Div.I for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 07.01.2020 has sought information regarding grants received/utilized in division from 07.01.2019 to 06.01.2020 –copies of comparative statements approved by competent authority for works by e-tendering/online – work by tender/offline undertaken – sanction letter issued for work of CSR to all SDE from the office of Executive Engineer, W/S & Sanitation Division No.1, Bathinda. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 05.02.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 28.09.2020 through video conferencing at DAC Bathinda. The appellant was absent and vide email informed that the PIO has not provided the information.

The respondent present asked for a week's time to provide the complete information. The PIO was directed to provide the information to the appellant within a week and send a compliance report to the Commission.

On the date of last hearing on 03.11.2020, the appellant vide email informed that the PIO has not provided the information.

On the hearing on 28.09.2019, Sh.Manpreet Singh, Xen Division No.1 appeared and sought a week's time to provide the complete information. The PIO was directed to provide the information within a week and send a compliance report to the Commission.

The PIO was again absent nor had complied with the earlier order of the Commission. The respondent present again asked for some more time to provide the information. The Commission saw this act of asking for continuous adjournments as delay in information by the PIO.

The PIO was issued a **show cause notice under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 and directed to file reply on an affidavit.** The PIO was again directed to provide information within 10 days of the receipt of this order.

Hearing dated 05.01.2021:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Bathinda. The appellant vide letter dated 26.12.2020 received in the Commission on 31.12.2020 has informed that the PIO has not provided the information.

The respondent present pleaded that the information has been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 01.01.2021.

The information stands provided. However, the PIO has not filed reply to the show cause notice. The PIO is given one last opportunity to file a reply to the show cause notice otherwise it will be presumed that the PIO has nothing to say in the matter.

To come up for further hearing on **26.04.2021 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Bathinda. The appellant to attend the hearing at DAC Pathankot.

Chandigarh
Dated 05.01.2021

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner