

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com

E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh.Ankit Jain, S/o Sh.Yashpal Jain,
1006, Morni Wala Khoo, Dera.Bassi,
Mohali

... Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
P.S.E.B
Phase-8, Mohali.

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 535 of 2018

Present: Sh.Ankit Jain as Complainant
Ms.HarjitKaur, Sr.AssistantP.S.E.B, Mohali for the Respondent

ORDER: The case was first heard on 28.08.2018. The complainant informed that he has received reply vide letter dated 01.02.2018 from the PIO stating 3 points; 1) he has been asked to provide clarity on the information sought (ii) the fee in the form of postal order has been discontinued and fees by way of draft be sent and (iii) further contact the DPI Punjab for information.

The Commission observed that the letter has been written in two languages i.e.in Punjabi and Hindi and since there could be a discrepancy in the letter and therefore, directed the Superintendent (Admn-2) to be personally present on the next date of hearing to explain.

The case was last heard on **25.09.2018**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The respondent present has pleaded that the letter was typed in Punjabi whereas point No.3 was hand written in Hindi and there is no discrepancy in the letter. She further pleaded that the RTI application which was filed by the complainant was in Hindi language, so the reply was sent in Hindi language. The view of the respondent is accepted.

The appellant pleaded that since his RTI application was returned by the PIO stating that it did not have any clarity about the information he sought, he had filed a fresh RTI to the DPI on 9.2.2018. After filing application, he received a reply from the DPI on 27.04.2018 stating that the information being third party cannot be provided.

The PIO-DPI(Secondary) is directed to explain the reasons for delay in attending to the RTI application. As for the complainant, if he is still interested to seek information, he should go to the First appellate Authority for perusal of his case.”

Hearing dated 05.11.2018:

The complainant is present. During the hearing, a new fact has emerged in this case. The complainant has already filed first appeal on 29.08.2018 which he did not disclose during the last hearing. The Commission therefore, feels that no further course of action is required. The complainant is advised to file second appeal if he is not satisfied with the orders of the First Appellate Authority.

The case is **disposed off and closed**.

Chandigarh
Dated: 05.11.2018

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com

E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh.Balvir Singh, S/o sh.Joginder Singh,
R/o Village Saide Ki (Khoo.Mohar Singh Wala),
P/O DulchiKe, Tehsil &Distt.Ferozepur.

... Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o DDPO,
Ferozepur.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o DDPO,
Ferozepur.

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 552 of 2018

Present: None for the Complainant
Sh.Kulwant Singh, Panchayat Secretary O/o BDPO Ferozepur for the Respondent

ORDER: The case was first heard on 20.08.2018. The respondent was absent. The complainant pleaded that despite his first appeal and again a letter sent to the DC Ferozepur on 17.04.2018 as well as his personal visits to the office of BDPO twice, he has not been provided the information. The PIO was directed to provide the information to the complainant within 15 days and be present on the next date of hearing with valid explanation for not providing the information within the prescribed time under the RTI Act.

The case was last heard on **17.09.2018**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“In the last order, the PIO was directed to provide the information within 15 days.. He was also directed to be present personally with valid explanation for not providing the information within the prescribed time under the RTI Act. The appellant has informed that he has not received the information. The PIO is absent for the hearing on two consecutive dates. It appears that the PIO is not serious in attending to his duties and has disobeyed the orders of the Commission on three grounds; (i) for not providing the information to the appellant (ii) being absent & (iii) for not sending any explanation for delay in responding to the RTI application.

The Commission has taken a serious view of this for not complying with the orders of the Commission and hereby directs the PIO **show cause why penalty be not imposed on him under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 for not supplying the information within the statutorily prescribed period of time and for not complying with the orders of the Commission**. He should file an affidavit in this regard. If there are other persons responsible for the delay in providing the information, the PIO is directed to inform such persons of the show cause and direct them to appear before the Commission along with the written replies.”

Hearing dated 05.11.2018:

The respondent present has brought the information. The appellant is not present to point out the discrepancies, if any. The respondent is directed to send the information to the complainant through registered post and send compliance to the Commission.

In the last hearing, the PIO was issued show cause notice and he was directed to file reply to the show cause on an affidavit. The PIO has not responded to the show cause. The Commission has taken a serious view of this. The PIO-BDPO is afforded one last opportunity to appear personally on the next date of hearing and reply to the show cause notice on an affidavit failing which the Commission will take action as per RTI Act.

To come up on **11.12.2018 at 11.00 AM** for further hearing.

Chandigarh
Dated: 05.11.2018

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

CC to :The BDPO Ferozepur.

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com

E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh.Tarsem Singh, S/o Sh.Swaran Singh,
R/o Village Saide Ki (Khoo.Mohar Singh Wala),
P/O DulchiKe, Tehsil &Distt.Ferozepur.

... Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o DDPO,
Ferozepur.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o DDPO,
Ferozepur.

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 553 of 2018

Present: Sh.Tarsem Singh as Complainant
None for the Respondent

ORDER: The case was first heard on 20.08.2018. The case was first heard on 20.08.2018. The respondent was absent. The complainant pleaded that despite his first appeal and again a letter sent to the DC Ferozepur on 17.04.2018 as well as his personal visits to the office of BDPO twice, he has not been provided the information. The PIO was directed to provide the information to the complainant within 15 days and be present on the next date of hearing with valid explanation for not providing the information within the prescribed time under the RTI Act.

The case was last heard on **17.09.2018**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“In the last order, the PIO was directed to provide the information within 15 days.. He was also directed to be present personally with valid explanation for not providing the information within the prescribed time under the RTI Act. The appellant has informed that he has not received the information. The PIO is absent for the hearing on two consecutive dates. It appears that the PIO is not serious in attending to his duties and has disobeyed the orders of the Commission on three grounds; (i) for not providing the information to the appellant (ii) being absent & (iii) for not sending any explanation for delay in responding to the RTI application.

The Commission has taken a serious view of this for not complying with the orders of the Commission and hereby directs the PIO **show cause why penalty be not imposed on him under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 for not supplying the information within the statutorily prescribed period of time and for not complying with the orders of the Commission**. He should file an affidavit in this regard. If there are other persons responsible for the delay in providing the information, the PIO is directed to inform such persons of the show cause and direct them to appear before the Commission along with the written replies.”

Hearing dated 05.11.2018:

The respondent present has brought the information. The appellant is not present to point out the discrepancies, if any. The respondent is directed to send the information to the complainant through registered post and send compliance to the Commission.

In the last hearing, the PIO was issued show cause notice and he was directed to file reply to the show cause on an affidavit. The PIO has not responded to the show cause. The Commission has taken a serious view of this. The PIO-BDPO is afforded one last opportunity to appear personally on the next date of hearing and reply to the show cause notice on an affidavit failing which the Commission will take action as per RTI Act.

To come up on **11.12.2018 at 11.00 AM** for further hearing.

Chandigarh
Dated: 05.11.2018

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

CC to :The BDPO Ferozepur.

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com
E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh.Tejinder Singh,
R/o Village Bholapura,
PO Ramgarh, Chandigarh Road,
Ludhiana.

... Appellant

Vs

Public Information Officer,
SDM, Licensing Authority & Registering,
Samrala, District Ludhiana.

First Appellate Authority,
DC. Ludhiana.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1264 of 2018

Present Sh. Tejinder Singh as Appellant
 Mrs.Sarabjit Kaur, Superintendent O/o SDM Samrala for the Respondent
 Sh.Ravinder Singh Clerk O/o RTA Ludhiana

ORDER: The case was first heard on **18.06.2018**. The Commission observed that the PIO in her reply mentioned that point no.2 & 5 did not relate to their department but has not forwarded the RTI application to the concerned department. PIO was directed to forward the same to the concerned department immediately. The PIO of that department was also directed to provide the information to the appellant and be present on the next date of hearing alongwith proof of sending the information.

The case was again heard on **25.07.2018**. The respondent was absent. The appellant informed that he has received the information relating to points No.1,7& 8 vide letter dated 25.6.2018. He further informed that the PIO in his letter has mentioned that the remaining information relates to the department of STA Ludhiana and STC, Punjab Chandigarh but has not forwarded the RTI application to the concerned departments.

The PIO was directed to provide the complete information relating to them and forward the RTI application to the concerned department for remaining information. He was also directed to be present on the next date of hearing with solid reasons for not complying with the orders of the Commission The PIO of STA Ludhiana and PIO of STC Punjab, Chandigarh were also directed to provide the information to the appellant and be present on the next date of hearing.

The case was last heard on **24.09.2018**:The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The respondent present from the office of SDM (Licensing & Registering Authority) Samrala has pleaded that as per the orders of the Commission, the RTI application has been transferred to the concerned departments on 13.08.2018 but no information has been provided by the concerned departments till now.

In the last order, the PIO-SDM Samrala was directed to explain the reasons for delay in transferring the RTI application but the PIO has not brought any solid explanation. The PIO-SDM Samrala is hereby given last opportunity to explain the reasons for delay in transferring the RTI application to the concerned departments.

Appeal Case No. 1264 of 2018

The appellant has also not received the information from the STA Ludhiana and STC Punjab, Chandigarh. The PIO, STA Ludhiana and the PIO-STC Punjab Chandigarh are directed to provide the information to the appellant and be present personally on the next date of hearing with reasons for delay in providing the information.”

Hearing dated 05.11.2018:

The respondent from the office of SDM (Licensing Authority & Registering), Samrala is present who pleaded that the RTI application has already been transferred to the concerned departments. Sh. Ravinder Singh Clerk, from the office of STA Ludhiana is also present who informed that the information for which the application was forwarded to them by the PIO-cum-SDM Samrala vide letter dated 20.08.2018 does not pertain to them and they have already written a letter to the PIO-SDM Samrala that the same be collected from the office of State Transport Commissioner, Punjab, Chandigarh. It seems that the application is being transferred from one desk to the other and is not being attended.

The PIO-SDM Samrala was asked to explain the reasons for delay in transferring the RTI application within the time prescribed under the RTI Act. The explanation from the Superintendent and the clerk that the RTI application was transferred to the concerned department vide letter dated 13.08.2018 is not appropriate to justify the enormous delay of 8 months in transferring the RTI application. The PIO is directed to collect all the information from the concerned departments and send it to the appellant. The PIO is also directed to be present personally on the next date of hearing and explain the reasons for such enormous delay of 8 months in transferring the RTI application.

To come up on **19.12.2018 at 11.00 AM.**

Chandigarh
Dated: 05.11.2018

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

CC to : State Transport Commissioner, Punjab,
Chandigarh.

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com

E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

ShTejinder Singh,
R/o Village Bholapura,
PO Ramgarh, Chandigarh Road,
Ludhiana.

... Appellant

Public Information Officer,
SDM (Licensing & Registering Authority),
Ajnala, Distt. Amritsar.

First Appellate Authority,
DC, Amritsar.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1326 of 2018

Present Sh. Tejinder Singh for the Appellant
 Sh.Pargat Singh, Clerk O/o SDM (Licensing & Registering Authority) Ajnala on
 behalf of the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on **18.06.2018**. The Commission observed that the appellant had sought information regarding licenses issued and other documents concerning the office of Licensing & Registering authority, Ajnala. The Commission further observed that the PIO in his reply has mentioned that point no.2, 5 & 9 relate to the department of State Transport Authority Amritsar but has not forwarded the RTI application to the concerned department. PIO was directed to forward the same to the concerned department immediately. The concerned PIO of that department was also directed to provide the information to the appellant and be present on the next date of hearing alongwith proof of sending the information.

The case was again heard on **25.07.2018**. The respondent was absent. The appellant was present who informed that the point No.9 of the information received from the PIO STA Amritsar is not clear for which the PIO was asked to explain the reasons for giving two different information on point No.9. The appellant informed that the PIO has mentioned in his letter that the point No.5 relates to STC Punjab Chandigarh but has not forwarded the application to the concerned departments.

The PIO was directed to be present on the next date of hearing with solid reasons for not complying with the orders of the Commission and explain why action should not be taken against him under the RTI Act and penalty be not imposed. The PIO of STA Amritsar and PIO of STC Punjab, Chandigarh was also directed to provide the information to the appellant and be present on the next date of hearing.

The case was last heard on **24.09.2018: The order is reproduced hereunder:**

This order should be read in continuation of the previous order in which the Commission had directed PIOs of various public authorities to comply with its directions. However, having gone through the information, there are clear discrepancies in the information provided as well as in following the orders of the Commission.

1. The respondent present from the office of SDM (Licensing & Registering Authority) Ajnala has pleaded that the information received from the STA Amritsar has been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 09.07.2018 and a copy of the same is submitted to the Commission.

Appeal Case No. 1326 of 2018

2. In the last order, the PIO-SDM office Ajnala was directed to explain the reasons for giving two different information regarding point No.9. It appears that the PIO has not read the orders of the Commission properly and has sent a wishy washy reply to the Commission. The Commission has taken a serious view of this non-serious attitude of the PIO while dealing with the RTI application.
3. The information relating to point No.2 has been provided but the information regarding points 5 & 9 still remains elusive. The PIO-STA Amritsar has mentioned that the point No.5 relates to the STC Punjab Chandigarh but has not forwarded the application to the concerned department. The PIO-STA Amritsar is directed to transfer the RTI application relating to point No.5 to the concerned department. The PIO STA Amritsar is also directed to be personally present on the next date of hearing.
4. Regarding point No.9, it is very clear from the application that the appellant is asking the information about Ajnala and to postpone providing the information by asking the appellant to clarify that what record he seeks is nothing short of delaying the information further. The concerned PIO (PIO-SDM, Ajnala or the PIO-STA Amritsar) is directed to provide the information.
5. In the last order, the Commission had also directed the PIO-SDM Ajnala to bring reasons for not complying with the orders of the Commission and to explain why action should not be taken and penalty not be imposed but the PIO has failed to submit a reply.
6. The PIO-SDM (Licensing & Registering Authority), Ajnala is hereby given one more opportunity to be present personally with the reasons for not providing the information as per RTI application.
7. The PIO, STC Punjab, Chandigarh is also directed to provide the information regarding point No.5 and be present personally on the next date of hearing.”

Hearing dated 05.11.2018:

The appellant is present who informed that he has received the information regarding point No.9 but the information regarding point No.5 is yet not received. The PIO SDM, Ajnala is directed to collect the information regarding point No.5 from the concerned department and sent it to the appellant within 15 days since they have not transferred the application to the concerned department.

To come up on **19.12.2018 at 11.00AM** for further hearing.

Chandigarh
Dated: 05.11.2018

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

CC to : State Transport Commissioner, Punjab,
Chandigarh.

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com
E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh.Sudesh Khosla,
C/o Khosla Agro Chowk,
Near Bye Pass Chowk,
Amritsar Road, Batala.

Appellant.

Versus

Public Information Officer,
Registrar of Firms and Societies,
Room No-12, 3rd Floor, 17 Bays Building,
Sec-17, Bear G.P.O,Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority,
Director of Industry & Commerce,
17, Bays Building, Sec-17, Chandigarh.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1348 of 2018

Present: Sh.Khushkaran Kumar, Advocate for the Appellant
Sh.Satnam Singh, Sr.Assistant O/o Registrar of Firms & Societies for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on **02.07.2018**.The respondent was absent. The PIO was directed to provide the information to the appellant in accordance with RTI Act within 10 days. He was further directed to explain the reason for not providing the information on time and be present personally on the next date of hearing.

The case was again heard on **01.08.2018**: Sh.Satnam Singh, Sr.Assistant from the office of Registrar of Firms and Societies was present. The PIO was directed to provide the information duly attested within 5 days of the receipt of copy of the list from the appellant.The PIO was also directed to explain the valid reasons for not providing the information and why he should not be penalized under the RTI Act.2005.

The case was last heard on **05.09.2018**. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided. The advocate on behalf of the appellant informed that the information has been received as per RTI application.

Since the information was delayed, the **PIO was directed to show cause why penalty be not imposed on him under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 for not supplying the information within the statutorily prescribed period of time** and for not complying with the orders of the Commission, he should file an affidavit in this regard.

The case was last heard on **.18.09.2018:The order is reproduced hereunder:**

“In the last order, the PIO was issued show cause notice and was directed to appear before the Commission with the written replies. The PIO is absent without intimation to the Commission.

The PIO is hereby granted one more opportunity and is directed to appear before the Commission on the next date of hearing alongwith the written reply on an affidavit regarding (i) delay in providing the information, (ii) for his absence and (iii) non-reply to the show cause notice.

Appeal Case No. 1348 of 2018

Hearing dated 05.11.2018:

In the last hearing, the PIO was asked to appear personally and reply to the show cause notice issued to the PIO. The PIO has chosen not to appear before the Commission but has preferred to send an affidavit through an Assistant without any authority letter. The Commission has taken a serious view of this and does not accept his plea.

The PIO is hereby afforded one last opportunity to appear personally before the Commission and plead his case for show cause issued to the PIO for non compliance of the orders of the Commission.

To come up on **19.12.2018 at 11.00 AM.**

Sd/-

**Chandigarh
Dated: 05.11.2018**

**(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner**

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com

E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh. Ashok Kumar,
Sr Lecture Assistant Govt College Lab,
Technical Staff Union, Pb, C/o Deepak Photostat,
Opposite Govt College, Gurdaspur.

.....Appellant.

Versus

Public Information Officer,
DPI, (SE), P.S.E.B,
Phase-8, Mohali.

First Appellate Authority,
DPI, (SE), P.S.E.B,
Phase-8, Mohali.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1698 of 2018

Present: None for the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was last heard on 25.09.2018. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The appellant through RTI application dated 30.11.2017 has sought information regarding posts of Senior Lab Attendants in the Punjab Government Schools and other information concerning the office of DPI (SE), P.S.E.B. Mohali. The appellant was not provided the information after which he filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 17.02.2018 which took no decision on the appeal.

The respondent present has pleaded that the information has been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 16.05.2018 and a copy of the same is submitted to the Commission. The appellant is absent to point out any discrepancy in the information.

I have seen the RTI application and the reply sent by the respondent. Regarding point No.3, the Commission feels that if the information is available for the year 1996, it should be provided. Mere writing that the information is old, cannot become a reason to deny the information if it is held by a public authority. The PIO is directed to send the complete information regarding point No.3 within 5 days of the receipt of the orders of the Commission.”

Hearing dated 05.11.2018:

In the last hearing the PIO was directed to send the complete information regarding Point No.3 within 5 days to the appellant. The appellant is absent on second consecutive hearing. It is presumed that he has received the information and is not interested to pursue his case further.

No further course of action is required. The case is **disposed off and closed**.

Chandigarh
Dated: 05.11.2018

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com
E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh.Ravinder Dhingra,
R/o H.No.733, First Floor,
Sector 43-A, Chandigarh.

... Appellant

Public Information Officer,
O/o City Police Station,
Main Bazar Kharar.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Punjab Police Head Quarter,
Sector 9, Chandigarh.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1273 of 2018

Present: Sh.Ravinder Dhingra as Appellant
Sh.Parminder Singh, Constable Police Chowki, Sunny Enclave, Kharar on behalf
of the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on **19.06.2018**. The respondent was absent. The PIO was directed to provide the information to the appellant within a week and be present on the next date of hearing alongwith proof of having provided the information.

The case was again heard on **24.07.2018**. Sh.Avtar Singh, ASI Police Choki Sunny Enclave was present. The PIO was directed to submit copy of complaint to the Commission alongwith objection of Smt.ChandaniKukreja in the complaint. Sh.Rajesh Traffic Incharge Mohali was also directed to be present personally on the next date of hearing.

The case was again heard on **21.08.2018**. Sh.RajeshHastir, Inspector Police Station Mullanpur was present. The respondent brought the information. The appellant was not satisfied. The appellant pleaded that he has sought information relating to Police Station, Kharar and not Police Chowki, Sunny Enclave or Mullanpur. The respondent also pleaded that he will rectify and provide the information pertaining to Police Station Kharar within 10 days.

The PIO Police Station, Kharar was directed to review the RTI application and provide the information as per the RTI application within 10 days.

The case was last heard on **18.09.2018**: The order is reproduced hereunder:

The respondent present has brought the information regarding Police Station Kharar which can be handed over to the appellant. The same is being taken on the file of the Commission. However, since the appellant is absent and vide letter received in the Commission on 14.09.2018, he has sought adjournment, the respondent is directed to send the information duly certified to the appellant within 5 days through registered post. The same is also being attached with the orders of the Commission.”

Hearing dated 05.11.2018:

In the hearing on 24.07.2018, the PIO was directed to submit copy of complaint to the Commission alongwith the objection of Smt.Chandani Kukreja whereby she did not want the complaint to be handed over to Sh.Ravinder Dhingra. In the last hearing, the respondent had provided the objections but did not submit the complaint to the commission to take a view whether the copy of the complaint is to be provided to the appellant or not.

The PIO is directed to bring entire case file including the copy of complaint to the Commission for further consideration of the case.

The case is adjourned. Both the parties to be present on **19.12.2018 at 11.00 AM** for further hearing.

Sd/-

**Chandigarh
Dated:05.11.2018.**

**(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner**

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com

E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh. Mohinder Singh, S/o Sh.Bant Singh,
H No-1, Gulmohar Complex, Desu Majra,
Sector-125, Mohali

Appellant.

Versus

Public Information Officer,
Circle Education Officer,
Jalandhar.

First Appellate Authority,
Circle Education Officer,
Jalandhar.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1715 of 2018

Present: Sh.Mohinder Singh as Appellant
Sh.Satpal, Principal, Govt. Girls Sr.Secondary School, Jandiala for the
Respondent

ORDER:

The case was last heard on **25.09.2018**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The appellant through RTI application dated 12.02.2018 has sought information regarding letter No.2/82-2011 dated 30.05.2011 relating to Ms.SandeepKaur d/o Sh.Nanak Singh concerning the office of Circle Education Officer, Jalandhar.. The appellant was not provided the information after which he filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 23.03.2018 which took no decision on the appeal.

The appellant has informed that no information has been provided to him. The respondent is absent without intimation to the Commission. In the interest of justice, one more opportunity is granted and the PIO is directed to provide the information to the appellant within 10 days and be present on the next date of hearing.”

Hearing dated 05.11.2018:

The respondent present has pleaded that he has been deputed to handle this RTI as deemed PIO. The respondent has informed that the office of Circle Education Officer Jalandhar has been closed and the related record has been transferred to the concerned Districts. The respondent further pleaded for a copy of the RTI application and has ensured to provide the information within 15 days. A copy of the RTI application has been provided by the appellant to the respondent.

The respondent is directed to collect the information from the concerned departments and send to the appellant within 15 days

Both the parties to be present on **19.12.2018 at 11.00 AM** for further hearing.

Chandigarh
Dated: 05.11.2018

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com

E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh. Mohinder Singh, S/o Sh. Bant Singh,
01 Gulmohar Complex, DesuMajra, Sector-125,
Mohali.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
DEO (SE),
Gurdaspur.

First Appellate Authority,
DEO (SE),
Gurdaspur

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1720 of 2018

Present: Sh.Mohinder Singh as Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER: The case was first heard on **30.08.2018**. The PIO was directed to provide the information in accordance with the RTI Act. The PIO was also directed to explain the reasons for not responding to the RTI application.”

The case was last heard on **24.09.2018**. **The order is reproduced hereunder:**

“The respondent present has pleaded that due to shifting of their office from the existing place to DAC Complex, the information could not be provided. The respondent further pleaded that they shall send the information to the appellant within 5 days.

In the last order, the PIO was directed to explain the reasons for not responding to the RTI application but he has not brought the explanation. The PIO is hereby given last opportunity to be present personally on the next date of hearing and explain the reasons for not responding to the RTI application and why penalty should not be imposed. The PIO is also directed to send the information to the appellant within 5 days of the receipt of the orders of the Commission.”

Hearing dated 05.11.2018:

The appellant informed that he has received the information and is satisfied.

Since the information has been provided, no further course of action is required.

The case is **disposed off and closed**.

Chandigarh
Dated: 05.11.2018

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com

E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

REGD POST

ShMadanLal, S/o ShParkash ,JainNiwas,
MCB Zone-2, H No-10803, Street No-18,
Parinda Road 18, Guru TegBahadur Nagar,
Bathinda.

Appellant.

Versus

Public Information Officer,
SHO, Gidderbaha,
DisttShriMukatsar Sahib.

First Appellate Authority,
SHO, Gidderbaha,
DisttShriMukatsar Sahib.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3085 of 2018

Present: None for the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER: The case was first heard on **03.10.2018**: The respondent was absent.

The PIO was directed to provide the information to the appellant as per RTI application within 48 hours of the receipt of the orders of the Commission. If the PIO wants to seek any exemption, he should give valid reasons and the section under which the exemption is sought.

The case was again heard on **09.10.2019**. The respondent was absent. The appellant informed that the information has not been provided to him. The PIO was directed to provide the information to the appellant within 48 hours be present personally on the next date of hearing with explanation for delay in providing the information on an affidavit.

The case was last heard on **23.10.2018**: The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The case was last heard under Life and Liberty. The appellant is absent without intimation to the Commission. The respondent is also absent.

The PIO is again directed to provide the information to the appellant within 48 hours of the receipt of the order via email or registered post and send compliance to the Commission. The PIO is also directed to be present personally on the next date of hearing with explanation for delay in providing the information on an affidavit.

A copy of the order is being sent to the SSP, Sri Mukatsar Sahib for compliance of the orders of the Commission.”

Hearing dated 05.11.2018:

The appellant vide email has desired to withdraw the appeal and has requested to close the case.

The case is **disposed off and closed**.

Chandigarh
Dated: 05.11.2018.

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner