

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden, Sector 16,**  
**Chandigarh.**

Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - [psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in)

Visit us: - [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)



Sh. Surjit Singh, S/o Sh.Gokul Singh,  
VPO Jarg, Tehsil Payal,  
Distt.Ludhiana.

...Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o DPI (EE),  
Sri Fatehgarh Sahib.

Respondent

**Complaint Case No. 457 of 2020**

**PRESENT: Sh.Surjit Singh as the Complainant**  
**Mrs.Ravinder Pal Kaur, Suptd. O/o DPI for the Respondent**

**Order:**

The complainant through RTI application dated 08.06.2020 has sought information regarding copy of bill vide which the arrears was paid to Sh.Prem Chand Head Teacher as per order of high court – copy of letter dated 05.05.2020 – copy of rule vide which seniority was fixed after 23 years and other information concerning the office of DPI(EE) Sri Fatehgarh Sahib. The complainant was not provided the information after which the complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 13.10.2020.

The case was first heard on 25.11.2020. Both the parties were absent.

The Commission received a letter diary No.13790 on 13.10.2020 from the DEO(EE) Sri Fatehgarh Sahib vide which the PIO had sent information on point-2 & 4 but has denied the information on point-1 & 3 stating that the information being 3<sup>rd</sup> party information, it cannot be provided. However, the PIO had not mentioned in the letter under which section of the RTI Act, the PIO was taking exemption and there was nothing on the file to explain that the PIO had applied the provisions of section 11 which pertains to Third Party Information.

Having gone through the record, the Commission observes that there has been a delay of more than four months in attending to the RTI application. The PIO was directed to explain the reasons for not attending to the RTI application within the time prescribed as well as not following due procedures. The PIO was also directed to appear before the Commission on the next date of hearing. A copy of the information was sent to the complainant.

**Hearing dated 06.01.2021:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Sri Fatehgarh Sahib. The respondent present pleaded that the information has already been provided to the complainant vide letter dated 13.10.2020. As per appellant, the information is incomplete and uncertified.

**Complaint Case No. 457 of 2020**

Hearing both the parties, the PIO is directed for the following:

- Point-1 - PIO to provide the information
- Point-2 - To provide certified copy of information
- Point-3 - To give in writing that the information is true and no  
other Information is available
- Point-4 - To provide. If not available, to give in writing on an  
affidavit

The information to be provided within 15 days of the receipt of the order.

With the above order, the case is **disposed off and closed.**

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated:06.01.2021**

**Sd/-**  
**(Khushwant Singh)**  
**State Information Commissioner**



Sh.Amrik Singh,  
Block J/26, BRS Nagar  
Ludhiana.

...Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Deputy Commissioner,  
Patiala.

... Respondent

**Complainant case No.385 of 2020**

Present: None for the complainant  
Sh.Shyam Lal Sharma, ATO Patiala for the Respondent

ORDER:

The complainant through RTI application dated 04.05.2020 has sought information regarding posting of MVI in Patiala and other Districts – their working details – detail of vehicle provided to MVI – work allotted except passing of vehicles – details of staff deputed under the MVI and other information concerning the office of DC Patiala. The appellant was not provided the information after which the complainant filed complaint in the Commission on 30.06.2020.

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. The respondent present pleaded that the complainant had filed RTI application with the office of DC Patiala which was transferred to them vide letter dated 13.05.2020.

The respondent further informed that till the date of RTI application, the post of MVI was lying vacant and the reply has already been sent to the complainant vide letter dated 03.06.2020 with a copy to the Commission.

Since the RTI application has been attended to within the time prescribed under the RTI Act and the reply has been sent to the complainant, I see no reason to continue the case further and close the complainant case.

If the complainant is not satisfied with the reply, he should go to the First Appellate Authority.

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

Chandigarh  
Dated 06.01.2021

Sd/-  
Khushwant Singh  
State Information Commissioner



Sh.Jarnail Singh, S/o Sh. Thakur Singh,  
R/o 23/14, Anand Nagar-B,  
Tipri Patiala.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o Tehsildar,  
Patiala.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o SDM,  
Patiala.

...Respondent

**Appeal case No.834 of 2020**

**Present: Sh.Jarnail Singh as the Appellant**  
**Sh.Ranjit Singh, Thsildar Patiala for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant through RTI application dated 04.10.2019 has sought information regarding khasra number of residential house of Smt. Karamjit Kaur w/o Pargat Singh – name of owner of house constructed on khasra No.16//23/2(2-0)and khasra No.16/23/1(2-15) and other information concerning the office of Tehsildar Patiala. The appellant was not satisfied with the information provided by the PIO vide letter dated 29.10.2019 after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 04.11.2019 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case was first heard on 26.08.2020 through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant was not satisfied.

Having gone through the RTI application and hearing both the parties, the PIO was directed to provide whatever the document is available on the basis of latest demarcation of the said land.

**Hearing dated 06.01.2021:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant.

After having discussed the matter, I am convinced that the information has been provided to the best possible extent and no further cause of action is left in this appeal case.

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

Chandigarh  
Dated :06.01.2021

**Sd/-**  
**Khushwant Singh**  
**State Information Commissioner**



Sh.Surjit Singh, S/o Late Sh.Bishan Singh,  
Kothi No-2, Urban Estate,  
Phase-2, Patiala.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o DC,  
Patiala.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o DC,  
Patiala.

...Respondent

**Appeal case No.793 of 2020**

**Present: Sh.Surjit Singh as the Appellant**  
**Sh.Surjit Singh, Clerk O/o DC Patiala for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant through RTI application dated 16.10.2019 has sought information regarding action taken report on the application dated 24.06.2019 – statement of both parties and witnesses – decision taken and other information concerning the office of Deputy Commissioner, Patiala. The appellant was not satisfied with the information provided by the PIO vide letter dated 06.12.2019 after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 26.12.2019 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case was first heard on 26.08.2020 through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. 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 and send a compliance report to the Commission.

**Hearing dated 06.01.2021:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant with a copy to the Commission. The appellant has received the information.

A copy of the information is being sent to the appellant alongwith the order.

Since the information has been provided, no further course of action is required. The case is **disposed off and closed**.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated 06.01.2021**

**Sd/-**  
**Khushwant Singh**  
**State Information Commissioner**

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,**

**Sector 16, Chandigarh.**

**Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - [psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in)**

**Visit us: - [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)**



Sh. Ranjit Singh, S/o Sh Ram Singh,  
VPO Galwati, Police Station, Sadar Nabha,  
Tehsil Nabha, Distt Patiala.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o SSP,  
Patiala.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o IGP, Patiala Range,  
Patiala .

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 416 of 2020**

**PRESENT: None for the Appellant**  
**Sh.Hakam Singh, ASI for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant through RTI application dated 31.07.2019 has sought information regarding FIR No.129 dated 18.07.2019 PS SadarNabha – copy of FIR – Copy of RC of vehicle –Driving license of car driver – action taken and other information concerning the office of SSP Patiala. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 03.09.2019 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 08.07.2020 through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. The respondent present pleaded that as per report of Chief officer, Police Station SadarNabha dated 19.03.2020, the challan alongwith relevant record has been presented in the Court of Judicial Magistrate First Class, Nabha on 13.01.2020, the information cannot be provided.

The PIO-JMIC was impleaded in the case and directed to look at the RTI application and provide the information to the appellant as per the RTI Act. A copy of RTI application was enclosed with the order.

On the date of last hearing on **02.09.2020**, the appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent present pleaded that as per report of Chief officer, Police Station Sadar Nabha, the challan alongwith relevant record has been presented in the Court on 13.01.2020, the information cannot be provided.

On the hearing of 08.07.2020, the PIO-JMIC was impleaded and directed to provide the information to the appellant as per the RTI Act and a copy of RTI application was sent to the PIO. The PIO-JMIC was absent on 02.09.2020.

Having gone through the record, the Commission observed that when the RTI application was filed, the information was in the custody of the police but the information was not provided. There had been an enormous delay in providing the information, the PIO O/o SSP Patiala was directed to explain the reasons why the information was not provided within the stipulated time and if denied under what ground and under what circumstances. The PIO was also directed to bring an explanation on the next date of hearing.

The respondent informed that the information was earlier in the custody of Police Station Sadar, Nabha and since the challan alongwith other documents has been presented in the court, now it is lying in the custody of the court.

**Appeal Case No. 416 of 2020**

The PIO-SSP Patiala was directed to procure the documents from the concerned court/police station/police file and provide to the appellant.

**Hearing dated 06.01.2021:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. The respondent has brought the information.

The appellant is absent. The respondent is directed to send the information to the appellant through registered post with a copy to the Commission.

**Case is disposed off.**

**Chandigarh  
Dated 06.01.2021**

**Sd/-  
(Khushwant Singh)  
State Information Commissioner**



Sh Raj Singh, S/o Ishar Singh,  
R/o Village Todarwal, P.O Babarpur,  
Tehsil Nabha, Distt Patiala

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o SSP,  
Patiala.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o IGP, Patiala Range,  
Patiala.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 1635 of 2019**

**PRESENT: None for the Appellant**  
**Sh.Hakam Singh, ASI for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant through RTI application dated 30.11.2018 has sought information regarding case No.293 dated 4.9.2014 Police Station Tripti Patiala and case no.309 dated 15.09.2014 Police Station Tripti Patiala and other information concerning the office of SSP patiala. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 09.01.2019 which took no decision on the appeal.

On the date of first hearing on 14.11.2019, the respondent present pleaded that the enquiry in both the cases has been completed and the reports alongwith complete files have been submitted in the courts of Sh.Randeep Kumar, Judicial Magistrate (1st Class)Patiala. The reply has been sent to the appellant. As per respondent, the appellant was satisfied with the reply and had agreed to get the information from the concerned court. The appellant however, asked for supply of copy of FIR only which they will send to the appellant through registered post. The appellant was absent and telephonically had asked for adjournment.

On the date of hearing on **23.01.2020**, the respondent pleaded that the appellant be asked to inspect the record and get the relevant information. The appellant agreed for the same. The appellant was directed to inspect the record by fixing a mutually convenient date and time and get the relevant information. The PIO was directed to allow inspection and provide the information as per the RTI Act before the next date of hearing.

On the date of next hearing on **17.02.2020**, tThe appellant informed that despite visiting the office of PIO for three times, the PIO did not provide the record for inspection. The respondent pleaded that since the enquiry has been completed and the report alongwith complete record has been presented in the court, the information cannot be provided. The copy of FIR was provided to the appellant during the hearing. The respondent was directed to send appropriate reply to the appellant that why information on other points is being denied. The reply to be sent within a week.

On the next date of hearing on **02.03.2020**, the respondent present pleaded that as per report of SHO, Police Station Tripti Patiala, the enquiry in both the FIR cases has been completed and final report has been filed in the court. The reply has been sent to the appellant.

The appellant was absent. The case was adjourned.



**Appeal Case No. 1635 of 2019**

On the date of hearing on **05.08.2020**, the appellant informed that as per the claim of the police, he had sought documents from the concerned court where the said challan had been presented. The appellant claimed that the court had provided some documents, but denied the remaining documents on the grounds that the remaining documents are not part of the judicial file.

Henceforth, The PIO was directed to provide the remaining documents, which are in the custody of the police. It was also made clear that if the PIO is unable to provide the information that has been sought, the Commission will be constrained to conduct an enquiry as to where the rest of the documents are-since the police is claiming that they are now part of the judicial file, whereas the court has replied that it has only some documents on the file which have been sought .

On the date of last hearing on **02.09.2020**, the respondent present pleaded that point-wise reply has been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 27.07.2020 with a copy to the Commission. As per respondent, following reply had been sent to the appellant:

- Point-1 : Copy of FIR provided in the court on 17.02.2020
- Point-2 : No enquiry was conducted
- Point-3 : No statement available in the record
- Point-4 : Information cannot be provided
- Point-5 : Presented in the court
- Point-6 : Cannot be provided
- Point-7 : Provided
- Point-8 : Cannot be provided
- Point-9 : Cannot be provided

Having gone through the reply of the PIO, the Commission found that the RTI application has been sufficiently addressed. However, the PIO had simply denied the information on points 4,6 8 & 9 and had not given any reasons and under which section had he denied the information. The PIO was directed to explain specific reasons for denial of information on points, and under which section the information has been denied. If the information on any point is not available in the record, the PIO is give in writing on an affidavit.

**Hearing dated 06.01.2021:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC, Patiala. The respondent present pleaded that the information as available in the record has been provided to the appellant and no further information is available.

The appellant is absent on 2<sup>nd</sup> consecutive hearing nor has communicated any discrepancies. It appears that the appellant has received the information and is satisfied.

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

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 06.01.2021**

**Sd/-**  
**(Khushwant Singh)**  
**State Information Commissioner**