

Sh. Ram Murti, S/o Sh Jaswant Rai, Sandhu Colony, H No-77, Village Malak Nangar, Tehsil Baba Bakala Distt Amritsar.

Versus

... Complainant

Public Information Officer, O/o SDO, PSPCL, Mehta Chowk, Amritsar.

...Respondent

# Complaint Case No. 1125 of 2018

#### Present: None for the Complainant None for the Respondent

# ORDER:

The case was first heard on **14.01.2019.** The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the complainant vide letter dated 06.12.2018 and submitted a copy the same to the Commission. The complainant was absent and vide letter received in the Commission on 11.01.2019, informed that the information has not been provided by the PIO. The Commission found that the PIO had not handled the RTI application properly and there was a delay of 3 months in attending to the RTI application. The PIO was directed to explain the reasons for delay in attending to the RTI application.

The case was last heard on **27.02.2019** through video conference facility available in the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Amritsar. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the complainant. However, the PIO did not submit any reply for delay in providing the information. The PIO was directed to be present on the next date of hearing and submit solid reasons for delay in attending to the RTI application on an affidavit.

# Hearing dated 06.05.2019:

The case has come up for further hearing today through video conference facility available in the office of **Deputy Commissioner**, **Amritsar**. The respondent is absent. The Commission has received a letter diary No.4895 on 06.03.2019 from the office of PIO-SDO, PSPCL Mahta Chowk Amritsar stating that the information has been provided to the complainant. The PIO in the letter has further stated that due to shortage of staff, the information has been delayed and they shall be careful in future. The plea is accepted.

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

Sd/-

Chandigarh Dated: 06.05.2019 (Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner



Sh. Harbans Singh, S/o Sh.Chunni Lal, Kothi No-1, Ward No-1, Near SD School, FatehgarhChurian, Distt.Gurdaspur.

....Appellant.

Versus

Public Information Officer,

Commissioner, Nagar Nigam, Amritsar.

First Appellate Authority,

Director, Local Govt, Sector-35, Chandigarh.

# Appeal Case No. 1397 of 2018

...Respondent

Present:	None for the Appellant
	None for the Respondent

#### ORDER:

The case was first heard on **27.06.2018**. Both the parties were absent and the case was adjourned.

The case was again heard on **25.07.2018**. Sh.D.P.Verma, SrAssstant from the office of Director Local Govt. Chandigarh was present. The PIO was directed to provide the information to the appellant within 10 days of the receipt of order and also explain the reason for not providing the information within the prescribed time limit under the RTI Act.

The case again came up for hearing on **28.08.2018:** Ms.HarpreetKaur, Building Inspector-cum-APIO from the office of Commissioner Nagar Nigam Amritsar was present for the respondent. The Commission found that the PIO's replies are vague and wishy washy. The reply that the appellant had not attached a valid ID holds no ground as the matter has already been adjudicated before the First Appellate Authority. Regarding the statement of the PIO that the information is third party, the Commission finds that the PIO has not even tended to the provisions of section 11(1) of the RTI Act.

The Commission found gross negligence on the part of PIO and directed the PIO to send a notice to the third party for their submission. The PIO was also directed to explain the reasons for delay in handling the RTI application.

The case was again heard on **26.09.2018.** The respondent was absent. The Commission had recorded gross negligence on the part of the PIO while tending to the RTI application and to not abide by either the order of the First Appellate Authority or the second appellate, which is the State Commission, Punjab. The PIO was issued show cause notice for not supplying the information within the statutory prescribed period of time under the RTI Act and for not complying with the order of the Commission. The PIO was directed to file reply to the show cause on an affidavit and be present personally on the next date of hearing.

The case was further heard on **19.11.2018.** The appellant informed that the information has not been provided to him so far. The respondent was again absent and neither provided the information nor replied to the show cause notice. The PIO was granted one last opportunity to reply to the show cause and be present personally before the Commission on the next date of hearing. Since there was continuous denial of the information on the part of the PIO, the Commission directed the Chief Commissioner, Nagar Nigam Amritsar to ensure compliance of the orders of the Commission and also to ensure the presence of the PIO before the Commission alongwith reply to the show cause.

The case was again heard on **15.01.2019.** The appellant was absent and vide email informed that no information has been provided.

The respondent was again absent and neither provided the information nor has replied to the show cause notice. The APIO, Ms.Harpreet Kaur (to be the deemed PIO by the Commission) was given one more opportunity to be present before the Commission on the next date of hearing alongwith the reply to the show cause. The Chief Commissioner, Nagar Nigam, Amritsar was also directed to ensure the presence of the PIO before the Commission on the next date of hearing alongwith reply to the show cause.

The case was last heard on **11.03.2019.** The appellant vide email informed that the information has not been provided. The PIO was absent on  $4^{th}$  consecutive hearing and nor had replied to the show cause.

On not providing the information on time as prescribed under section 7, which is within 30 days of the receipt of the request, and for repeated and willful defiance of the Punjab State Information Commission's orders, Ms.Harpreet Kaur, APIO(deemed PIO in this case) was found guilty and a penalty of **Rs.25**, **000/-** was imposed upon Ms.Harpreet Kaur, APIO-cum-deemed PIO, O/o Commissioner, Nagar Nigam, Amritsar which was to be deposited in the Govt. Treasury. The APIO-cum-deemed PIO, Ms.Harpreet Kaur O/o Commissioner, Nagar Nigam, Amritsar was directed to duly inform the Commission of the compliance of the orders by producing a copy of the challan justifying the deposition of the penalty in the Govt Treasury.

The PIO was also directed to provide part of the information i.e. the names of the property holders only to the appellant within a week and send a compliance report to the Commission.

#### Hearing dated 06.05.2019:

The case has come up for hearing today. The appellant is also absent and vide email has sought adjournment. The respondent is again absent and has not sent any compliance report to the commission. The PIO is granted one last opportunity to comply with the earlier order of the Commission which still stands and send a compliance report of the order by producing a copy of the challan justifying the deposition of the penalty in the Govt. Treasury. The PIO is also directed to be present on the next date of hearing otherwise the Commission will be constrained to issue warrants under section 18(3) of the RTI Act.

The case is adjourned. To come up for compliance on **02.07.2019 at 11.00 AM**.

Sd/-

Chandigarh Dated: 06.05.2019. (Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner

CC to: 1. The Chief Commissioner, Nagar Nigam, Amritsar

> 2. Ms.Harpreet Kaur, Building Inspector, Municipal Corporation, Moga



Sh.Ravjot Singh, S/o Lt.Sh.Didar Singh, H No-386/10, NeemWala,Chowk, Brown Road, Ludhiana.

....Appellant

Versus

#### **Public Information Officer**, DTO, Mohali.

**First Appellate Authority,** DTO, Mohali.

..Respondent

# Appeal Case No. 1696 of 2018

# Present: None for the Appellant Mrs.Baljeet Kaur, Superintendent-cum-PIO O/o SDM Kharar for the Respondent

#### ORDER:

The case was first heard**on 29.08.2018**. The respondent pleaded that the information relates to the office of SDM Kharar and the appellant has been informed for the same. The appellant was not satisfied. The PIO was directed to have a relook at the RTI and provide the information concerning to their department. The PIO was further directed to transfer the RTI application for the remaining information to the concerned department. The PIO, SDM Kharar was directed to provide the information which pertains to them in accordance with the RTI Act.

The case was again heard on **26.09.2018.** "The respondent present pleaded that since the vehicle in question for which the appellant has sought information was registered with the office of SDM, Kharar, they have transferred the RTI application to the PIO, SDM Kharar. The appellant is absent to point out whether he has received the information or not. The PIO-SDM, Kharar was directed to provide the information and be present on the next date of hearing.

The case again came up for hearing on **19.11.2018.** The appellant informed that the information has not been provided to him so far. The PIO-SDM Kharar was again directed to provide the information to the appellant within 10 days and be present personally on the next date of hearing and explain the reasons for delay in providing the information.

The case was again heard on **15.01.2019.** The appellant was absent and vide email sought exemption. The appellant however, did not informe whether the appellant had received the information or not.

The respondent was also absent. The PIO-SDM Kharar was directed to comply with the earlier order of the Commission which still stands and be present personally on the next date of hearing alongwith the explanation for delay in providing the information, otherwise the Commission will be constrained to take action as per RTI Act.

#### Appeal Case No. 1696 of 2018

The case was last heard on **11.03.2019.** The appellant was absent. The PIO-SDM Kharar was again absent and neither sent any communication whether the PIO has complied with the order of the Commission or not. The PIO-SDM Kharar was issued a **show cause notice and the PIO was directed to file** an affidavit in this regard. The PIO-SDM Kharar was again directed to provide the information to the appellant within 10 days.

#### Hearing dated 06.05.2019:

The respondent has submitted a reply to the show cause notice. In the reply, the PIO has stated that they received the RTI application on 29.09.2018 and sent reply to the appellant vide letter dated 12.10.2018 and again sent point-wise reply vide letter dated 18.04.2019. The PIO further stated in the reply that since they did not receive the order of the Commission dated 29.08.2018, 26.09.2018, 19.11.2018 and 15.01.2019, the PIO could not appear and assured to be careful in future. The plea is accepted.

The appellant is absent to point-out the discrepancies, if any with the latest information that has been provided. I have gone through the reply and found that the information has been provided to the best possible extent.

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

Sd/-

Chandigarh Dated: 06.05.2019 (Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner

CC to PIO-SDM, Kharar

AND PSIC Using the formation of the form

Sh.Gurpreet Singh, S/o Sh.Surinder Singh, Village Hussainpura, P/O Badhochi.Kalan Tehsil &DisttShri Fatehgarh Sahib.

Versus

Appellant.

**Public Information Officer,** O/o DC, Distt.Shri.Fatehgarh Sahib.

**First Appellate Authority,** O/o Addl, DC, Distt.Shri.Fatehgarh Sahib.

...Respondent

# Appeal Case No. 1795 of 2018

# Present: Sh.Gurpreet Singh as Appellant Sh. Rajinder Singh, Panchayat Secretary for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first head on 20.08.2018. The respondent was absent. The Commission received a letter diary No.16039 dated 06.8.2018 from the PIO, DDPO Fatehgarh Sahib vide which the PIO-DDPO has transferred the RTI to BDPO, Sirhind, instructing them to provide the information directly to the appellant.

The PIO was directed to provide the information to the appellant within 15 days and be present on the next date of hearing. The PIO was also directed to explain the reasons for not providing the information within the time prescribed under the RTI Act."

The case was again heard on **26.09.2018.** The appellant informed that he has not received the information. Sh.Rajinder Singh, Panchayat Secretary was present. The respondent pleaded that he has just joined the seat as the earlier dealing person Sh.Tajinder Singh has been transferred. The respondent further assured to send the information within 10 days. The PIO was directed to provide the information and send compliance report to the Commission. Sh.Rajinder Singh was also directed to explain the reasons for delay in providing the information. The explanation be sent on an affidavit.

The case again came up for hearing on **1911.2018.** Sh.Iqbal Singh, Panchayat Secretary o/o BDPO Sirhind was present. The respondent present has pleaded that he has received the RTI application recently and assured to provide the information within 10 days. The PIO, BDPO Sirhindwas given one more opportunity to provide the information to the appellant within 10 days and be present personally on the next date of hearing alongwith explanation for delay in providing the information on an affidavit.

The case was again heard on **15.01.2019.** The appellant informed that no information has been provided to him. The PIO was absent on 4<sup>th</sup> consecutive hearing and preferred to not abide by the order of the Commission. Taking a serious view of the scant regard shown by the PIO towards the RTI Act, the PIO-BDPO Sirhind was issued **show cause notice under section 20 of the RTI Act** and the PIO was directed to 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.

The commission also directed the PIO to provide the information to the appellant within 10 days and send a compliance report to the Commission.

The case was last heard on **11.03.2019.** The appellant informed that the information has not been provided so far. The respondent Sh.Rajinder Singh appeared late and pleaded that since the earlier BDPO has been transferred and new BDPO has recently joined, the case be adjourned for the next date. The respondent further assured to provide the information within 15 days.

The case was adjourned and the PIO was directed to appear personally on the next date of hearing and submit reply to the show cause notice on an affidavit. The PIO was also directed to provide the information within 15 days and send a compliance report to the Commission.

#### Hearing dated 06.05.2019:

The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant informed that he has received the information but still there is some discrepancy.

In the hearing on 15.01.2019, the appellant was present and informed that the PIO has not provided the information. The PIO was absent. The PIO-BDPO Sirhind was issued a show cause notice under section 20 of the RTI Act for not providing the information within the time prescribed under the RTI Act, and for continuous defiance of the Commission's order. The PIO-BDPO Sirhind was directed to file an affidavit in this regard. The PIO was also directed to provide the information within 10 days and send a compliance report to the Commission.

In the hearing on 11.03.2019, Sh.Rajinder Singh, Panchayat Secretary appeared late and pleaded that since the earlier BDPO has been transferred and new BDPO has recently joined, the case be adjourned.

During this hearing, it has come to the notice that the BDPO Sirhind had transferred the RTI application to Sh.Rajinder Singh, Panchayat Secretary-cum-PIO Gram Panchayat, Hussainpura, Block Sirhind under section 6(3) of the RTI Act vide letter dated 08.02.2018 with a direction to provide the information to the appellant. Now the responsibility lies on the Panchayat Secretary-cum-PIO Gram Panchayat, Hussainpura.

The PIO has submitted an affidavit explaining the reasons for delay in providing the information. Since the application was transferred to the Panchayat Secretary-cum-PIO Gram Panchayat, the PIO-Gram Panchayat has submitted a reply to the show cause. The reply, however does not justify the enormous delay in providing the information.

Since the responsibility to ensure the timely transmission of the information to the appellant lies on the PIO, the PIO-Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat, Hussainpura is hereby held guilty for not providing the information on time as prescribed under section 7, which is within 30 days of the receipt of the request, and for repeated and willful defiance of the Punjab State Information Commission's orders.

A penalty of **Rs.10,000/-** is hereby imposed upon the PIO, Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat, Hussainpura which be deposited in the Govt. Treasury. The PIO, Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat, Hussainpura is directed to duly inform the Commission of the compliance of the orders by producing a copy of the challan justifying the deposition of the penalty in the Govt Treasury.

# Appeal Case No. 1795 of 2018

Further, the Commission is of the view that since the appellant has had to suffer undue inconvenience to get the information, it is a fit case for awarding compensation to the appellant u/s 19(8)(b) of the RTI Act.

The PIO is directed to pay an amount of **Rs.5000/-** 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.

2) The PIO is directed to provide rest of the information and send a compliance report to the Commission.

To come up for further hearing on **02.07.2019 at 11.00 AM**.

Sd/-

Chandigarh Dated: 06.05.2019 (Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner

# CC to 1. The PIO, DDPO Sri Fatehgarh Sahib

- 2. The PIO- BDPO Sirhind
- 3. PIO-Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat, Hussainpura



Sh Thakar Dass, S/o Sh Guranditta Mal, R/o Village Diwan Khera, Tehsil Abohar, Distt Fazilka..

Versus

.....Appellant

...Respondent

**Public Information Officer,** O/o SDM, Abohar, Distt Fazilka.

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

# Appellant Case No. 3474 of 2018

# Present: Sh.Thakar Dass as Appellant None for the Respondent

#### ORDER:

The case was first heard on **09.01.2019.** The respondent present brought some information and handed over to the appellant. The appellant received the same. The respondent further pleaded that the remaining information shall be provided to the appellant. The appellant pleaded that he had filed RTI application in the month of April whereas the respondent is providing the information after a delay of 9 months.

The PIO was directed to explain the reasons for delay in providing the information on an affidavit. If there is any other official involved in the delay, that person to appear and explain the reasons.

The case was last heard on **27.02.2019** through video conference facility available in the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Fazilka. The respondent present pleaded that the information has already been provided to the appellant during the last hearing. The respondent further informed that as per order of the Commission, remaining information was sent to the appellant vide letter dated 11.01.2019. The appellant was not satisfied with the information. The appellant further informed that the information has been provided after a period of 9 months.

Having gone through the RTI application and hearing both the parties, the Commission found that the RTI application had been replied to the best possible extent. However, the Commission observed that there had been enormous delay of nine months in providing the information, the PIO-SDM Abohar was issued a **show cause notice 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 order of the Commission. The PIO was directed to 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 06.05.2019:

The case has come up for hearing today. The respondent is absent and vide email has sought adjournment being on election duty.

The case is adjourned. The PIO is directed to comply with the earlier order which still stands.

To come up for further hearing on **02.07.2019 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Fazilka. **The PIO to be present at Chandigarh.** Copies of the order be sent to the parties through registered post.

Sd/-

Chandigarh Dated: 06.05.2019 (Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner



Sh Thakar Dass, S/o Sh Guranditta Mal, R/o Village Diwan Khera, Tehsil Abohar, Distt Fazilka..

....Appellant

Versus

#### **Public Information Officer,** O/o SDM, Abohar, Distt Fazilka.

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

...Respondent

#### Appellant Case No. 3475 of 2018

### Present: Sh.Thakar Dass as Appellant None for the Respondent

#### ORDER:

The case was first heard on **09.01.2019.** The respondent present brought some information and handed over to the appellant. The appellant received the same. The respondent further pleaded that the remaining information shall be provided to the appellant. The appellant pleaded that he had filed RTI application in the month of April whereas the respondent is providing the information after a delay of 9 months.

The PIO was directed to explain the reasons for delay in providing the information on an affidavit

The case was last heard on **27.02.2019** through video conference facility available in the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Fazilka. The respondent present pleaded that the information has already been provided to the appellant during the last hearing. The appellant was not satisfied and informed that the PIO vide his letter dated 18.10.2018 had denied the information stating that the information sought was in question form. The appellant further informed that the information has been provided after a period of 9 months.

Having gone through the RTI application and hearing both the parties, the Commission found that the RTI application had been replied to the best possible extent. However, the Commission observed that there had been enormous delay of nine months in providing the information. The PIO-SDM Abohar was issued a show cause 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 order of the Commission. The PIO was directed to 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 06.05.2019:

The case has come up for hearing today. The respondent is absent and vide email has sought adjournment being on election duty.

The case is adjourned. The PIO is directed to comply with the earlier order which still stands.

To come up for further hearing on **02.07.2019 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Fazilka. The PIO to be present at Chandigarh. Copies of the order be sent to the parties through registered post.

Sd/-

Chandigarh Dated: 06.05.2019 (Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner

Sh.Simranjit Singh, S/o ShJagdish Singh, # 93/2,Adarsh Nagar, Jalandhar

Versus

#### Public Information Officer,

O/o Jalandhar Development Authority, Jalandhar.

# First Appellate Authority,

O/o Jalandhar Development Authority, Jalandhar.

#### Appeal Case No. 3673 of 2018

# Present: None for the Appellant None for the Respondent

Order:

The case was first heard on **04.20.2019.** The respondent present pleaded that the information regarding point 1 has been provided and since the information sought regarding other points is not clear, it cannot be provided.

Having gone through the RTI application and the reply of the PIO, the Commission directed the appellant to clarify for which vehicle the information is being sought as well as to specify the period from which day and year, the information is being sought.

The case was last heard on **27.02.2019** through video conference facility available in the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Jalandhar. The appellant informed that he has specified the vehicle and period from which the information is being sought. The respondent pleaded that the appellant has provided the date today only. The PIO was directed to provide the information within 5 days and send a compliance report to the Commission.

# Hearing dated 06.05.2019:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conference facility available in the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Jalandhar. Since both the parties are absent, in the interest of justice, one more opportunity is granted and the case is adjourned.

To come up for further hearing on **02.07.2019 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Jalandhar Copies of the order be sent to the parties *through registered post*.

Sd/-

Chandigarh Dated: 06.05.2019 (Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner



Appellant.

...Respondent



Sh.Rajinder Kumar, Q No-35-L, I.T.I Staff Colony, Talwara

... Appellant

...Respondent

Versus

**Public Information Officer,** SDO, PSPCL, Sub Division, Haryana, Distt.Hoshiarpur.

**First Appellate Authority,** SDO, PSPCL, Sub Division, Haryana, DisttHoshiarpur.

# Appeal Case No. 3594 of 2018

# Present: Sh.Rajinder Kumar as Appellant Sh.Davinder Singh, SDO, PSPCL Haryana, Hoshiarpur for the Respondent

**Order:** The case was first heard on **04.02.2019.** The respondent present pleaded that since the information is 3<sup>rd</sup> party, it cannot be provided. Having gone through the RTI application, the Commission directed the PIO to provide information regarding points 2. Rest of the points tol be adjudicated at the next date of hearing.

The case was last heard on **27.02.2019.** The respondent informed that as per order of the Commission, the information regarding point-2 has been provided. Regarding information on point-1, the respondent denied the information stating that the information is 3<sup>rd</sup> party and it cannot be provided.

To provide an opportunity to the 3<sup>rd</sup> party under section 19(4) of the RTI Act, Sh.Baljinder Singh was impleaded as a party to the case and Sh.Baljinder Singh was directed to appear before the Commission on the next date of hearing if he wanted to plead the case. The PIO was also directed to provide information regarding point-4 to the appellant.

# Hearing dated 06.05.2019:

The respondent present pleaded that Sh.Baljinder Singh, the 3<sup>rd</sup> party has not given his consent to part with the information. Sh.Baljinder Singh is absent. Sh.Baljinder Singh, the 3<sup>rd</sup> party is given one more opportunity to appear before the Commission on the next date of hearing and plead his case otherwise the Commission will decide the case ex-parte.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing **on 02.07.2019 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Hoshiarpur. Copies of the order be sent to the parties *through registered post*.

Sd/-

Chandigarh Dated: 06.05.2019 (Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner

CC to Sh.Baljinder Singh S/o Sh.Hari Singh Saini, Village Bassi Mudda, P.O.Baghpur, District Hoshiarpur (M-81462-23964)



Sh.Prem Kumar Rattan, H No. 78/8, Park Road, New Mandi, Dhuri, DisttSangrur

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer, Police Commissioner, Sarabha Nagar, Ludhiana.

**First Appellate Authority,** Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana

...Respondent

#### Appeal Case No. 3097 of 2018

# Present: None for the Appellant Sh.Pawandeep Singh, SI O/o Police Commissioner, Ludhiana and Sh.Balwant Singh, HC for the Respondent

Order:

The case was first heard **on 26.11.2018.** The respondent pleaded that since the information is third party information, it cannot be provided and the appellant has been informed vide letter dated 20.08.2018. Since the information was denied on the ground that the information is 3<sup>rd</sup> party, the case was adjourned for adjudication on the next date of hearing

The case was again heard on **16.01.2019.** The appellant was absent and vide letter received in the Commission on 14.01.2019 informed that the information has not been provided.

The respondent present pleaded that since the information is 3<sup>rd</sup> party, it cannot be provided. The appellant had not been able to produce any evidence to prove that the revealing of station leave of Sh.Balwant Singh which is a matter of his service, will lead to revelation of indiscretion in service, corruption or human rights violation. The Commission observed that since the information being sought is about an intra-family dispute, the appellant was directed to produce evidence that revealing of information regarding Sh.Balwant Singh involves larger public interest.

The case was last heard on **11.03.2019.** The order is reproduced hereunder:

"The appellant alleged that Sh.Balwant Singh, HC had appeared as witness at Police Station Dhuri on 19.5.2018 and 22.06.2018 whereas Sh.Balwant Singh was posted in Ludhiana. The appellant claims that he requires the information regarding leave/station leave to ascertain whether Sh.Balwant Singh had taken appropriate leave/station leave to appear at Dhuri or had not.

Since this matter pertains to the services matter as already observed, the Commission directs Sh.Balwant Singh, HC to appear before the Commission to plead his case that why his information should not be provided since the appellant has raised a doubt about whether Sh.Balwant Singh had followed the procedure for appearing as witness at Police Station Dhuri."

#### Hearing dated 06.05.2019:

Sh.Balwant Singh, HC is present and informed that he appeared as witness at Police Station Dhuri on 19.05.2018 after taking permission from the Competent Authority and on 22.06.2018, he was on leave and the leave was duly sanctioned.

The PIO is directed to provide a copy of the permission granted by the competent authority to Sh.Balwant Singh, HC for appearing as a witness at Police Station Dhuri on 19.05.2018 and copy of leave application duly sanctioned by the competent authority to the appellant. The information be provided within a week and the PIO to send a compliance report to the Commission.

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

Sd/-

Chandigarh Dated: 06.05.2019 (Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner

CC to :Sh.Balwant Singh, HC H.No.824,Gali No.6, SBS Nagar, Ludhiana.

Sh.Sarvan Kumar, S/o ShRanvir Kumar, VPO Kullar, Tehsil Abohar, Distt.Fazilka.

....Appellant

PSIC

Versus

# Public Information Officer,

O/o Principal Secretary, Govt. of Pb, Power Department, Sec-9, Mini Secretariat, Chandigarh

#### First Appellate Authority,

O/o Principal Secretary, Govt. of Pb, Power Department, Sec-9, Mini Secretariat, Chandigarh.

...Respondent

# Appellant Case No. 4092 of 2019

#### Present: None for the Appellant None for the Respondent

**ORDER:** The case was last heard on **12.03.2019**. The respondent present pleaded that since the information relates to the office of Chairman-cum-Managing Director, PSPCL Patiala, they have already transferred the RTI application to them vide letter dated 10.07.2018.

Respondent from PSPCL was absent. The PIO-Chairman-cum-Managing Director, PSPCL Patiala was directed to look at the RTI application which was transferred by the PIO-Principal Secretary, Govt of Punjab, Power Department on 10.07.2018 and provide the information before the next date of hearing. The PIO-PSPCL was also directed to be present on the next date of hearing.

The appellant was absent and asked for hearing through video conferencing at Fazilka. The case was adjourned. The PIO was directed to be present at Chandigarh.

#### Hearing dated 06.05.2019:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conference facility available in the office of **Deputy Commissioner, Fazilka**. Since both the parties are absent, in the interest of justice, one more opportunity is granted and the case is adjourned. The PIO is directed to comply with the earlier order which still stands.

To come up for further hearing on **02.07.2019 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of **Deputy Commissioner**, **Fazilka**. The copies of the order be sent to both the parties through registered post. The **PIO to be present at Chandigarh**.

Sd/-

Chandigarh Dated: 06.05.2019. (Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner

CC to PIO-Chairman-cum-Managing Director, PSPCL Patiala

Sh. Sarvan Kumar, S/o Sh.Ranvir Kumar, VPO Kullar, Tehsil Abohar, Distt.Fazilka.

Versus

# Public Information Officer,

O/o SDO, PSPCL, Sub Division No-3, Abohar.

**First Appellate Authority,** O/o XEN, PSPCL, Sub Division No-3, Abohar.

...Respondent

# Appellant Case No. 4093 of 2019

# Present: None for the Appellant None for the Respondent

#### ORDER:

The case was last heard on 12.03.2019. The order is reproduced hereunder:

"The appellant through RTI application dated 12.06.2018 has sought information regarding domestic power supply sanctioned to Sh.Madan Lal s/o Sh.Krishan Lal VPO Kullar, Tehsil Abohar and Sh.Mohinder s/o Sh.Tulsi Ram, VPO Kullar Tehsil Abohar from Oct 2008 to 2018 and other information concerning the office of SDO Division No.3, Abohar. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority 14.07.2018 which took no decision on the appeal.

Since both the parties are absent, in the interest of justice one more opportunity is granted and the case is adjourned. The appellant in his appeal has asked for hearing through video conferencing at Fazilka."

#### Hearing dated 06.05.2019:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conference facility available in the office of **Deputy Commissioner**, **Fazilka**. The respondent is absent. The Commission has received a letter diary No.5840 on 18.03.2019 whereby the PIO has informed that the information has been provided to the appellant on 12.03.2019 through registered post and a copy sent to the Commission. The appellant is absent and has not pointed out any discrepancies, in the information. It is presumed that the appellant 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**.

Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner

Chandigarh Dated: 06.05.2019. Provide Mormation Col

....Appellant