**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**Red Cross Building (Near to Rose Garden)**

**Sector-16, Chandigarh**

**Contact No. 0172-2864115, Fax No. 0172-2864125**

**Visit us @** [**www.infocommpunjab.com**](http://www.infocommpunjab.com), **Email-ID** [**psic25@punjabmail.gov.in**](mailto:psic25@punjabmail.gov.in)

**Sh. Prem Kumar Rattan**

House No. 78/8, Park Road,

New Mandi, Dhuri,

District Sangrur.(98722-20039)

**Encl. – Copy of reply submitted by the Respondent**

**along with supporting documents.** Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**

O/o SSP, Patiala.

**First Appellate Authority**

O/o IGP, Zonal -1,

Patiala. Respondents

**Appeal Case No.: 3195 of 2017**

**Present:** Sh. Prem Kumar Rattan, the appellant in person.

Nobody present on behalf of the respondent.

**ORDER**

1. Sh. Prem Kumar Rattan the appellant appeared late and states that no information has been supplied to him by the respondent till date.
2. Respondent PIO is absent without any intimation to the Commission for today’s hearing and nor did he file any reply in this regard.
3. After hearing the appellant and examining the case file, the respondent PIO is directed to represent this case in person or through any of his representative(s) by next date of hearing along with directions to either provide the requisite information or file a written reply satisfying the RTI application, failing to which action under section 20(1) of RTI would be initiated against the respondent PIO.
4. The subject matter is adjourned for further hearing on **04.06.2018 at 11.00 AM**.
5. Announced in the Court, copy of the order to be sent to the parties.

**Chandigarh**  **(Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)**

**07.05.2018 State Information Commissioner**

**Note:** After the hearing was over Sh. Ajit Singh, ASI cum In-charge RTI cell appeared on the behalf of respondent PIO. He states and submits a written reply signed by PIO cum SSP, District Patiala referencing **therein judgment passed by Hon’ble Information Commissioner, CIC New Delhi, Sh. Sushma Singh in case no. CIC/SS/A/2011/001578 of Sh. Mohan Lal.**
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**Appeal Case No.: 3195 of 2017**

In Para 3 of the said order it is mentioned that ‘During the hearing the respondent submitted that the case diary is also not disclosable document under the provision of Section 172(3) of the Cr. CPC which reads as follows: “*Neither the accused nor his agents shall be entitled to call for such diaries, nor shall he or they be entitled to see them merely because they are referred to by the Court but, if they are used by Police officer of contradicting such police officer who made them to refresh his memory, or if the Court uses them for the purpose of contradicting such police officer, the provision of Section 161 or Section 145 as they may be, of the Indian Evidence At, 1972 (1 of 1872) shall apply.”* Hence the Information was denied u/s 8(1) (h) of RTI Act*.*

It was also referenced **last Para of Appeal case No. 477 of 2013** of Sh. Bhagwan Jain with clear orders passed therein dated 09.04.2013 in the Court of Hon’ble SIC Sh. Chander Prakash mentioning therein *“Since the requisite information sought for by the appellant cannot be supplied due to the fact that case-diary of police department is not an official record and meant for ‘personal information of the police department’, the case is dismissed.”*

He also submitted copies of above said judgments/order which are also taken on record along with this covering letter.

**In the view of above last opportunity is given to both the parties are represent this case in person or through any of their representative(s) in time to clear the facts of this case, failing to which ex-parte decision shall be taken against the concerned. A copy of submission along with supporting documents by respondent also be sent along with this order through registered post to the appellant for his ready reference.**

**Sd/-**

**Chandigarh**  **(Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)**

**07.05.2018 State Information Commissioner**
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**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**Red Cross Building (Near to Rose Garden)**

**Sector-16, Chandigarh**

**Contact No. 0172-2864115, Fax No. 0172-2864125**

**Visit us @** [**www.infocommpunjab.com**](http://www.infocommpunjab.com), **Email-ID** [**psic25@punjabmail.gov.in**](mailto:psic25@punjabmail.gov.in)

**Sh. Prem Kumar Rattan**

House No. 78/8, Park Road,

New Mandi, Dhuri,

District Sangrur.(98722-20039) Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**

O/o EO, Nagar Council

Dhuri, District Sangrur,

**First Appellate Authority**

O/o Deputy Director,

Local Govt. Patiala. Respondents

**Appeal Case No.: 3200 of 2017**

**Present:** Nobody present on the behalf of appellant.

Sh. Sandeep Kumar, Accountant (96461-05544) present on behalf of the respondent PIO.

**ORDER**

1. Sh. Sandeep Kumar, Accountant states that point wise requisite information was supplied to appellant along with their office letter no. 43/PIO dated 14.09.2017 and Sh. Prem Kumar Rattan pointed out deficiencies in it vide appellant’s letter dated 18.09.2018. He further added that the above said deficiencies were removed/justified appellant along with their office letter no. 48/PIO dated 29.09.2017 and assures the Commission that complete available information has been supplied or satisfactory reply has been supplied to the appellant but the appellant is not satisfied with it. The said documents are already on record.
2. Appellant is absent for today’s hearing but a telephonic message has been received in the Commission that he will appear late for the hearing.
3. After hearing the respondent and examining the case file, last opportunity is given to the appellant to represent this case in person or through any of his representative(s) **in time** to clear the facts of this case, along with advice to point out deficiencies in written and send it to the respondent (and also a copy of it to the Commission), failing to which ex-parte decision may be taken against the appellant. Respondent PIO is also directed to represent this case in time in person or through any of his representative(s), failing to which action under section 20(1) of RTI would be initiated against the respondent PIO.
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**Appeal Case No.: 3200 of 2017**

1. The subject matter is adjourned for further proceedings on **04.06.2018 at 11.00 AM.** Announced in the Court, copy of the order to be sent to the parties.

**Chandigarh**  **(Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)**

**07.05.2018 State Information Commissioner**

**Note:** *After the hearing was over, appellant Sh. Prem Kumar Rattan appeared**and read out the above said order. He said that he has not received the information, as said by the respondent in Para 1 of this order but received only the covering letters from the respondent.*

*After hearing the appellant, the respondent PIO is directed to send the requisite information (point wise) through registered post to the appellant by the next dated of hearing, and also present the copy of receipt of registered post before the Commission on next date of hearing, failing to which action under section 20(1) of RTI would be initiated against the respondent PIO. The appellant is also given last opportunity with an advice to point out deficiencies in written and send it to the respondent (and also a copy of it to the Commission), after receiving the information from the respondent, failing to which ex-parte decision may be taken against the appellant.*

**Sd/-**

**Chandigarh**  **(Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)**

**07.05.2018 State Information Commissioner**
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**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**Red Cross Building (Near to Rose Garden)**

**Sector-16, Chandigarh**

**Contact No. 0172-2864115, Fax No. 0172-2864125**

**Visit us @** [**www.infocommpunjab.com**](http://www.infocommpunjab.com), **Email-ID** [**psic25@punjabmail.gov.in**](mailto:psic25@punjabmail.gov.in)

**Sh. Prem Kumar Rattan**

House No. 78/8, Park Road,

New Mandi, Dhuri,

District Sangrur.(98722-20039) Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**

O/o EO, Nagar Council

Dhuri, District Sangrur,

**First Appellate Authority**

O/o Deputy Director,

Local Govt. Patiala. Respondents

**Appeal Case No.: 3203 of 2017**

**Present:** Nobody present on the behalf of appellant.

Sh. Sandeep Kumar, Accountant (96461-05544) present on behalf of the respondent PIO.

**ORDER**

1. Sh. Sandeep Kumar, Accountant states that point wise requisite information was supplied to appellant but the appellant is not satisfied with it.
2. Appellant is absent for today’s hearing but a telephonic message has been received in the Commission that he will appear late for the hearing.
3. After hearing the respondent and examining the case file, respondent PIO is also directed to send the requisite information (point wise) through registered post to the appellant by the next dated of hearing, and also present the copy of receipt of registered post before the Commission on next date of hearing and also directed to represent this case in time in person or through any of his representative(s), failing to which action under section 20(1) of RTI would be initiated against the respondent PIO. The appellant is also given last opportunity to represent this case in person or through any of his representative(s) **in time** to clear the facts of this case, along with advice to point out deficiencies in written and send it to the respondent (and also a copy of it to the Commission), failing to which ex-parte decision may be taken against the appellant
4. The subject matter is adjourned for further proceedings on **04.06.2018 at 11.00 AM.**
5. Announced in the Court, copy of the order to be sent to the parties.

**Sd/-**

**Chandigarh**  **(Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)**

**07.05.2018 State Information Commissioner**

**Note:** *After the hearing was over, appellant Sh. Prem Kumar Rattan appeared**and read out the above said order. He said that he has not received the information, as said by the respondent, in Para 1 of this order.*

**Sd/-**

**Chandigarh**  **(Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)**

**07.05.2018 State Information Commissioner**

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**Red Cross Building (Near to Rose Garden)**

**Sector-16, Chandigarh**

**Contact No. 0172-2864115, Fax No. 0172-2864125**

**Visit us @** [**www.infocommpunjab.com**](http://www.infocommpunjab.com), **Email-ID** [**psic25@punjabmail.gov.in**](mailto:psic25@punjabmail.gov.in)

**Sh. Prem Kumar Rattan**

House No. 78/8, Park Road,

New Mandi, Dhuri,

District Sangrur.(98722-20039) Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**

O/o SDM, Dhuri

District Sangrur.

**First Appellate Authority**

O/o SDM, Dhuri,

District Sangrur. Respondents

**Appeal Case No.: 3528 of 2017**

**Present:** Nobody present on the behalf of appellant.

Ms. Manjit Kaur, Superintendent cum PIO (73472-34171) present along with Sh. Abhinav Singla, clerk as respondent PIO.

**ORDER**

1. Ms. Manjit Kaur, Superintendent and states that point wise requisite information/written reply satisfying RTI application was supplied to appellant through registered post and submitted the supporting documents along with copy of receipt of registered post to the Commission, which are taken on record. She further describes that:
2. Information that relates to point no. 1 of RTI is supplied.
3. Information that relates to point no. 1 of RTI is not supplied because information is vague in nature as no time period of information required is specified in RTI application.
4. Information that relates to point no. 1 of RTI is not supplied as the appellant has not deposited documentation fee of Rs 370/- for 185 pages @ Rs 2/- per page.
5. Appellant is absent for today’s hearing but a telephonic message has been received in the Commission that he will appear late for the hearing.
6. After hearing the respondent and examining the case file, the appellant is given last opportunity to represent this case in person or through any of his representative(s) **in time** to clear the facts of this case, along with advice to specify the time period for information that relates to point no. 2 in written and send it to the respondent (and also a copy of it to the Commission), and deposit the documentation fee demanded and mentioned as above by the respondent in Para 1 of this order, failing to which ex-parte decision may be taken against the appellant.
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**Appeal Case No.: 3528 of 2017**

1. The subject matter is adjourned for further proceedings on **04.06.2018 at 11.00 AM.**
2. Announced in the Court, copy of the order to be sent to the parties.

**Sd/-**

**Chandigarh**  **(Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)**

**07.05.2018 State Information Commissioner**

**Note:** *After the hearing was over, appellant Sh. Prem Kumar Rattan appeared**and read out the above said order.*

**Sd/-**

**Chandigarh**  **(Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)**

**07.05.2018 State Information Commissioner**
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**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**Red Cross Building (Near to Rose Garden)**

**Sector-16, Chandigarh**

**Contact No. 0172-2864115, Fax No. 0172-2864125**

**Visit us @** [**www.infocommpunjab.com**](http://www.infocommpunjab.com), **Email-ID** [**psic25@punjabmail.gov.in**](mailto:psic25@punjabmail.gov.in)

**Ms. Mamta Rani (90562-56664)**

W/o Sh. Rajinder Kumar

Village Pancha Wali

Tehsil & District Fazilka. Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**

O/o XEN, W/S and Sanitation

Department, Fazilka. Respondents

**Complaint Case No.: 130 of 2018**

**Present:** Nobody present on the behalf of appellant.

Sh. Sukhdev Chand, Clerk present on the behalf of the respondent PIO.

**ORDER**

1. A letter has been received in the Commission vide diary no. 8651 dated 26.04.2018 signed by XEN, W/S and Sanitation, Division Fazilka that their office has demanded documentation fee of Rs 1000/- for about 500 or more pages @ Rs 2/- per page and a Big Postal envelope/bag with Rs 100/- Postal Stamps, vide reference no. 254 dated 16.01.2018 but it has not been deposited in respondent’s office till date. The above mentioned both documents are taken on record.
2. Sh. Sukhdev Chand, Clerk stated as above in Para 1 of this order.
3. The appellant is absent without any intimation to the Commission and nor did she file any reply in this regard.
4. After hearing the respondent and going through the documents placed on record, the appellant is given last opportunity to deposit the documentation fee and envelope/bag demanded as mention above in Para 1 of this order to the respondent’s office by the next date of hearing positively, along with advice to represent this case in person or through any of his representative(s)to clear the facts of this case, failing to which this case would be considered as for non-pursuance by the appellant. The respondent is also directed to supply the information demanded after receiving the documentation fee and envelope as mentioned above, and present the copy of evidence/proof of sending the information to the appellant.
5. The subject matter is adjourned for further proceedings on **06.06.2018 at 11.00 AM.**
6. Announced in the Court, copy of the order to be sent to the parties.

**Sd/-**

**Chandigarh**  **(Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)**

**07.05.2018 State Information Commissioner**

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**Red Cross Building (Near to Rose Garden)**

**Sector-16, Chandigarh**

**Contact No. 0172-2864115, Fax No. 0172-2864125**

**Visit us @** [**www.infocommpunjab.com**](http://www.infocommpunjab.com), **Email-ID** [**psic25@punjabmail.gov.in**](mailto:psic25@punjabmail.gov.in)

**Sh SP Yadav, Sr. Scale Stenographer**

Thapar Institute of

Engg. & Technology,

Patiala 147004. Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**

O/o Deputy Registrar (HR),

Thapar University, Patiala. Respondents

**Complaint Case No.: 137 of 2018**

**Present:** Sh. S.P. Yadhav the complainant in person.

Advocate Ashutosh (99889-96014) present on the behalf of respondent PIO.

**ORDER**

1. Advocate Ashutosh on the behalf of respondent stated that the appellant has not passed the proper channel of RTI to retrieve information. He intimated the Commission and the complainant the Name and designation of First Appellate Authority i.e. Sh. R.S. Mishra at O/o Deputy Registrar (HR), Thapar University, Patiala.
2. Sh. S.P. Yadhav the complainant states that his interest is with information and has no objection if the concerned First Appellate Authority deals in supplying requisite information from the respondent PIO.
3. After hearing the both the parties and examining the case file, It is found that the appellant has not passed the proper channel of RTI, therefore this the instant appeal case is **remanded to the concerned First Appellate Authority i.e. O/o Deputy Registrar (HR), Thapar University, Patiala (Sh. R.S. Mishra)** along with a copy of RTI application for their ready reference.
4. The complainant also has liberty to approach the Commission if he is not satisfied with decision of First Appellate Authority regarding his RTI request.
5. Announced in the Court, copy of the order to be sent to the parties.

**Sd/-**

**Chandigarh**  **(Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)**

**07.05.2018 State Information Commissioner**

**First Appellate Authority (By Name)**

**(Sh. R.S. Mishra)**

**(Regd. Post)** O/o Deputy Registrar (HR),

Thapar University, Patiala

**Encl. RTI Request.**

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**Red Cross Building (Near to Rose Garden)**

**Sector-16, Chandigarh**

**Contact No. 0172-2864115, Fax No. 0172-2864125**

**Visit us @** [**www.infocommpunjab.com**](http://www.infocommpunjab.com), **Email-ID** [**psic25@punjabmail.gov.in**](mailto:psic25@punjabmail.gov.in)

**Sh. Prem Singh, S/o Sh. Jaspal Singh**

VPO Amarpura, Tehsil Abohar,

District Fazilka. Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**

O/o Deputy Director (Academics),

PSBTE & IT, Sector 36 Chandigarh.

**First Appellate Authority**

O/o Secretary,

PSBTE & IT, Sector 36 Chandigarh. Respondents

**Appeal Case No.: 334 of 2018**

**Present:** Nobody present on the behalf of appellant.

Sh. Navjot Singh, Clerk present on the behalf of the respondent PIO.

**ORDER**

1. A letter has been received in the Commission vide diary no. 639 dated 03.05.2018 from the appellant requesting therein for case to heard through video conferencing facility at Fazilka he also requested for exemption of his presence for today’s hearing.
2. Sh. Navjot Singh, Clerk is present along with requisite information to hand it over to the appellant but the appellant is absent for today’s hearing.
3. After hearing the respondent and examining the case file, the respondent PIO is directed to send the requisite information through registered Post to the appellant and present a copy of receipt of said registered post before the Commission on next dated of hearing, failing to which action under section 20(1) of RTI would be initiated against the respondent PIO. The appellant is also advised to point out deficiencies in written to the respondent and also send/e-mail a copy of it to the Commission after receiving the information, failing to which ex-parte decision may be taken.
4. On the request of appellant, the matter is adjourned for further hearing dated **21.05.2018 at 11.30 AM through video conferencing through NIC Facility at DC office Fazilka.**
5. The respondent PIO or his representative(s) may also appear before the Commission at Punjab State Information Commission office, Red Cross Building (near to Rose Garden), Sector 16, Chandigarh.
6. Announced in the Court, copy of the order to be sent to the parties.

**Sd/-**

**Chandigarh**  **(Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)**

**07.05.2018 State Information Commissioner**

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**Red Cross Building (Near to Rose Garden)**

**Sector-16, Chandigarh**

**Contact No. 0172-2864115, Fax No. 0172-2864125**

**Visit us @** [**www.infocommpunjab.com**](http://www.infocommpunjab.com), **Email-ID** [**psic25@punjabmail.gov.in**](mailto:psic25@punjabmail.gov.in)

**Dr. Manish Aggarwal (President)**

Mohalla Sewa Samiti (Regd.)

Shop No. 1, Street No. 4,

Arman Nagar, PO Dakoha -144023

Jaladhar (94653-90678) Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**

O/o Health & Sanitation Department,

MC, Jalandhar City.

**First Appellate Authority**

O/o Additional Commissioner,

MC, Jalandhar. Respondents

**Appeal Case No.: 367 of 2018**

**Present:** Dr. Manish Aggarwal, the appellant in person.

Nobody present on the behalf of the respondent PIO.

**ORDER**

1. An email has been received in the Commission on 04.05.2018 from respondent’s email id [healthbranch.mcj1@gmail.com](mailto:healthbranch.mcj1@gmail.com) along with copy of requisite information signed by appellant as received and satisfied. This email is taken on record.
2. A telephonic message from Superintendent of respondent’s office is received stating that as the requisite information has been supplied to the appellant and he is satisfied with therefore requested for the respondent’s exemption from being present for today’s hearing.
3. Dr. Manish Aggarwal, the appellant states that he is not satisfied with the information received as he has not checked it properly on receiving it.
4. After hearing the appellant and examining the case file, it is found that the appellant not satisfied with the information received therefore the appellant is advised to point out deficiencies in written to the respondent by the next date of hearing and also send/e-mail a copy of it to the Commission, along with advice to appear in person to clear the facts of this case, failing to which the case would be decided on merit basis. The respondent PIO is also directed to represent this case in person or through any of his representative(s) to clear the facts of this case, on next date of hearing, failing to which action under section 20(1) of RTI would be initiated against the respondent PIO.
5. The subject matter is adjourned for further proceedings on **06.06.2018 at 11.00 AM**.
6. Announced in the Court, copy of the order to be sent to the parties.

**Sd/-**

**Chandigarh**  **(Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)**

**07.05.2018 State Information Commissioner**

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**Red Cross Building (Near to Rose Garden)**

**Sector-16, Chandigarh**

**Contact No. 0172-2864115, Fax No. 0172-2864125**

**Visit us @** [**www.infocommpunjab.com**](http://www.infocommpunjab.com), **Email-ID** [**psic25@punjabmail.gov.in**](mailto:psic25@punjabmail.gov.in)

**Sh. Sanjeev Goyal S/o Ashok Kumar**

Kothi No. 148, Model Town,

Phase-1, Near TV Tower,

Bathinda Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**

O/o Commissioner,

MC, Bathinda.

**First Appellate Authority**

O/o Commissioner,

MC, Bathinda. Respondents

**Appeal Case No.: 372 of 2018**

**Present:** Nobody present on the behalf of appellant.

Sh. Ravinder Singh Cheema, Inspector (88376-52551) present on the behalf of the respondent PIO.

**ORDER**

1. An email has been received in the Commission on 06.05.2018 from the appellant’s email id [sanjeevgoyalbti48@gmail.com](mailto:sanjeevgoyalbti48@gmail.com) requesting therein or an adjournment and exemption of appellant’s presence on today’s hearing. Appellant has also pointed out deficiencies mentioning that point no. 3, 4, 5 has not been provided to him and incomplete information regarding point no 6, 7 & 8 has been provided to him. This email is taken on record.
2. Sh. Ravinder Singh Cheema, Inspector, on the behalf of respondent is unaware of the case.
3. Two emails has been received in the Commission on 04.05.2018 and 05.05.2018 from the respondent’s email id [sanjeevgoyalbti48@gmail.com](mailto:sanjeevgoyalbti48@gmail.com) mentioning therein following:
4. Appellant is satisfied with information that relates with point no. 1 & 2.
5. Information that relates to point no. 3, 4 & 5 has already been supplied to appellant in another case with Complaint Case no. 617 of 2017 (in point no. 13 a) and 13 b)) as similar information was requisite in it.
6. Information that relates to point no. 6, 7 & 8 has been provided vides their office letter no. 48/RTI dated 15.02.2018 and 539 dated 04.09.2018.
7. After hearing the representative of respondent PIO and examining the case file, it is found that the representative of respondent PIO was not of the case wasting the time and resources of the Commission and Public Authority, therefore the respondent PIO is given last opportunity along with directions to appear in person along with pending information that relates with Point no. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 & 8 on next date of hearing, failing to which action under section 20(1) of RTI would be initiated against the respondent PIO.
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**Appeal Case No.: 372 of 2018**

1. The appellant is also given last opportunity with an advice to appear in person on next date of hearing, failing to which the case would be considered as for non-pursuance by the appellant.
2. The subject matter is adjourned for further proceedings on **06.06.2018 at 11.00 AM.**
3. Announced in the Court, copy of the order to be sent to the parties.

**Sd/-**

**Chandigarh**  **(Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)**

**07.05.2018 State Information Commissioner**
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**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**Red Cross Building (Near to Rose Garden)**

**Sector-16, Chandigarh**

**Contact No. 0172-2864115, Fax No. 0172-2864125**
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**Sh. Darshan Singh (94630-34292)**

S/o Sh. Amar Singh R/o H. No. 14053)

Ganesh Nagar, Bathinda. Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**

O/o Commissioner,

MC, Bathinda.

**First Appellate Authority**

O/o Commissioner,

MC, Bathinda. Respondents

**Appeal Case No.: 380 of 2018**

**Dated of Institution: 17.01.2018**

**Date of Decision: 07.05.2018**

**Present:** Sh. Darshan Singh, the appellant in person.

Sh. Akshay Kumar (81465-25233) along with Sh. Anmol (97801-88343) present on the behalf of the respondent PIO.

**ORDER**

1. An email on 26.04.2018 respondent from email id [cmcbathinda@gmail.com](mailto:cmcbathinda@gmail.com) and a similar letter has been received in the Commission vide diary no. 9259 dated 04.05.2018 along with written reply from Executive Officer (Nigam Engineer) mentioning therein that information that relates to point no. 2 and 3 have been provided to the appellant and information that relates to point no. 1 cannot be provided with the consent of the third party as it is third party information. It is further added that if the appellant provide the ‘Naksha’ no. as then the respondent may precede further to get the consent of third party to supply the information to the appellant. This email and letter along with supporting documents are taken on record.
2. Sh. Akshay Kumar, the reprenstative of respondent stated as above and added that as requisite information that relates with point no. 1 is not clear that how old it is as Nakshas of about 40 years are in record, requisite information is vague in nature. They may find if the appellant provide particular year or relevant status of Naksha so that the consent may be taken from the third party to retrieve the information.
3. Sh. Darshan Singh, the appellant states that he is not aware of the year and stated that that information relates to point no. 1 may be left to be supplied. He further added that rest information is incomplete as information after date 21.10.2017 has not been supplied to him.
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**Appeal Case No.: 380 of 2018**

**Dated of Institution: 17.01.2018**

**Date of Decision: 07.05.2018**

1. On this, Sh. Akshay Kumar, the reprenstative of respondent stated the appellant filed RTI application on date 21.10.2017 and information till that date has been already supplied.
2. After hearing both the parties and examining the case file, it is found that available and specified requisite information has been supplied to the appellant till the date of filing the RTI application and appellant is satisfied with it. It is further added that if the appellant wants information after date 21.10.2017 he may file a fresh RTI and information that relates to point no. 1 is vague in nature and the appellant failed to specify it so that the respondent may take consent to third party to provide information. In the view of this, it is found that the available/specified requisite information has been supplied to the appellant and he is satisfied with it, therefore no further action is required in this case and hence this instant appeal case is **disposed of and closed.**
3. Announced in the Court, copy of the order to be sent to the parties.

**Sd/-**

**Chandigarh**  **(Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)**

**07.05.2018 State Information Commissioner**
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**Sh. Darshan Singh (94630-34292)**

S/o Sh. Amar Singh R/o H. No. 14053)

Ganesh Nagar, Bathinda. Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**

O/o Commissioner,

MC, Bathinda.

**First Appellate Authority**

O/o Commissioner,

MC, Bathinda. Respondents

**Appeal Case No.: 381 of 2018**

**Dated of Institution: 17.01.2018**

**Date of Decision: 07.05.2018**

**Present:** Sh. Darshan Singh, the appellant in person.

Sh. Akshay Kumar (81465-25233) along with Sh. Anmol (97801-88343) present on the behalf of the respondent PIO.

**ORDER**

1. An email on 26.04.2018 respondent from email id [cmcbathinda@gmail.com](mailto:cmcbathinda@gmail.com) and a similar letter has been received in the Commission vide diary no. 9260 dated 04.05.2018 along with written reply from Executive Officer (Nigam Engineer) mentioning therein that information that relates to point no. 2 has been provided to the appellant and information that relates to point no. 1 cannot be provided with the consent of the third party as it is third party information. It is further added that if the appellant provide the ‘Naksha’ no. as then the respondent may precede further to get the consent of third party to supply the information to the appellant. This email and letter along with supporting documents are taken on record.
2. Sh. Akshay Kumar, the reprenstative of respondent stated as above and added that as requisite information that relates with point no. 1 is not clear that how old it is as Nakshas of about 40 years are in record, requisite information is vague in nature. They may find if the appellant provide particular year or relevant status of Naksha so that the consent may be taken from the third party to retrieve the information.
3. Sh. Darshan Singh, the appellant states that he is not aware of the year and stated that that information relates to point no. 1 may be left to be supplied. He further added that rest information is incomplete as information after date 21.10.2017 has not been supplied to him.
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**Appeal Case No.: 381 of 2018**

**Dated of Institution: 17.01.2018**

**Date of Decision: 07.05.2018**

1. On this, Sh. Akshay Kumar, the reprenstative of respondent stated the appellant filed RTI application on date 21.10.2017 and information till that date has been already supplied.
2. After hearing both the parties and examining the case file, it is found that available and specified requisite information has been supplied to the appellant till the date of filing the RTI application and appellant is satisfied with it. It is further added that if the appellant wants information after date 21.10.2017 he may file a fresh RTI and information that relates to point no. 1 is vague in nature and the appellant failed to specify it so that the respondent may take consent to third party to provide information. In the view of this, it is found that the available/specified requisite information has been supplied to the appellant and he is satisfied with it, therefore no further action is required in this case and hence this instant appeal case is **disposed of and closed.**
3. Announced in the Court, copy of the order to be sent to the parties.

**Sd/-**

**Chandigarh**  **(Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)**

**07.05.2018 State Information Commissioner**
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**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**Red Cross Building (Near to Rose Garden)**

**Sector-16, Chandigarh**

**Contact No. 0172-2864115, Fax No. 0172-2864125**

**Visit us @** [**www.infocommpunjab.com**](http://www.infocommpunjab.com), **Email-ID** [**psic25@punjabmail.gov.in**](mailto:psic25@punjabmail.gov.in)

**Sh. Darshan Singh (94630-34292)**

S/o Sh. Amar Singh R/o H. No. 14053)

Ganesh Nagar, Bathinda. Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**

O/o Commissioner,

MC, Bathinda.

**First Appellate Authority**

O/o Commissioner,

MC, Bathinda. Respondents

**Appeal Case No.: 382 of 2018**

**Dated of Institution: 17.01.2018**

**Date of Decision: 07.05.2018**

**Present:** Sh. Darshan Singh, the appellant in person.

Sh. Akshay Kumar (81465-25233) along with Sh. Anmol (97801-88343) present on the behalf of the respondent PIO.

**ORDER**

1. An email on 26.04.2018 respondent from email id [cmcbathinda@gmail.com](mailto:cmcbathinda@gmail.com) and a similar letter has been received in the Commission vide diary no. 9261 dated 04.05.2018 along with written reply from Executive Officer (Nigam Engineer) mentioning therein that information that relates to point no. 2 has been provided to the appellant and information that relates to point no. 1 cannot be provided with the consent of the third party as it is third party information. It is further added that if the appellant provide the ‘Naksha’ no. as then the respondent may precede further to get the consent of third party to supply the information to the appellant. This email and letter along with supporting documents are taken on record.
2. Sh. Akshay Kumar, the reprenstative of respondent stated as above and added that as requisite information that relates with point no. 1 is not clear that how old it is as Nakshas of about 40 years are in record, requisite information is vague in nature. They may find if the appellant provide particular year or relevant status of Naksha so that the consent may be taken from the third party to retrieve the information.
3. Sh. Darshan Singh, the appellant states that he is not aware of the year and stated that that information relates to point no. 1 may be left to be supplied. He further added that rest information is incomplete as information after date 21.10.2017 has not been supplied to him.
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**Appeal Case No.: 382 of 2018**

**Dated of Institution: 17.01.2018**

**Date of Decision: 07.05.2018**

1. On this, Sh. Akshay Kumar, the reprenstative of respondent stated the appellant filed RTI application on date 21.10.2017 and information till that date has been already supplied.
2. After hearing both the parties and examining the case file, it is found that available and specified requisite information has been supplied to the appellant till the date of filing the RTI application and appellant is satisfied with it. It is further added that if the appellant wants information after date 21.10.2017 he may file a fresh RTI and information that relates to point no. 1 is vague in nature and the appellant failed to specify it so that the respondent may take consent to third party to provide information. In the view of this, it is found that the available/specified requisite information has been supplied to the appellant and he is satisfied with it, therefore no further action is required in this case and hence this instant appeal case is **disposed of and closed.**
3. Announced in the Court, copy of the order to be sent to the parties.

**Sd/-**

**Chandigarh**  **(Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)**

**07.05.2018 State Information Commissioner**
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**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**Red Cross Building (Near to Rose Garden)**

**Sector-16, Chandigarh**

**Contact No. 0172-2864115, Fax No. 0172-2864125**

**Visit us @** [**www.infocommpunjab.com**](http://www.infocommpunjab.com), **Email-ID** [**psic25@punjabmail.gov.in**](mailto:psic25@punjabmail.gov.in)

**Sh. Prem Kumar Rattan (98722-20039)**

House No. 78/8, Park Road,

New Mandi, Dhuri, District Sangrur Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**

O/o State Information Commission,

Punjab, Chandigarh

**First Appellate Authority**

O/o State Information Commission,

Punjab, Chandigarh Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 3191 of 2017**

**Present:** Sh. Prem Kumar Rattan, the appellant in person.

For the respondent: Sh. Sadhu Ram (On behalf of the First Appellate Authority).

**ORDER**

1. Sh. Prem Kumar Rattan, the appellant in person show his dissatisfaction sating that irrelevant affidavit has been received from the respondent PIO contradicting the previous submissions by the respondent PIO.
2. Sh. Sadhu Ram, on the behalf of First Appellate Authority states that PIO cum SO, Mr. Sudhir is on leave.
3. After hearing both the parties and examining the case file, the respondent PIO is given last opportunity to appear in person along with directions to present copy of affidavit supplied to appellant and documents in support to his reply, failing to which action under section 20 (1) of RTI would be initiated against the respondent PIO**.**  The appellant is also advised to present with all necessary supporting documents on next date of hearing to clear the facts of this case, failing to which ex-parte decision shall be taken.
4. The subject matter is adjourned for further hearing on **04.06.2018 at 11.00 AM**.
5. Announced in the Court, copy of the order to be sent to the parties.

**Sd/-**

**Chandigarh (Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)**

**Dated: 07.05.2018 State Information Commissioner**

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**Red Cross Building (Near to Rose Garden)**

**Sector-16, Chandigarh**

**Contact No. 0172-2864115, Fax No. 0172-2864125**

**Visit us @** [**www.infocommpunjab.com**](http://www.infocommpunjab.com), **Email-ID** [**psic25@punjabmail.gov.in**](mailto:psic25@punjabmail.gov.in)

**Sh. Prem Kumar Rattan (98722-20039)**

House No. 78/8, Park Road,

New Mandi, Dhuri, District Sangrur Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**

O/o State Information Commission,

Punjab, Chandigarh

**First Appellate Authority**

O/o State Information Commission,

Punjab, Chandigarh Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 3192 of 2017**

**Present:** Sh. Prem Kumar Rattan, the appellant in person.

For the respondent: Sh. Sadhu Ram (On behalf of the First Appellate Authority).

**ORDER**

1. Sh. Prem Kumar Rattan, the appellant in person show his dissatisfaction sating that irrelevant affidavit has been received from the respondent PIO contradicting the previous submissions by the respondent PIO.
2. Sh. Sadhu Ram, on the behalf of First Appellate Authority states that PIO cum SO, Mr. Sudhir is on leave.
3. After hearing both the parties and examining the case file, the respondent PIO is given last opportunity to appear in person along with directions to present copy of affidavit supplied to appellant and documents in support to his reply, failing to which action under section 20 (1) of RTI would be initiated against the respondent PIO**.**  The appellant is also advised to present with all necessary supporting documents on next date of hearing to clear the facts of this case, failing to which ex-parte decision shall be taken.
4. The subject matter is adjourned for further hearing on **04.06.2018 at 11.00 AM**.
5. Announced in the Court, copy of the order to be sent to the parties.

**Sd/-**

**Chandigarh (Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)**

**Dated: 07.05.2018 State Information Commissioner**

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**Red Cross Building (Near to Rose Garden)**

**Sector-16, Chandigarh**

**Contact No. 0172-2864115, Fax No. 0172-2864125**

**Visit us @** [**www.infocommpunjab.com**](http://www.infocommpunjab.com), **Email-ID** [**psic25@punjabmail.gov.in**](mailto:psic25@punjabmail.gov.in)

**Sh. Prem Kumar Rattan (98722-20039)**

House No. 78/8, Park Road,

New Mandi, Dhuri, District Sangrur Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**

O/o State Information Commission,

Punjab, Chandigarh

**First Appellate Authority**

O/o State Information Commission,

Punjab, Chandigarh Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 3196 of 2017**

**Present:** Sh. Prem Kumar Rattan, the appellant in person.

For the respondent: Sh. Sadhu Ram (On behalf of the First Appellate Authority).

**ORDER**

1. Sh. Prem Kumar Rattan, the appellant in person show his dissatisfaction sating that irrelevant affidavit has been received from the respondent PIO contradicting the previous submissions by the respondent PIO.
2. Sh. Sadhu Ram, on the behalf of First Appellate Authority states that PIO cum SO, Mr. Sudhir is on leave.
3. After hearing both the parties and examining the case file, the respondent PIO is given last opportunity to appear in person along with directions to present copy of affidavit supplied to appellant and documents in support to his reply, failing to which action under section 20 (1) of RTI would be initiated against the respondent PIO**.**  The appellant is also advised to present with all necessary supporting documents on next date of hearing to clear the facts of this case, failing to which ex-parte decision shall be taken.
4. The subject matter is adjourned for further hearing on **04.06.2018 at 11.00 AM**.
5. Announced in the Court, copy of the order to be sent to the parties.

**Sd/-**

**Chandigarh (Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)**

**Dated: 07.05.2018 State Information Commissioner**