**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)

**Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang**

**(Regd. Post)** H. No. 3398, Sector 19 D,

Chandigarh -160019 (9914751111). Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**,

**(Regd. Post)** O/o XEN, Jalandhar Drainage Division,

Jalandhar.

**Public Information Officer**,

**(Regd. Post)** O/o Vigilance Bureau, SCO 60-61,

Sector 17 D, Shopping Plaza,

Chandigarh. Respondent

**Complaint Case No. 139 of 2018**

**Present:** Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang the complainant in person.

Sh. Ajit Singh, XEN (97794-33633) as respondent PIO along with Sh. Ashish Kapoor, AIG, FS-1, Vigilance Bureau, Punjab, Chandigarh.

**ORDER**

1. The case was filed under **Life & liberty** clause 7(1) of RTI Act by the complainant, Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang vide diary no. 2896 date 09.02.2018 where the information seeker has sought information in his RTI application dated 12.01.2018.
2. On previous hearing dated 16.02.2018 respondent PIO O/o XEN, Jalandhar Drainage Division, Jalandhar said that information cannot be provided to the complainant under section 8(h) of RTI Act as the inquiry is pending with the Vigilance department and he prayed that the complaint filed by the complainant may be dismissed. Sh. Karanjeet Singh, the complainant states the information demanded by him is not covered under section 8(h) of RTI Act 2005. In the view of above the Deputy Registrar was directed to present the instant case before the Hon’able Chief Information Commissioner for appropriate orders. Refer previous orders in this context.
3. Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang states that other 18 departments had already provided the similar information in this regard in similar cases and whose investigation was pending and/or completed in/by Vigilance Bureau, Punjab, and 8 departments have been left and PIO O/o XEN, Jalandhar Drainage Division, Jalandhar is one of them but they are denying information in mal-intention or unknowingly.
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**Complaint Case No. 139 of 2018**

1. Sh. Ashish Kapoor, AIG, FS-1, Vigilance Bureau, Chandigarh states and submits a letter signed by AIG, FS-1, Vigilance Bureau, Punjab Chandigarh vide diary no. 331 dated 14.03.2018 mentioning therein that cases with FIR Nos. 10 dated 17.08.2017, U/s 406, 409, 420, 467, 468, 471, 477-A, 201, 120-B, IPC & 13 (1) (D) R/W 13 (2) P.C Act 1988 and FIR 03 dated 01.03.2018 U/s 406, 409, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B, IPC & 13 (1) (D) R/W 13 (2) P.C Act 1988 Police Station FS-1, Vigilance Bureau, Punjab at Mohali have been registered. This written reply is taken on record.
2. Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang, the complainant states the following points:
3. That the Challan has been submitted in the Court by the Vigilance Bureau, Department therefore pending investigation as said above by Sh. Ashish Kapoor, AIG, FS-1, Vigilance Bureau, Chandigarh, therefore information can be provided as investigation has been done and challan has been submitted in the Court.
4. The information has been requested by the PIO O/o XEN, Jalandhar Drainage Division, Jalandhar and not from the PIO O/o Vigilance Bureau, SCO 60-61, Sector 17 D, Shopping Plaza, Chandigarh.
5. General information of public interest has been requisite and not of any individual/ process of prosecution of offenders has been requisite information which the respondent PIO may deny under section 8 (h).
6. Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang, the complainant also submits the following judgments in support to his reply and those are taken on record.
7. Judgment of Hon’able Justice Sh. S. Muralidhar dated 03 June 2011 in the case of B.S. Mathur Vs. PIO of Delhi High Court in W.P. (c) 608/2011.
8. Judgment of Sh. G. Madhavan, Hon’able Chief Information Commissioner Haryana, Chandigarh dated 27.05.2008 in the case Sh. Subhash Sachdeva, Advocate, #583, Karam Singh, Colony Vs. State PIO O/o Director General State Vigilance Bureau, Haryana, Sector-6, Panchcula and FAA O/o Director General State Vigilance Bureau, Haryana, Sector-6, Panchcula in Case No. 1272 of 2008.
9. Judgment of Hon’able Justice Sh. Vibhu Bakhru dated 16.12.2014 in the case of Adesh Kumar Vs. Union of India & others of Delhi High Court in W.P. (c) 3543/2014.
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**Complaint Case No. 139 of 2018**

1. Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang, the complainant also submits documents in the form of a report in tabular form mentioning therein other department who have already provided the similar information and departments who are pending. These documents are also taken on record.
2. After hearing the both the parties and examining the case file, the reply from respondent PIO O/o Vigilance Bureau, SCO 60-61, Sector 17 D, Shopping Plaza, Chandigarh is seen and observed. **Respondent PIO O/o Vigilance Bureau, SCO 60-61, Sector 17 D, Shopping Plaza, Chandigarh is exempted from this case till any further orders**.
3. As it is observed that the requisite information does not comes under 8 (h) of RTI act and general information of Public interest and also similar information has been provided by 18 other departments in this regard in similar cases and whose investigation was pending and/or completed in/by Vigilance Bureau, Punjab. **The PIO O/o XEN, Jalandhar Drainage Division, Jalandhar is directed to provide the requisite information to the complainant by the next date of hearing**, failing to which action under section 20(1) of RTI would be initiated against the respondent PIO. The complainant is also advised to point out deficiencies if any after receiving the information as said above from the respondent PIO in written to respondent PIO and also a copy of it to the Commission.
4. The subject matter is adjourned on **21.03.2018 at 12.00 Noon for** further proceedings**.**
5. Announced in the Court, copy of the order to be sent to the parties.

**Sd/-**

**(Ms. Preety Chawla) (Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)**

**State Information Commissioner State Information Commissioner**

**Chandigarh; Dated: 14.03.2018 (12:00 Noon)**

**Copy to:**

* PS/SIC (PC) for kind information.
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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)

**Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang**

**(Regd. Post)** H. No. 3398, Sector 19 D,

Chandigarh -160019 (9914751111). Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**,

**(Regd. Post)** O/o XEN, Canal Lining Division,

Ferozepur.

**Public Information Officer**,

**(Regd. Post)** O/o Vigilance Bureau, SCO 60-61,

Sector 17 D, Shopping Plaza,

Chandigarh. Respondent

**Complaint Case No. 140 of 2018**

**Present:** Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang the complainant in person.

Sh. Ashutosh, XEN (98148-14121) as respondent PIO along with Sh. Ashish Kapoor, AIG, FS-1, Vigilance Bureau, Punjab, Chandigarh.

**ORDER**

1. The case was filed under **Life & liberty** clause 7(1) of RTI Act by the complainant, Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang vide diary no. 2896 date 09.02.2018 where the information seeker has sought information in his RTI application dated 12.01.2018.
2. On previous hearing dated 16.02.2018 respondent PIO O/o XEN, Canal Lining Division, Ferozepur said that information cannot be provided to the complainant under section 8(h) of RTI Act as the inquiry is pending with the Vigilance department and he prayed that the complaint filed by the complainant may be dismissed. Sh. Karanjeet Singh, the complainant states the information demanded by him is not covered under section 8(h) of RTI Act 2005. In the view of above the Deputy Registrar was directed to present the instant case before the Hon’able Chief Information Commissioner for appropriate orders. Refer previous orders in this context.
3. Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang states that other 18 departments had already provided the similar information in this regard in similar cases and whose investigation was pending and/or completed in/by Vigilance Bureau, Punjab, and 8 departments have been left and PIO O/o XEN, Canal Lining Division, Ferozepur is one of them but they are denying information in mal-intention or unknowingly.
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**Complaint Case No. 140 of 2018**

1. Sh. Ashish Kapoor, AIG, FS-1, Vigilance Bureau, Chandigarh states and submits a letter signed by AIG, FS-1, Vigilance Bureau, Punjab Chandigarh vide diary no. 333 mentioning therein that cases with FIR Nos. 10 dated 17.08.2017, U/s 406, 409, 420, 467, 468, 471, 477-A, 201, 120-B, IPC & 13 (1) (D) R/W 13 (2) P.C Act 1988 and FIR 03 dated 01.03.2018 U/s 406, 409, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B, IPC & 13 (1) (D) R/W 13 (2) P.C Act 1988 Police Station FS-1, Vigilance Bureau, Punjab at Mohali have been registered. This written reply is taken on record.
2. Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang, the complainant states the following points:
3. That the Challan has been submitted in the Court by the Vigilance Bureau, Department therefore pending investigation as said above by Sh. Ashish Kapoor, AIG, FS-1, Vigilance Bureau, Chandigarh, therefore information can be provided as investigation has been done and challan has been submitted in the Court.
4. The information has been requested by the PIO O/o XEN, Canal Lining Division, Ferozepur and not from the PIO O/o Vigilance Bureau, SCO 60-61, Sector 17 D, Shopping Plaza, Chandigarh.
5. General information of public interest has been requisite and not of any individual/ process of prosecution of offenders has been requisite information which the respondent PIO may deny under section 8 (h).
6. Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang, the complainant also submits the following judgments in support to his reply and those are taken on record.
7. Judgment of Hon’able Justice Sh. S. Muralidhar dated 03 June 2011 in the case of B.S. Mathur Vs. PIO of Delhi High Court in W.P. (c) 608/2011.
8. Judgment of Sh. G. Madhavan, Hon’able Chief Information Commissioner Haryana, Chandigarh dated 27.05.2008 in the case Sh. Subhash Sachdeva, Advocate, #583, Karam Singh, Colony Vs. State PIO O/o Director General State Vigilance Bureau, Haryana, Sector-6, Panchcula and FAA O/o Director General State Vigilance Bureau, Haryana, Sector-6, Panchcula in Case No. 1272 of 2008.
9. Judgment of Hon’able Justice Sh. Vibhu Bakhru dated 16.12.2014 in the case of Adesh Kumar Vs. Union of India & others of Delhi High Court in W.P. (c) 3543/2014.
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**Complaint Case No. 140 of 2018**

1. Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang, the complainant also submits documents in the form of a report in tabular form mentioning therein other department who have already provided the similar information and departments who are pending. These documents are also taken on record.
2. After hearing the both the parties and examining the case file, the reply from respondent PIO O/o Vigilance Bureau, SCO 60-61, Sector 17 D, Shopping Plaza, Chandigarh is seen and observed. **Respondent PIO O/o Vigilance Bureau, SCO 60-61, Sector 17 D, Shopping Plaza, Chandigarh is exempted from this case till any further orders**.
3. As it is observed that the requisite information does not comes under 8 (h) of RTI act and general information of Public interest and also similar information has been provided by 18 other departments in this regard in similar cases and whose investigation was pending and/or completed in/by Vigilance Bureau, Punjab. **The PIO O/o XEN, Canal Lining Division, Ferozepur is directed to provide the requisite information to the complainant by the next date of hearing**, failing to which action under section 20(1) of RTI would be initiated against the respondent PIO. The complainant is also advised to point out deficiencies if any after receiving the information as said above from the respondent PIO in written to respondent PIO and also a copy of it to the Commission.
4. The subject matter is adjourned on **21.03.2018 at 12.00 Noon for** further proceedings**.**
5. Announced in the Court, copy of the order to be sent to the parties.

**Sd/-**

**(Ms. Preety Chawla) (Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)**

**State Information Commissioner State Information Commissioner**

**Chandigarh; Dated: 14.03.2018 (12:00 Noon)**

**Copy to:**

* PS/SIC (PC) for kind information.
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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)

**Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang**

**(Regd. Post)** H. No. 3398, Sector 19 D,

Chandigarh -160019 (9914751111). Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**,

**(Regd. Post)** O/o XEN, Ludhiana Drainage Division,

Ludhiana.

**Public Information Officer**,

**(Regd. Post)** O/o Vigilance Bureau, SCO 60-61,

Sector 17 D, Shopping Plaza,

Chandigarh. Respondent

**Complaint Case No. 141 of 2018**

**Present:** Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang the complainant in person.

Sh. R.P Singh, XEN (98787-05263) as respondent PIO along with Sh. Ashish Kapoor, AIG, FS-1, Vigilance Bureau, Punjab, Chandigarh.

**ORDER**

1. The case was filed under **Life & liberty** clause 7(1) of RTI Act by the complainant, Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang vide diary no. 2896 date 09.02.2018 where the information seeker has sought information in his RTI application dated 12.01.2018.
2. On previous hearing dated 16.02.2018 respondent PIO O/o XEN, Ludhiana Drainage Division, Ludhiana said that information cannot be provided to the complainant under section 8(h) of RTI Act as the inquiry is pending with the Vigilance department and he prayed that the complaint filed by the complainant may be dismissed. Sh. Karanjeet Singh, the complainant states the information demanded by him is not covered under section 8(h) of RTI Act 2005. In the view of above the Deputy Registrar was directed to present the instant case before the Hon’able Chief Information Commissioner for appropriate orders. Refer previous orders in this context.
3. Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang states that other 18 departments had already provided the similar information in this regard in similar cases and whose investigation was pending and/or completed in/by Vigilance Bureau, Punjab, and 8 departments have been left and PIO O/o XEN, Ludhiana Drainage Division, Ludhiana is one of them but they are denying information in mal-intention or unknowingly.
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**Complaint Case No. 141 of 2018**

1. Sh. Ashish Kapoor, AIG, FS-1, Vigilance Bureau, Chandigarh states and submits a letter signed by AIG, FS-1, Vigilance Bureau, Punjab Chandigarh vide diary no. 335 dated 14.03.2018 mentioning therein that cases with FIR Nos. 10 dated 17.08.2017, U/s 406, 409, 420, 467, 468, 471, 477-A, 201, 120-B, IPC & 13 (1) (D) R/W 13 (2) P.C Act 1988 and FIR 03 dated 01.03.2018 U/s 406, 409, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B, IPC & 13 (1) (D) R/W 13 (2) P.C Act 1988 Police Station FS-1, Vigilance Bureau, Punjab at Mohali have been registered. This written reply is taken on record.
2. Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang, the complainant states the following points:
3. That the Challan has been submitted in the Court by the Vigilance Bureau, Department therefore pending investigation as said above by Sh. Ashish Kapoor, AIG, FS-1, Vigilance Bureau, Chandigarh, therefore information can be provided as investigation has been done and challan has been submitted in the Court.
4. The information has been requested by the PIO O/o XEN, Ludhiana Drainage Division, Ludhiana and not from the PIO O/o Vigilance Bureau, SCO 60-61, Sector 17 D, Shopping Plaza, Chandigarh.
5. General information of public interest has been requisite and not of any individual/ process of prosecution of offenders has been requisite information which the respondent PIO may deny under section 8 (h).
6. Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang, the complainant also submits the following judgments in support to his reply and those are taken on record.
7. Judgment of Hon’able Justice Sh. S. Muralidhar dated 03 June 2011 in the case of B.S. Mathur Vs. PIO of Delhi High Court in W.P. (c) 608/2011.
8. Judgment of Sh. G. Madhavan, Hon’able Chief Information Commissioner Haryana, Chandigarh dated 27.05.2008 in the case Sh. Subhash Sachdeva, Advocate, #583, Karam Singh, Colony Vs. State PIO O/o Director General State Vigilance Bureau, Haryana, Sector-6, Panchcula and FAA O/o Director General State Vigilance Bureau, Haryana, Sector-6, Panchcula in Case No. 1272 of 2008.
9. Judgment of Hon’able Justice Sh. Vibhu Bakhru dated 16.12.2014 in the case of Adesh Kumar Vs. Union of India & others of Delhi High Court in W.P. (c) 3543/2014.
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**Complaint Case No. 141 of 2018**

1. Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang, the complainant also submits documents in the form of a report in tabular form mentioning therein other department who have already provided the similar information and departments who are pending. These documents are also taken on record.
2. After hearing the both the parties and examining the case file, the reply from respondent PIO O/o Vigilance Bureau, SCO 60-61, Sector 17 D, Shopping Plaza, Chandigarh is seen and observed. **Respondent PIO O/o Vigilance Bureau, SCO 60-61, Sector 17 D, Shopping Plaza, Chandigarh is exempted from this case till any further orders**.
3. As it is observed that the requisite information does not comes under 8 (h) of RTI act and general information of Public interest and also similar information has been provided by 18 other departments in this regard in similar cases and whose investigation was pending and/or completed in/by Vigilance Bureau, Punjab. **The PIO O/o XEN, Ludhiana Drainage Division, Ludhiana is directed to provide the requisite information to the complainant by the next date of hearing**, failing to which action under section 20(1) of RTI would be initiated against the respondent PIO. The complainant is also advised to point out deficiencies if any after receiving the information as said above from the respondent PIO in written to respondent PIO and also a copy of it to the Commission.
4. The subject matter is adjourned on **21.03.2018 at 12.00 Noon for** further proceedings**.**
5. Announced in the Court, copy of the order to be sent to the parties.

**Sd/-**

**(Ms. Preety Chawla) (Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)**

**State Information Commissioner State Information Commissioner**

**Chandigarh; Dated: 14.03.2018 (12:00 Noon)**

**Copy to:**

* PS/SIC (PC) for kind information.
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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)

**Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang**

**(Regd. Post)** H. No. 3398, Sector 19 D,

Chandigarh -160019 (9914751111). Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**,

**(Regd. Post)** XEN, Hoshiarpur Drainage Division,

Hoshiarpur.

**Public Information Officer**,

**(Regd. Post)** O/o Vigilance Bureau, SCO 60-61,

Sector 17 D, Shopping Plaza,

Chandigarh. Respondent

**Complaint Case No. 142 of 2018**

**Present:** Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang the complainant in person.

Sh. Ram Rattan, XEN (9779717655) as respondent PIO along with Sh. Ashish Kapoor, AIG, FS-1, Vigilance Bureau, Punjab, Chandigarh.

**ORDER**

1. The case was filed under **Life & liberty** clause 7(1) of RTI Act by the complainant, Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang vide diary no. 2896 date 09.02.2018 where the information seeker has sought information in his RTI application dated 12.01.2018.
2. On previous hearing dated 16.02.2018 respondent PIO O/o XEN, Hoshiarpur Drainage Division, Hoshiarpur said that information cannot be provided to the complainant under section 8(h) of RTI Act as the inquiry is pending with the Vigilance department and he prayed that the complaint filed by the complainant may be dismissed. Sh. Karanjeet Singh, the complainant states the information demanded by him is not covered under section 8(h) of RTI Act 2005. In the view of above the Deputy Registrar was directed to present the instant case before the Hon’able Chief Information Commissioner for appropriate orders. Refer previous orders in this context.
3. Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang states that other 18 departments had already provided the similar information in this regard in similar cases and whose investigation was pending and/or completed in/by Vigilance Bureau, Punjab, and 8 departments have been left and PIO O/ XEN, Hoshiarpur Drainage Division, Hoshiarpur is one of them but they are denying information in mal-intention or unknowingly.
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**Complaint Case No. 142 of 2018**

1. Sh. Ashish Kapoor, AIG, FS-1, Vigilance Bureau, Chandigarh states and submits a letter signed by AIG, FS-1, Vigilance Bureau, Punjab Chandigarh vide diary no. 337 dated 14.03.2018 mentioning therein that cases with FIR Nos. 10 dated 17.08.2017, U/s 406, 409, 420, 467, 468, 471, 477-A, 201, 120-B, IPC & 13 (1) (D) R/W 13 (2) P.C Act 1988 and FIR 03 dated 01.03.2018 U/s 406, 409, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B, IPC & 13 (1) (D) R/W 13 (2) P.C Act 1988 Police Station FS-1, Vigilance Bureau, Punjab at Mohali have been registered. This written reply is taken on record.
2. Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang, the complainant states the following points:
3. That the Challan has been submitted in the Court by the Vigilance Bureau, Department therefore pending investigation as said above by Sh. Ashish Kapoor, AIG, FS-1, Vigilance Bureau, Chandigarh, therefore information can be provided as investigation has been done and challan has been submitted in the Court.
4. The information has been requested by the PIO O/o XEN, Hoshiarpur Drainage Division, Hoshiarpur and not from the PIO O/o Vigilance Bureau, SCO 60-61, Sector 17 D, Shopping Plaza, Chandigarh.
5. General information of public interest has been requisite and not of any individual/ process of prosecution of offenders has been requisite information which the respondent PIO may deny under section 8 (h).
6. Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang, the complainant also submits the following judgments in support to his reply and those are taken on record.
7. Judgment of Hon’able Justice Sh. S. Muralidhar dated 03 June 2011 in the case of B.S. Mathur Vs. PIO of Delhi High Court in W.P. (c) 608/2011.
8. Judgment of Sh. G. Madhavan, Hon’able Chief Information Commissioner Haryana, Chandigarh dated 27.05.2008 in the case Sh. Subhash Sachdeva, Advocate, #583, Karam Singh, Colony Vs. State PIO O/o Director General State Vigilance Bureau, Haryana, Sector-6, Panchcula and FAA O/o Director General State Vigilance Bureau, Haryana, Sector-6, Panchcula in Case No. 1272 of 2008.
9. Judgment of Hon’able Justice Sh. Vibhu Bakhru dated 16.12.2014 in the case of Adesh Kumar Vs. Union of India & others of Delhi High Court in W.P. (c) 3543/2014.
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**Complaint Case No. 142 of 2018**

1. Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang, the complainant also submits documents in the form of a report in tabular form mentioning therein other department who have already provided the similar information and departments who are pending. These documents are also taken on record.
2. After hearing the both the parties and examining the case file, the reply from respondent PIO O/o Vigilance Bureau, SCO 60-61, Sector 17 D, Shopping Plaza, Chandigarh is seen and observed. **Respondent PIO O/o Vigilance Bureau, SCO 60-61, Sector 17 D, Shopping Plaza, Chandigarh is exempted from this case till any further orders**.
3. As it is observed that the requisite information does not comes under 8 (h) of RTI act and general information of Public interest and also similar information has been provided by 18 other departments in this regard in similar cases and whose investigation was pending and/or completed in/by Vigilance Bureau, Punjab. **The PIO O/o XEN, Hoshiarpur Drainage Division, Hoshiarpur is directed to provide the requisite information to the complainant by the next date of hearing**, failing to which action under section 20(1) of RTI would be initiated against the respondent PIO. The complainant is also advised to point out deficiencies if any after receiving the information as said above from the respondent PIO in written to respondent PIO and also a copy of it to the Commission.
4. The subject matter is adjourned on **21.03.2018 at 12.00 Noon for** further proceedings**.**
5. Announced in the Court, copy of the order to be sent to the parties.

**Sd/-**

**(Ms. Preety Chawla) (Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)**

**State Information Commissioner State Information Commissioner**

**Chandigarh; Dated: 14.03.2018 (12:00 Noon)**

**Copy to:**

* PS/SIC (PC) for kind information.
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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)

**Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang**

**(Regd. Post)** H. No. 3398, Sector 19 D,

Chandigarh -160019 (9914751111). Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**,

**(Regd. Post)** O/o XEN, Phagwara Drainage Division,

Jalandhar.

**Public Information Officer**,

**(Regd. Post)** O/o Vigilance Bureau, SCO 60-61,

Sector 17 D, Shopping Plaza,

Chandigarh. Respondent

**Complaint Case No. 143 of 2018**

**Present:** Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang the complainant in person.

Sh. Ram Rattan, XEN (97797-17655) as respondent PIO along with Sh. Ashish Kapoor, AIG, FS-1, Vigilance Bureau, Punjab, Chandigarh.

**ORDER**

1. The case was filed under **Life & liberty** clause 7(1) of RTI Act by the complainant, Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang vide diary no. 2896 date 09.02.2018 where the information seeker has sought information in his RTI application dated 12.01.2018.
2. On previous hearing dated 16.02.2018 respondent PIO O/o XEN, Phagwara Drainage Division, Jalandhar said that information cannot be provided to the complainant under section 8(h) of RTI Act as the inquiry is pending with the Vigilance department and he prayed that the complaint filed by the complainant may be dismissed. Sh. Karanjeet Singh, the complainant states the information demanded by him is not covered under section 8(h) of RTI Act 2005. In the view of above the Deputy Registrar was directed to present the instant case before the Hon’able Chief Information Commissioner for appropriate orders. Refer previous orders in this context.
3. Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang states that other 18 departments had already provided the similar information in this regard in similar cases and whose investigation was pending and/or completed in/by Vigilance Bureau, Punjab, and 8 departments have been left and PIO O/o XEN, Phagwara Drainage Division, Jalandhar is one of them but they are denying information in mal-intention or unknowingly.
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**Complaint Case No. 143 of 2018**

1. Sh. Ashish Kapoor, AIG, FS-1, Vigilance Bureau, Chandigarh states and submits a letter signed by AIG, FS-1, Vigilance Bureau, Punjab Chandigarh vide diary no. 339 mentioning therein that cases with FIR Nos. 10 dated 17.08.2017, U/s 406, 409, 420, 467, 468, 471, 477-A, 201, 120-B, IPC & 13 (1) (D) R/W 13 (2) P.C Act 1988 and FIR 03 dated 01.03.2018 U/s 406, 409, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B, IPC & 13 (1) (D) R/W 13 (2) P.C Act 1988 Police Station FS-1, Vigilance Bureau, Punjab at Mohali have been registered. This written reply is taken on record.
2. Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang, the complainant states the following points:
3. That the Challan has been submitted in the Court by the Vigilance Bureau, Department therefore pending investigation as said above by Sh. Ashish Kapoor, AIG, FS-1, Vigilance Bureau, Chandigarh, therefore information can be provided as investigation has been done and challan has been submitted in the Court.
4. The information has been requested by the PIO O/o XEN, Phagwara Drainage Division, Jalandhar and not from the PIO O/o Vigilance Bureau, SCO 60-61, Sector 17 D, Shopping Plaza, Chandigarh.
5. General information of public interest has been requisite and not of any individual/ process of prosecution of offenders has been requisite information which the respondent PIO may deny under section 8 (h).
6. Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang, the complainant also submits the following judgments in support to his reply and those are taken on record.
7. Judgment of Hon’able Justice Sh. S. Muralidhar dated 03 June 2011 in the case of B.S. Mathur Vs. PIO of Delhi High Court in W.P. (c) 608/2011.
8. Judgment of Sh. G. Madhavan, Hon’able Chief Information Commissioner Haryana, Chandigarh dated 27.05.2008 in the case Sh. Subhash Sachdeva, Advocate, #583, Karam Singh, Colony Vs. State PIO O/o Director General State Vigilance Bureau, Haryana, Sector-6, Panchcula and FAA O/o Director General State Vigilance Bureau, Haryana, Sector-6, Panchcula in Case No. 1272 of 2008.
9. Judgment of Hon’able Justice Sh. Vibhu Bakhru dated 16.12.2014 in the case of Adesh Kumar Vs. Union of India & others of Delhi High Court in W.P. (c) 3543/2014.
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**Complaint Case No. 143 of 2018**

1. Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang, the complainant also submits documents in the form of a report in tabular form mentioning therein other department who have already provided the similar information and departments who are pending. These documents are also taken on record.
2. After hearing the both the parties and examining the case file, the reply from respondent PIO O/o Vigilance Bureau, SCO 60-61, Sector 17 D, Shopping Plaza, Chandigarh is seen and observed. **Respondent PIO O/o Vigilance Bureau, SCO 60-61, Sector 17 D, Shopping Plaza, Chandigarh is exempted from this case till any further orders**.
3. As it is observed that the requisite information does not comes under 8 (h) of RTI act and general information of Public interest and also similar information has been provided by 18 other departments in this regard in similar cases and whose investigation was pending and/or completed in/by Vigilance Bureau, Punjab. **The PIO O/o XEN, Phagwara Drainage Division, Jalandhar** **is directed to provide the requisite information to the complainant by the next date of hearing**, failing to which action under section 20(1) of RTI would be initiated against the respondent PIO. The complainant is also advised to point out deficiencies if any after receiving the information as said above from the respondent PIO in written to respondent PIO and also a copy of it to the Commission.
4. The subject matter is adjourned on **21.03.2018 at 12.00 Noon for** further proceedings**.**
5. Announced in the Court, copy of the order to be sent to the parties.

**Sd/-**

**(Ms. Preety Chawla) (Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)**

**State Information Commissioner State Information Commissioner**

**Chandigarh; Dated: 14.03.2018 (12:00 Noon)**

**Copy to:**

* PS/SIC (PC) for kind information.
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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)

**Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang**

**(Regd. Post)** H. No. 3398, Sector 19 D,

Chandigarh -160019 (9914751111). Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**,

**(Regd. Post)** O/o XEN, Amritsar Drainage Division,

Amritsar.

**Public Information Officer**,

**(Regd. Post)** O/o Vigilance Bureau, SCO 60-61,

Sector 17 D, Shopping Plaza,

Chandigarh. Respondent

**Complaint Case No. 144 of 2018**

**Present:** Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang the complainant in person.

Sh. Kulwinder Singh, XEN (97793-11777) as respondent PIO along with Sh. Ashish Kapoor, AIG, FS-1, Vigilance Bureau, Punjab, Chandigarh.

**ORDER**

1. The case was filed under **Life & liberty** clause 7(1) of RTI Act by the complainant, Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang vide diary no. 2896 date 09.02.2018 where the information seeker has sought information in his RTI application dated 12.01.2018.
2. On previous hearing dated 16.02.2018 respondent PIO O/o XEN, Amritsar Drainage Division, Amritsar said that information cannot be provided to the complainant under section 8(h) of RTI Act as the inquiry is pending with the Vigilance department and he prayed that the complaint filed by the complainant may be dismissed. Sh. Karanjeet Singh, the complainant states the information demanded by him is not covered under section 8(h) of RTI Act 2005. In the view of above the Deputy Registrar was directed to present the instant case before the Hon’able Chief Information Commissioner for appropriate orders. Refer previous orders in this context.
3. Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang states that other 18 departments had already provided the similar information in this regard in similar cases and whose investigation was pending and/or completed in/by Vigilance Bureau, Punjab, and 8 departments have been left and PIO O/o XEN, Amritsar Drainage Division, Amritsar is one of them but they are denying information in mal-intention or unknowingly.
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**Complaint Case No. 144 of 2018**

1. Sh. Ashish Kapoor, AIG, FS-1, Vigilance Bureau, Chandigarh states and submits a letter signed by AIG, FS-1, Vigilance Bureau, Punjab Chandigarh vide diary no. 341 dated 14.03.2018 mentioning therein that cases with FIR Nos. 10 dated 17.08.2017, U/s 406, 409, 420, 467, 468, 471, 477-A, 201, 120-B, IPC & 13 (1) (D) R/W 13 (2) P.C Act 1988 and FIR 03 dated 01.03.2018 U/s 406, 409, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B, IPC & 13 (1) (D) R/W 13 (2) P.C Act 1988 Police Station FS-1, Vigilance Bureau, Punjab at Mohali have been registered. This written reply is taken on record.
2. Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang, the complainant states the following points:
3. That the Challan has been submitted in the Court by the Vigilance Bureau, Department therefore pending investigation as said above by Sh. Ashish Kapoor, AIG, FS-1, Vigilance Bureau, Chandigarh, therefore information can be provided as investigation has been done and challan has been submitted in the Court.
4. The information has been requested by the PIO O/o XEN, Amritsar Drainage Division, Amritsar and not from the PIO O/o Vigilance Bureau, SCO 60-61, Sector 17 D, Shopping Plaza, Chandigarh.
5. General information of public interest has been requisite and not of any individual/ process of prosecution of offenders has been requisite information which the respondent PIO may deny under section 8 (h).
6. Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang, the complainant also submits the following judgments in support to his reply and those are taken on record.
7. Judgment of Hon’able Justice Sh. S. Muralidhar dated 03 June 2011 in the case of B.S. Mathur Vs. PIO of Delhi High Court in W.P. (c) 608/2011.
8. Judgment of Sh. G. Madhavan, Hon’able Chief Information Commissioner Haryana, Chandigarh dated 27.05.2008 in the case Sh. Subhash Sachdeva, Advocate, #583, Karam Singh, Colony Vs. State PIO O/o Director General State Vigilance Bureau, Haryana, Sector-6, Panchcula and FAA O/o Director General State Vigilance Bureau, Haryana, Sector-6, Panchcula in Case No. 1272 of 2008.
9. Judgment of Hon’able Justice Sh. Vibhu Bakhru dated 16.12.2014 in the case of Adesh Kumar Vs. Union of India & others of Delhi High Court in W.P. (c) 3543/2014.
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**Complaint Case No. 144 of 2018**

1. Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang, the complainant also submits documents in the form of a report in tabular form mentioning therein other department who have already provided the similar information and departments who are pending. These documents are also taken on record.
2. After hearing the both the parties and examining the case file, the reply from respondent PIO O/o Vigilance Bureau, SCO 60-61, Sector 17 D, Shopping Plaza, Chandigarh is seen and observed. **Respondent PIO O/o Vigilance Bureau, SCO 60-61, Sector 17 D, Shopping Plaza, Chandigarh is exempted from this case till any further orders**.
3. As it is observed that the requisite information does not comes under 8 (h) of RTI act and general information of Public interest and also similar information has been provided by 18 other departments in this regard in similar cases and whose investigation was pending and/or completed in/by Vigilance Bureau, Punjab. **The PIO O/o XEN, Amritsar Drainage Division, Amritsar** **is directed to provide the requisite information to the complainant by the next date of hearing**, failing to which action under section 20(1) of RTI would be initiated against the respondent PIO. The complainant is also advised to point out deficiencies if any after receiving the information as said above from the respondent PIO in written to respondent PIO and also a copy of it to the Commission.
4. The subject matter is adjourned on **21.03.2018 at 12.00 Noon for** further proceedings**.**
5. Announced in the Court, copy of the order to be sent to the parties.

**Sd/-**

**(Ms. Preety Chawla) (Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)**

**State Information Commissioner State Information Commissioner**

**Chandigarh; Dated: 14.03.2018 (12:00 Noon)**

**Copy to:**

* PS/SIC (PC) for kind information.
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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)

**Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang**

**(Regd. Post)** H. No. 3398, Sector 19 D,

Chandigarh -160019 (9914751111). Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**,

**(Regd. Post)** XEN, Golewala Drainage Division,

Ferozepur.

**Public Information Officer**,

**(Regd. Post)** O/o Vigilance Bureau, SCO 60-61,

Sector 17 D, Shopping Plaza,

Chandigarh. Respondent

**Complaint Case No. 145 of 2018**

**Present:** Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang the complainant in person.

Sh. Ashutosh, XEN (98148-14121) as respondent PIO along with Sh. Ashish Kapoor, AIG, FS-1, Vigilance Bureau, Punjab, Chandigarh.

**ORDER**

1. The case was filed under **Life & liberty** clause 7(1) of RTI Act by the complainant, Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang vide diary no. 2896 date 09.02.2018 where the information seeker has sought information in his RTI application dated 12.01.2018.
2. On previous hearing dated 16.02.2018 respondent PIO O/o XEN, Golewala Drainage Division, Ferozepur said that information cannot be provided to the complainant under section 8(h) of RTI Act as the inquiry is pending with the Vigilance department and he prayed that the complaint filed by the complainant may be dismissed. Sh. Karanjeet Singh, the complainant states the information demanded by him is not covered under section 8(h) of RTI Act 2005. In the view of above the Deputy Registrar was directed to present the instant case before the Hon’able Chief Information Commissioner for appropriate orders. Refer previous orders in this context.
3. Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang states that other 18 departments had already provided the similar information in this regard in similar cases and whose investigation was pending and/or completed in/by Vigilance Bureau, Punjab, and 8 departments have been left and PIO O/o XEN, Golewala Drainage Division, Ferozepur is one of them but they are denying information in mal-intention or unknowingly.

Page 1of 3

**Complaint Case No. 145 of 2018**

1. Sh. Ashish Kapoor, AIG, FS-1, Vigilance Bureau, Chandigarh states and submits a letter signed by AIG, FS-1, Vigilance Bureau, Punjab Chandigarh vide diary no. 343 dated 14.03.2018 mentioning therein that cases with FIR Nos. 10 dated 17.08.2017, U/s 406, 409, 420, 467, 468, 471, 477-A, 201, 120-B, IPC & 13 (1) (D) R/W 13 (2) P.C Act 1988 and FIR 03 dated 01.03.2018 U/s 406, 409, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B, IPC & 13 (1) (D) R/W 13 (2) P.C Act 1988 Police Station FS-1, Vigilance Bureau, Punjab at Mohali have been registered. This written reply is taken on record.
2. Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang, the complainant states the following points:
3. That the Challan has been submitted in the Court by the Vigilance Bureau, Department therefore pending investigation as said above by Sh. Ashish Kapoor, AIG, FS-1, Vigilance Bureau, Chandigarh, therefore information can be provided as investigation has been done and challan has been submitted in the Court.
4. The information has been requested by the PIO O/o XEN, Golewala Drainage Division, Ferozepur and not from the PIO O/o Vigilance Bureau, SCO 60-61, Sector 17 D, Shopping Plaza, Chandigarh.
5. General information of public interest has been requisite and not of any individual/ process of prosecution of offenders has been requisite information which the respondent PIO may deny under section 8 (h).
6. Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang, the complainant also submits the following judgments in support to his reply and those are taken on record.
7. Judgment of Hon’able Justice Sh. S. Muralidhar dated 03 June 2011 in the case of B.S. Mathur Vs. PIO of Delhi High Court in W.P. (c) 608/2011.
8. Judgment of Sh. G. Madhavan, Hon’able Chief Information Commissioner Haryana, Chandigarh dated 27.05.2008 in the case Sh. Subhash Sachdeva, Advocate, #583, Karam Singh, Colony Vs. State PIO O/o Director General State Vigilance Bureau, Haryana, Sector-6, Panchcula and FAA O/o Director General State Vigilance Bureau, Haryana, Sector-6, Panchcula in Case No. 1272 of 2008.
9. Judgment of Hon’able Justice Sh. Vibhu Bakhru dated 16.12.2014 in the case of Adesh Kumar Vs. Union of India & others of Delhi High Court in W.P. (c) 3543/2014.
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**Complaint Case No. 145 of 2018**

1. Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang, the complainant also submits documents in the form of a report in tabular form mentioning therein other department who have already provided the similar information and departments who are pending. These documents are also taken on record.
2. After hearing the both the parties and examining the case file, the reply from respondent PIO O/o Vigilance Bureau, SCO 60-61, Sector 17 D, Shopping Plaza, Chandigarh is seen and observed. **Respondent PIO O/o Vigilance Bureau, SCO 60-61, Sector 17 D, Shopping Plaza, Chandigarh is exempted from this case till any further orders**.
3. As it is observed that the requisite information does not comes under 8 (h) of RTI act and general information of Public interest and also similar information has been provided by 18 other departments in this regard in similar cases and whose investigation was pending and/or completed in/by Vigilance Bureau, Punjab. **The PIO O/o XEN, Golewala Drainage Division,Ferozepur is directed to provide the requisite information to the complainant by the next date of hearing**, failing to which action under section 20(1) of RTI would be initiated against the respondent PIO. The complainant is also advised to point out deficiencies if any after receiving the information as said above from the respondent PIO in written to respondent PIO and also a copy of it to the Commission.
4. The subject matter is adjourned on **21.03.2018 at 12.00 Noon for** further proceedings**.**
5. Announced in the Court, copy of the order to be sent to the parties.

**Sd/-**

**(Ms. Preety Chawla) (Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)**

**State Information Commissioner State Information Commissioner**

**Chandigarh; Dated: 14.03.2018 (12:00 Noon)**

**Copy to:**

* PS/SIC (PC) for kind information.
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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)

**Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang**

**(Regd. Post)** H. No. 3398, Sector 19 D,

Chandigarh -160019 (9914751111). Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**,

**(Regd. Post)** O/o XEN, Canal Lining Arrear Division,

Tarn Taran at Amritsar.

**Public Information Officer**,

**(Regd. Post)** O/o Vigilance Bureau, SCO 60-61,

Sector 17 D, Shopping Plaza,

Chandigarh. Respondent

**Complaint Case No. 219 of 2018**

**Present:** Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang the complainant in person.

Sh. Kulwinder Singh, XEN (97793-11777) as respondent PIO along with Sh. Ashish Kapoor, AIG, FS-1, Vigilance Bureau, Punjab, Chandigarh.

**ORDER**

1. The case was filed under **Life & liberty** clause 7(1) of RTI Act by the complainant, Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang vide diary no. 2896 date 09.02.2018 where the information seeker has sought information in his RTI application dated 12.01.2018.
2. On previous hearing dated 16.02.2018 respondent PIO said that information cannot be provided to the complainant under section 8(h) of RTI Act as the inquiry is pending with the Vigilance department and he prayed that the complaint filed by the complainant may be dismissed. Sh. Karanjeet Singh, the complainant states the information demanded by him is not covered under section 8(h) of RTI Act 2005. In the view of above the Deputy Registrar was directed to present the instant case before the Hon’able Chief Information Commissioner for appropriate orders. Refer previous orders in this context.
3. Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang states that other 18 departments had already provided the similar information in this regard in similar cases and whose investigation was pending and/or completed in/by Vigilance Bureau, Punjab, and 8 departments have been left and PIO O/o XEN, Canal Lining Arrear Division, Tarn Taran at Amritsar is one of them but they are denying information in mal-intention or unknowingly.
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**Complaint Case No. 219 of 2018**

1. Sh. Ashish Kapoor, AIG, FS-1, Vigilance Bureau, Chandigarh states and submits a letter signed by AIG, FS-1, Vigilance Bureau, Punjab Chandigarh vide diary no. 345 dated 14.03.2018 mentioning therein that cases with FIR Nos. 10 dated 17.08.2017, U/s 406, 409, 420, 467, 468, 471, 477-A, 201, 120-B, IPC & 13 (1) (D) R/W 13 (2) P.C Act 1988 and FIR 03 dated 01.03.2018 U/s 406, 409, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B, IPC & 13 (1) (D) R/W 13 (2) P.C Act 1988 Police Station FS-1, Vigilance Bureau, Punjab at Mohali have been registered. This written reply is taken on record.
2. Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang, the complainant states the following points:
3. That the Challan has been submitted in the Court by the Vigilance Bureau, Department therefore pending investigation as said above by Sh. Ashish Kapoor, AIG, FS-1, Vigilance Bureau, Chandigarh, therefore information can be provided as investigation has been done and challan has been submitted in the Court.
4. The information has been requested by the PIO O/o XEN, Canal Lining Arrear Division, Tarn Taran at Amritsar and not from the PIO O/o Vigilance Bureau, SCO 60-61, Sector 17 D, Shopping Plaza, Chandigarh.
5. General information of public interest has been requisite and not of any individual/ process of prosecution of offenders has been requisite information which the respondent PIO may deny under section 8 (h).

6. Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang, the complainant also submits the following judgments in support to his reply and those are taken on record.

1. Judgment of Hon’able Justice Sh. S. Muralidhar dated 03 June 2011 in the case of B.S. Mathur Vs. PIO of Delhi High Court in W.P. (c) 608/2011.
2. Judgment of Sh. G. Madhavan, Hon’able Chief Information Commissioner Haryana, Chandigarh dated 27.05.2008 in the case Sh. Subhash Sachdeva, Advocate, #583, Karam Singh, Colony Vs. State PIO O/o Director General State Vigilance Bureau, Haryana, Sector-6, Panchcula and FAA O/o Director General State Vigilance Bureau, Haryana, Sector-6, Panchcula in Case No. 1272 of 2008.
3. Judgment of Hon’able Justice Sh. Vibhu Bakhru dated 16.12.2014 in the case of Adesh Kumar Vs. Union of India & others of Delhi High Court in W.P. (c) 3543/2014.
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**Complaint Case No. 219 of 2018**

1. Advocate Karanjeet Singh Narang, the complainant also submits documents in the form of a report in tabular form mentioning therein other department who have already provided the similar information and departments who are pending. These documents are also taken on record.
2. After hearing the both the parties and examining the case file, the reply from respondent PIO O/o Vigilance Bureau, SCO 60-61, Sector 17 D, Shopping Plaza, Chandigarh is seen and observed. **Respondent PIO O/o Vigilance Bureau, SCO 60-61, Sector 17 D, Shopping Plaza, Chandigarh is exempted from this case till any further orders**.
3. As it is observed that the requisite information does not comes under 8 (h) of RTI act and general information of Public interest and also similar information has been provided by 18 other departments in this regard in similar cases and whose investigation was pending and/or completed in/by Vigilance Bureau, Punjab. **The PIO O/o XEN, Canal Lining Arrear Division, Tarn Taran at Amritsar is directed to provide the requisite information to the complainant by the next date of hearing**, failing to which action under section 20(1) of RTI would be initiated against the respondent PIO. The complainant is also advised to point out deficiencies if any after receiving the information as said above from the respondent PIO in written to respondent PIO and also a copy of it to the Commission.
4. The subject matter is adjourned on **21.03.2018 at 12.00 Noon for** further proceedings**.**
5. Announced in the Court, copy of the order to be sent to the parties.

**Sd/-**

**(Ms. Preety Chawla) (Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)**

**State Information Commissioner State Information Commissioner**

**Chandigarh; Dated: 14.03.2018 (12:00 Noon)**

**Copy to:**

* PS/SIC (PC) for kind information.
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