



Sh. Davinderjit Singh, S/o Sh Karamjit Singh,
H No- 3196, Gali No-3, Azad Nagar,
Putilgarh, Amritsar.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Chief Engineer (Store),
PSPCL, Ludhiana.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Chief Engineer (Store & Workshop),
PSPCL, Ludhiana.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3056 of 2019

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
Sh.Sanjeev Prabhakar, Sr.Assistant O/o CE- PSPCL Ludhiana for the
Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 12.02.2019 has sought information on 6 points regarding DMS project and detail of EPF deducted and deposited by contractor/PSPCL under work order allotted other information concerning the office of Chief Engineer(Store), PSPCL Ludhiana. The appellant was asked by the different field offices of the PIO to deposit requisite fee to which the appellant was not satisfied and filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 27.05.2019 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case was last heard on 30.12.2019. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the complete information and raised an unfair amount for the information which he has not sought. The respondent pleaded that since the information sought by the appellant relates to district controller of stores, the RTI application was transferred to them and the fee was raised by the district controller of stores. Thereafter, the appellant filed first appeal with the First Appellate Authority on 27.05.2019 which asked the appellant to appear before it on 18.06.2019 and specify the information but the appellant did not appear.

During the hearing, the appellant had clarified the information. Having gone through the file and hearing both the parties, the PIO was directed to raise exact amount of information as per the RTI Act. The appellant was directed to deposit the requisite amount and get the relevant information. The information to be provided within 10 days once the fee is deposited by the appellant.

Hearing dated 17.03.2020:

The respondent present informed that since the appellant has not deposited the requisite fee, the information has not been provided.

The appellant is absent. The earlier order stands. If the appellant is still interested to seek information, he is directed to deposit the requisite fee and get the relevant information as per earlier order which will be valid for two months.

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

Chandigarh
Dated 17.03.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



registered post.

Sh Anil Mittal, S/o Sh Dharam Pal,
22121, Gali No-11/4, Power House Road,
Bathinda.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o EO, BDA,
Bathinda.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Addl, Chief Administrator,
BDA, Bathinda.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1943 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Anil Mittal as the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER: The case was first heard on 17.10.2019. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant was not satisfied and informed that the information supplied is incomplete and not certified. Hearing both the parties, following was concluded:

Points-1,2,3,4,5, 7, 8, 9, 11 & 14	-	Information provided.
Points-10	-	Information not available in the record
Points-6, 12 & 13	-	Respondent informed that the information relates to Revenue Patwari, Patti Mehna Distt.Bathinda. The PIO is directed to transfer the RTI Application to the Concerned Patwari. The Revenue Patwari, Patti Mehna is impleaded in the case and directed to provide the information duly certified.

The case was last heard on **23.12.2019**. Both the parties were absent. The PIO-Revenue Patwari was also absent. The PIO-Revenue Patwari, Patti Mehna, was given one more opportunity to comply with the earlier order of the Commission and be present on the next date of hearing.

Hearing dated 17.03.2020:

The appellant informed that the PIO-Revenue Patwari, Patti-Mehna has not provided the information and the information supplied on points 1,3,4,5,11 & 14 is not legible.

The Revenue Patwari, Patti Mehna is absent. The earlier order stands. The PIO is directed to provide legible and signed copies of the information to the appellant. The Revenue Patwari, Patti Mehna is given one last opportunity to provide the information concerning them as per earlier order which still stands otherwise the Commission will be constrained to take action as per the provisions of RTI Act. The information be provided within 15 days.

To come up for compliance on **13.05.2020 at 11.00 AM** through through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Bathinda. Copies of order be sent to both the parties through registered post.

Chandigarh
Dated 17.03.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

CC to: Revenue Patwari,

Patti Mehna, Distt.Bhatinda.

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in
Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Sh Surjit Kaur, D/o Sh Bhagwant Singh,
VPO Ramuwala Nawa, Distt Moga.

... Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o SSP,
Moga.

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 793 of 2019

PRESENT: None for the Complainant
Sh.Ravinder Singh, DSP-Homicide & Forensics and Sh.Mohinder Singh,
ASI for the Respondent

ORDER:

The complainant through RTI application dated 26.11.2018 has sought information regarding action taken on complaints dated 31.05.2018, 07.08.2018, 01.06.2018, 23.10.2018 & 30.08.2018 and other information concerning the office of SSP Moga. The complainant was not provided the information after which the complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 30.08.2019.

The case was last heard on 06.01.2020. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 20.12.2019 through registered post.

The complainant was absent. The complainant was directed to point out the discrepancies, if any. The PIO was directed to remove the same.

Hearing dated 17.03.2020:

The respondent present pleaded that the information has already been supplied to the complainant vide letter dated 20.12.2019. The respondent further informed that since the enquiry was pending, the information was not supplied and the reply was sent to the complainant vide letter dated 29.12.2018. The respondent says that after completion of enquiry, the information was provided and telephonically, the complainant has conveyed that she is satisfied.

The complainant is absent on 2nd consecutive hearing. I have gone through the record and find that there is no malafide on the part of the PIO in attending to the RTI application. Hence I see no further course of action and dispose off the complaint.

However, if the complainant is not satisfied with the information, the complainant is directed to go to the First Appellate Authority.

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

Chandigarh
Dated 17.03.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh Himanshu Raj, C/o Law Office of Himanshu Raj,
Sector 10-A, # 102, Chandigarh.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o PUDA,
Amritsar.

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 750 of 2019

PRESENT: None for the Complainant
Sh.Prabhjot Singh for the Respondent

ORDER:

The complainant through RTI application dated 07.03.2019 has sought information on 10 points regarding allotment of 694 freehold residential plots at Urban Estate Gurdaspur in the scheme open on 12.01.2011 and other information concerning the office of PUDA Amritsar. The complainant was not provided the information since the complainant did not provide the ID proof as asked by the PIO vide letter dated 16.03.2018 after which the complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 22.08.2019.

The case was last heard on 30.12.2019. Both the parties were absent. The case was adjourned.

Sh.Gurpreet Singh, Clerk O/o PUDA Amritsar appeared late and informed that since the complainant had not submitted ID proof and also the information sought being 3rd party, information, it could not be provided.

Hearing dated 17.03.2020:

The respondent present pleaded that since the complainant had not submitted ID proof, the information was not provided and after receipt of ID proof, the information on points 1 & 3 has been provided and the information on point-2 is not available in the record. The information on points 4, 6, 7 & 8 has been collected from concerned departments and is being sent to the complainant.

The respondent further pleaded that since the complainant had not submitted the ID proof, the information was not supplied.

The complainant is absent on 2nd consecutive hearing. Since partial information has been sent and remaining information is being sent to the complainant, I see no malafide on the part of the PIO in attending to the RTI application, hence dispose off the complaint. The PIO is directed to send the remaining information as per RTI application of the complainant. However, if the complainant is not satisfied with the information, the complainant is directed to go to the First Appellate Authority.

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

Chandigarh
Dated 17.03.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



registered post.

Sh. Tarsem Singh, S/o Sh Nishan Singh,
Roj Avenue, Chamiani Road,
Ajnala, Amritsar

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Addl, SE (Operational),
PSPCL, Division Ajnala,
Distt Amritsar.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Chief Engineer, Border Zone,
Amritsar.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3057 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh. Tarsem Singh for the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 30.04.2019 has sought information regarding copy of application form/request dated 25.08.2015 for electric connection No.A11SA441492M alongwith copy of bills issued and other information concerning the office of Addl. SE (Operational), PSPCL Division Ajnala. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 20.05.2019 which took no decision on the appeal. After filing first appeal, the PIO sent reply to the appellant vide letter dated 27.06.2019. On being not satisfied with the information, the appellant filed 2nd appeal in the Commission on 21.08.2019.

The case was last heard on 30.12.2019. The representative appeared on behalf of the appellant informed that the PIO has not provided the complete information. The respondent was absent. The PIO was directed to relook at the RTI application and provide the complete information to the appellant within 10 days.

Hearing dated 17.03.2020:

The appellant claims that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent is absent on 2nd consecutive hearing. Having gone through the record, the Commission observes that there has been an enormous delay of eight months in providing the information. The Commission has taken a serious note of this and hereby directs the PIO to **show cause why penalty be not imposed on him under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 for not supplying the information within the statutorily prescribed period of time.** He/she should file an affidavit in this regard. If there are other persons responsible for the delay in providing the information, the PIO is directed to inform such persons of the show cause and direct them to appear before the Commission along with the written replies.

The PIO is again directed to provide the complete information within 10 days of the receipt of this order.

To come up for further hearing on **13.05.2020 at 11.00 AM.** Through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Amritsar. Copies of order be sent to both the parties through registered post.

Chandigarh
Dated 17.03.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh. Rajwinder Singh, S/o Sh Kuldeep Singh,
R/o 2636, Gali No-1, Azad Nagar,
Near Shimla Market, Putlighar,
Amritsar

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Chairman-cum-Managing Director,
PSPCL, Head Office, Patiala.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Chief Engineer, Border Zone,
PSPCL, Amritsar.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3307 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Rajwinder Singh as the Appellant
Sh.Sudhir Kumar SDO-PSPCL- Chatiwind City Circle, Amritsar for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 30.05.2019 has sought information regarding action taken on the complaint dated 21.05.2019 - statement of witnesses and other information concerning the office of Deputy Chief Engineer Operational, Urban Division, PSPCL Patiala. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 03.07.2019 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case was last heard on 06.01.2020. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 08.08.2019 and again on 03.01.2020 and a copy of the same was submitted to the Commission.

The appellant was absent. The appellant was directed to point out the discrepancies, if any in writing and the PIO was directed to remove the same.

Hearing dated 17.03.2020:

The respondent present pleaded that the information has been supplied to the appellant. The appellant is not satisfied with the information regarding point-2 and stated that the PIO has not provided the statement of both parties and the witnesses. The respondent says that no statement was recorded.

Hearing both the parties, the Commission directs the PIO to provide this in writing on an affidavit.

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

Chandigarh
Dated 17.03.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh.Amandeep Singh, S/o Sh P.S Manaise,
H No- 26, HM, Sec-59,
Phase-4, Mohali.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Naib Tehsildar,
Lambi, Tehsil Malout,
Distt Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 448 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Parkash Chander for the Complainant
Sh.Sukhvinder Kumar O/o Land Records for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on 10.09.2019. The respondent present pleaded that the information does not pertain to them and they have already sent reply to the complainant vide letter dated 24.04.2019. The respondent further informed that the information regarding point 4(a) relates to FCR office, point-4(b) relates to Rehabilitation department and points 4(c) & 4(d) relates to the office of Sadar Kanungo, Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

The appellant was absent and vide letter received in the Commission through a counsel, sought adjournment. The PIO-FCR Punjab, PIO-Rehabilitation department, Punjab and PIO-Sadar Kanungo Sri Mukatsar Sahib were impleaded in the case and directed to provide the information as per the RTI application, a copy of which was enclosed with the order.

The case was last heard on **23.12.2019**. The respondent present from the office of Tehsildar Lambi informed that the information does not pertain to them and they have already sent reply to the complainant.

The respondent present from the office of FCR, Punjab pleaded that the record relating to the information on points-4(a)& (b) is not traceable. The Commission made it clear that the record cannot be considered missing until an enquiry is conducted and a complete enquiry report is submitted to the Commission which establishes that the record is missing and the responsibility has been fixed for the person responsible. If the record is not traceable or missing, the PIO-FCR, Pb was directed to conduct an enquiry into the matter and submit a complete enquiry report.

The respondent PIO-Sadar Kanoongo Sri Mukatsar Sahib pleaded that the information regarding points 4 (c) &(d) is voluminous and would divert the sufficient resources. The appellant was absent. The appellant was directed to inspect the record by fixing a mutually convenient date and time and get the relevant information. The PIO was directed to allow inspection to the appellant and provide the relevant information.

Hearing dated 17.03.2020:

The representative appeared on behalf of the complainant informed that the information on point-4(a) has been received and the PIO-FCR Punjab has denied the information regarding point-4(b) stating that the record is not traceable.

Complaint Case No. 448 of 2019

The respondent present from the office of land records pleaded that the information does not relate to them. The respondents from the office of FCR, Punjab and Sadar Kanoongo Sri Mukatsar Sahib are absent. The PIO-FCR,Punjab is directed to send reply on an affidavit regarding information on point-4(b) if the record is not traceable.

At the earlier hearing, the PIO-Sadar Kanoongo informed that the information regarding points 4 (c) & 4(d) is voluminous and the complainant was directed to inspect the record and get the relevant information. The complainant has not inspected the record.

If the complainant still wants the information, he is directed to inspect the record by fixing a mutually convenient date and time and get the relevant information.

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

Chandigarh
Dated 17.03.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

**CC to 1. PIO-Financial Commissioner Revenue, Pb
Chandigarh.**

**2. Director Land Records, Punjab
Kaputhala Road, Jalandhar**

**3. PIO-Sadar Kanungo,
Sri Mukatsar Sahib.**



registered post.

Ms. Kadambini,
4124, Abohar Road,
Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o DC,
Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

First Appellate Authority,
DC,
Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1919 of 2019

PRESENT: Ms.Kadambini as the Appellant
Mrs.Adarshpal Kaur, Suptd. and Sh.Chand Singh, Sadar Kanoongo for the
Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on 17.10.2019. The respondent present pleaded that since the information was voluminous, the appellant was called for inspection and after inspection, the appellant was asked to deposit a sum of Rs.390/- for 195 pages which the appellant did not deposit. However, the available information was provided to the appellant by the SDM office Malout. The appellant stated that the PIO had provided the information regarding point-2 only.

Hearing both the parties, the Commission observed that there had been delay in attending to the RTI application and directed the PIO to provide the information on points 1,3,4,5,& 6 free of cost. The information regarding point-2 had been provided. The information be provided within 3 weeks.

The case was last heard on **23.12.2019**. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 15.11.2019 and a copy of the same submitted to the Commission. The appellant was not satisfied with the information on points 3 & 4. Hearing both the parties, the appellant was directed to inspect the record for the remaining information on 30.12.2019 at 11.00 AM in the office of DC Sri Mukatsar Sahib and get the relevant information. The PIO was directed to allow inspection to the appellant and provide the remaining information whatever available on record. If the information is not available, to transfer the RTI application to the concerned PIO.

Hearing dated 17.03.2020:

The appellant informed that she has inspected the record, however, the information has not been provided. The appellant further stated that she has received the information only on point-4 but the information on points 3, 6 & 7 has also not been provided. The respondent present informed that this information relates to DC office.

Hearing both the parties, the Commission observes that there is delay in providing the information regarding points 3, 6 & 7 and these points have not been adequately replied. The Commission has taken a serious view of this and hereby directs the PIO to **show cause why penalty be not imposed on him under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 for not supplying the information within the statutorily prescribed period of time**. He/she should file an affidavit in this regard. If there are other persons responsible for the delay in providing the

information, the PIO is directed to inform such persons of the show cause and direct them to appear before the Commission along with the written replies.

Appeal Case No. 1919 of 2019

The PIO is again directed to provide the complete information within 10 days of the receipt of this order.

I am also marking this application to the First Appellate Authority, Deputy Commissioner, Sri Mukatsar Sahib to take a cognizance on this application and ensure compliance of order of the Commission.

To come up for further hearing on **13.05.2020 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Sri Mukatsar Sahib. The order be sent to both the parties through registered post.

Chandigarh
Dated 17.03.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden, Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in
Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



registered post.

Sh. Devan Munjal,
Ward No-13, Near Usha Nursing Home,
Gidderbaha.

... Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Tehsildar, Gidderbaha,
Distt Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o SDM, Gidderbaha,
Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 1099 of 2018

Present: None for the Complainant
Sh.Bhalinder Singh for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on **09.01.2019**. The complainant stated that since the PIO provided the information only on point No.4 out of 9 points, he filed first appeal with the First Appellate Authority which marked the same to the Tehsildar Gidderbaha to adjudicate the appeal. The Tehsildar denied the information stating that it is in question form. The appellant further stated that the information has been delayed intentionally and with malafide and the First Appellate Authority had not properly handled the RTI application, for the decision cannot be taken by the PIO when the case has come to the First Appellate Authority.

The respondent was absent. The PIO was directed to relook at the RTI application and provide all the information which is available with the public authority, even it had been raised in question form. The PIO was also directed to be present on the next date of hearing alongwith the reasons for delay in providing the information.

The case was again heard on **26.02.2019**. The appellant informed that he has not received the information. The respondent was absent and vide email, sought exemption stating that as per order of the DC, Mukatsar Sahib, the respondent has to remain at the station during the leave period of SDM Gidderbaha from 26.02.2019 to 01.03.2019. The PIO further informed that the information has been sent to the complainant vide letter dated 25.02.2019 and a copy of the same sent to the Commission.

A copy of the information was provided to the complainant. The complainant was not satisfied with the information regarding points 6 & 7. The PIO was directed to allow the inspection of the concerned record regarding points 6 & 7 by fixing a mutually convenient date and time and provide the information before the next date of hearing. The PIO was also directed to be present on the next date of hearing and explain the reasons for not providing the information within the time prescribed under the RTI Act.

The case again came up for hearing on **02.04.2019**. The appellant was absent and vide email informed that he visited the office of the PIO on 15.03.2019 and 20.03.2019 but the Tehsildar was not available in the office and nobody showed any concern. The respondent was absent. The PIO was directed to contact the appellant and fix a mutually convenient date & time for inspection within 10 days and provide the information to the appellant as per previous order which still stands.

Complaint Case No. 1099 of 2018

The case was again heard on **21.05.2019**. The appellant claimed that despite order of the Commission, the PIO neither provided the information, nor cooperated to inspect the record. The respondent was absent. The PIO was issued a **show cause notice under section 20 of the RTI Act and** directed to file reply on an affidavit. The PIO was also directed to bring the record regarding information relating to points 6 & 7 to the Commission on the next date of hearing.

The case was further heard on **17.07.2019**. The appellant was absent and vide email sought exemption. The respondent present from the office of Warehousing Corporation pleaded that the matter does not relate to them and he has been ordered to attend the hearing only.

The PIO was absent nor had sent any reply to the **show cause notice**. The Commission observed that the appellant has sought information from the revenue department whereas the PIO instead of complying with the order of the Commission had preferred to send an official from the office of Warehousing Corporation who knew nothing about the case. The PIO was however, granted one last opportunity to comply with the earlier order of the Commission and appear personally before the Commission on the next date of hearing alongwith written reply to the show cause on an affidavit, otherwise the Commission will be constrained to take action as per provision of the RTI Act.

The case was again heard on **29.10.2019**. The respondent present pleaded that the information has already been sent to the complainant. The PIO however, did not submit reply to the show cause notice issued on 21.05.2019. The complainant was absent.

The case was last heard on **23.12.2019**. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant was not satisfied and stated that the PIO has not provided copy of mortgage deed regarding point-6. The PIO was directed to provide the copy of mortgage deed and if not available to give in writing on an affidavit. Rest of the information had been provided.

The PIO however, did not submit reply to the show cause notice issued on 21.05.2019. The PIO was directed to submit reply to the show cause notice on an affidavit.

Hearing dated 17.03.2020:

The respondent present pleaded that the information regarding point-6 (mortgage deed) is not available in the record. The PIO is directed to give this in writing on an affidavit. The Commission has received reply to the show cause notice from the PIO through email which is taken on the file of the Commission.

The complainant is absent and vide email has sought adjournment.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **13.05.2019 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Sri Mukatsar Sahib. Copy of order be sent to both the parties though **registered post**.

Chandigarh
Dated: 17.03.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden, Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in
Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Sh Tejinder Singh,
R/o village Bholapur, P.O Ramgarh,
Chandigarh Road, Ludhiana.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o SDM-Cum- Licensing & Registration Authority,
Abohar, Distt Fazilka.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o SDM-Cum- Licensing & Registration Authority,
Abohar, Distt Fazilka.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1707 of 2019

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on 18.09.2019. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 14.03.2019 and a copy of the same submitted to the Commission. The appellant was absent. Having gone through the RTI application and the information provided by the PIO, the PIO was directed for the following :

- Point-1 - Not to be provided
- Point-2 - To provide total number of vehicles re-assigned

Regarding point-3,4 & 5, the appellant was directed to send his observations to the PIO and the PIO was directed to give reply on the observations of the appellant. A copy of the reply was attached with the order for the appellant.

The case was last heard on **23.12.2019**. Both the parties were absent. The case was adjourned.

Hearing dated 17.03.2020:

Both the parties are absent. In the earlier hearing, the appellant was directed to send his observations on the reply of the PIO. The appellant is absent on 3rd consecutive hearing. It is presumed that the appellant is not interested to pursue its case.

The case is **closed for non-persuasion**.

Chandigarh
Dated 17.03.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh Mohan Lal, S/o Sh Raj Kumar,
175, Military Hospital, Cantt Abohar,
Distt Fazilka.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o EO, Nagar Council,
Abohar, Distt Fazilka.

First Appellate Authority,
Deputy Director,
Local Govt, Ferozepur.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1970 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Mohan Lal as the Appellant
Sh.Lachman Dass for the Respondent

ORDER: The case was first heard on 21.10.2019. Both the parties were absent. The case was adjourned.

The case was last heard on **23.12.2019**. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant was not satisfied and stated the PIO has only sent a reply vide letter dated 17.10.2019 stating that the NC Abohar has not awarded any contract for parking.

The Commission observed that the PIO's reply was absolutely ambiguous and PIO was trying to use delaying tactics. The PIO was directed to relook at the RTI application and provide point-wise information to the appellant. The information to be provided within 15 days of the receipt of the order.

Hearing dated 17.03.2020:

The appellant claims that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent informed that the concerned PIO has been transferred and he has been deputed to attend the hearing.

The Commission observed that the PIO has not attended to the RTI application appropriately and even not complied with the order of the Commission. The Commission has taken a serious view of this and hereby directs the PIO(PIO concerned when the RTI application was filed) to **show cause why penalty be not imposed on him under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 for not supplying the information within the statutorily prescribed period of time**. He/she should file an affidavit in this regard. If there are other persons responsible for the delay in providing the information, the PIO is directed to inform such persons of the show cause and direct them to appear before the Commission along with the written replies.

I am also marking this application to the First Appellate Authority-Deputy Director, Local Govt. Ferozepur to ensure compliance of this order and information to be provided within 15 days.

To come up for further hearing on **06.05.2020 at 11.00 AM.**

Sd/-

Chandigarh
Dated 17.03.2020

(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



registered post

Sh. Subhash Chander, s/o Sh Dalip Kumar,
R/o village Panjkosi, Tehsil Abohar,
Distt Fazilka .

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Tehsildar, Abohar,
Distt Fazilka.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o SDM, Abohar,
Distt Fazilka

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3364 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Subhash Chander as the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 20.06.2019 has sought information regarding joining of Sh.Jaspal Singh Brar, Tehsildar Abohar alongwith educational certificates and other information concerning the office of Tehsildar Abohar. The appellant was not satisfied with the reply of the PIO dated 08.07.2019 whereby the PIO denied the information stating that the information is personal after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 13.07.2019 which disposed off the appeal on 02.09.2019 upholding the view of the PIO.

The case was last heard on 06.01.2020. The respondent was absent. The case was adjourned.

Hearing dated 17.03.2020:

The appellant claims that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent is absent and vide email has sought exemption on the plea that their all staff is on field duty as per order of the Deputy Commissioner Fazilka.

Having gone through the file, the Commission observes that there is nothing on record which establishes that there is a larger public interest involved in disclosure of the information. The appellant is directed to bring on record that there is a larger public interest in revealing this information.

To come up for further hearing on **13.05. 2020 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Fazilka. Copies of order be sent to both the parties through registered post.

Chandigarh
Dated 17.03.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner