Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: - <u>www.infocommpunjab.com</u>

Ms. Kadambini, # 4124, Abohar Road, SriMukatsarSahib.

Versus

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

First Appellate Authority, DC, SriMukatsarSahib.

..... Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1919 of 2019

PRESENT: None for the Appellant

Sh.Gurbinder Singh Sarao, ADC(D)) for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 03.01.2019 has sought information regarding details of income and expenditure of GaushalaRattaTibba comprising cash book/ledger/vouchers, employees and other information concerning the office of DC Mukatsar. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed a first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 14.03.2019, which took no decision on the appeal.

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.

On the next date of hearing 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 remaininginformationon30.12.2019at11.00AMintheofficeofDCSriMukatsarSahibandget 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 concernedPIO.



...Appellant

On the date of hearing on **17.03.2020**, the appellant informed that she had 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 DCoffice.

Appeal Case No. 1919 of 2019

Hearing both the parties, the Commission observed that there is delay in providing the information regarding points 3, 6 & 7 and these points have not been adequately replied. The PIO-SDM Malout was issued a **show cause notice under Section 20 of the RTI Act and directed to file reply on an affidavit.** The PIO was again directed to provide the complete information within 10 days of the receipt of this order.

The application was also marked to the First Appellate Authority, Deputy Commissioner, SriMukatsar Sahib for taking a cognizance on this application and to ensure compliance of order of theCommission.

On the date of hearing on **03.08.2020, which was** held through video conferencing at DAC Sri Mukatsar Sahib, the respondent present pleaded that the available information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant had received the information. The appellant however, claimd that the information has been provided with a delay of more than one and half year and requested for penalizing the PIO and awarding compensation to the appellant.

Information had been provided. The reply to show cause was not filed. The PIO-SDM Malout was given one last opportunity to submit reply to the show cause notice.

On the date of last hearing on **08.09.2020**, which was held through video conferencing at DAC, Sri Mukatsar Sahib, the Commission received reply to the show cause notice from the PIO-SDM Malout on 07.09.2020 which was taken on the file of theCommission.

Having gone through the reply of the PIO, the plea was accepted and the show cause was dropped. However, The Commission observed that the appellant to collect the information had to suffer undue inconvenience, it was found a fit case for awarding compensation to the appellant u/s 19(8)(b) of the RTI Act. The PIO was directed to pay an amount of **Rs.2500/-** via demand draft drawn through Govt. Treasury as compensation to the appellant and submit proof of having compensated the appellant.

Hearing dated 18.11.2020:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC, Sri Mukatsar Sahib. The respondent present pleaded that in compliance of the order of the Commission, the compensation amount of Rs.2500/- has been paid to the appellant via demand draft No.000801 vide letter dated 15.10.2020 and the appellant has acknowledged having received the demanddraft.

The appellant is absent. The appellant telephonically has informed that she has received the demanddraft.

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

Sd/-

Chandigarh Dated18.11.2020 (KhushwantSingh) State InformationCommissioner

CC to PIO-SDM Malout



Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: - <u>www.infocommpunjab.com</u>

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

...Complainant

..... Respondent

Versus

Public Information Officer, O/o Tehsildar, Gidderbaha,

Distt. Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

First Appellate Authority,

O/o SDM, Gidderbaha, SriMukatsarSahib.

Complaint Case No. 1099 of 2018

<u>Se NO. 1055 01 2010</u>

Present: Sh.PrinceGoyal, Advocate for the Appellant

Sh.Jatinder Pal Singh ,NaibTehsildarGidderbaha for the Respondent

ORDER: This order should be read in continuation to the earlierorder.

The complainant through RTI application dated 14.09.2017 has sought information on 9 points regarding rules under which the Revenue Officer-cum-Tehsildar can mortgage property on a simple application, orders for entry of rapat No.624, consent of mortgagor and other information concerning the office of TehsildarGidderbaha, District Sri Mukatsar Sahib. The complainant was not satisfied with the information provided by the PIO vide letter dated 25.10.2017 after which he filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 30.10.2017 which marked the appeal to the PIO and the PIO disposed off the appeal on 06.11.2017.

The case has earlier been heard on 09.01.2019, 26.02.2019,02.04.2019, 21.05.2019, 17.07.2019, 29.10.2019, 23.12.2019, 17.03.2020, 03.08.2020 & 08.09.2020.

On the date of hearing 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 a 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.

On the date of hearing on **17.07.2019.**The appellant was absent. The respondent present from the office of Warehousing Corporation appeared and 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 PIO was granted one last opportunity to comply with the earlier order of the Commission and appear personally before the Commission onthenextdateofhearingalongwithawrittenreplytotheshowcauseonanaffidavit.

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

On the date of hearing on **23.12.2019**, the respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant 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. 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.

Complaint Case No. 1099 of 2018

On the date of hearing on **17.03.2020**, the respondent present pleaded that the information regarding point-6 (mortgage deed) is not available in the record. The PIO was 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 was taken on the file of the Commission. The complainant was absent and vide email had sought adjournment.

On the date of last hearing on **03.08.2020**, the respondent present pleaded that in compliance with the order of the Commission, an affidavit regarding information relating to point-6 has been given to the complainant. The complainant however, pleaded that even though the information had been provided by the PIO, it was with a delay of more than two and half years. Henceforth, the PIO may be penalized and he(appellant) may be compensated for undue harassment in getting theinformation.

The information had been provided. However, the Commission agreed with the appellant that he had to suffer undue inconvenience to get the information, making it a fit case for awarding compensation to the appellant u/s 19(8)(b) of the RTIAct.

The PIO was directed to pay an amount of **Rs.5000/-** via demand draft drawn through as compensation to the appellant and submit proof of having compensated the appellant. The decision on the show cause notice issued to the PIO to be taken on the next date of hearing.

On the date of last hearing on **08.09.2020**, both the parties were absent. The Commission has received an email from the PIO stating that since due to some officials of SDM office having been found corona positive, the SDM has ordered all the staff of SDM office and Tehsil office to remain home quarantined from 05.09.020 to 08.09.2020, he was unable to attend the hearing. The case wasadjourned.

Hearing dated 18.11.2020:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC, Sri Mukatsar Sahib. Sh. Jatinder Pal Singh, NaibTehsildarGidderbaha is present and informed that as per order of the Commission, a demand draft of Rs.5000/- has been prepared and is being sent to the appellant through registered post. The respondent has sent a copy of demand draft No.488052 dated 17.11.2020 to the Commission viawhatsapp.

Information stands provided. Having gone through the reply to the show cause notice received in the Commission on 17.03.2020, I accept the plea of the PIO and drop the show cause.

The respondent is directed to send the draft of Rs.5000/- to the appellant through registered post and the appellant is directed to acknowledge the same with a copy to the Commission.

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

Sd/-

Chandigarh Dated: 18.11.2020 (Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner

Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: - <u>www.infocommpunjab.com</u>



Sh Jang Bahadur, S/o Sh Jai Chand, R/o MandiAminganj, Roranwali, Tehsil &Distt.Fazilka..

...Appellant

Public Information Officer,

O/o Deputy Chief Engineer, DS Circle, PSPCL, Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

First Appellate Authority,

O/o Chief Engineer, DS West, PSPCL, Bathinda.

...Respondent

Appeal Case .No. 75 of 2020 PRESENT: None for theAppellant Sh.Parampal Singh, Xen-PSPCL Sri Mukatsar Sahib for the respondent

Vs

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 04.07.2020 has sought information regarding action taken on the application dated 06.05.2019 filed for status of the action taken on online complaints regarding non-supply of electricity for 8 to 20 hours and other information concerning the office of Deputy Chief Engineer, DS Circle, PSPCL Sri Mukatsar Sahib. The appellant was provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 09.08.2019 which disposed off the appeal on 21.10.2019.

On the date of first hearing on 19.08.2020, the respondent present pleaded that the information has been supplied to the appellant. The appellant vide email informed that the information that has been provided is a created information and the PIO has not provided the action taken on his complaint.

The respondent informed that the complaint received online is passed out to the concerned complaint center and the reply is being sent by the complaint center which is an outside agency. However, there is no documentation.

The PIO was directed to procure from the concerned outsource agency, any document whether it is in computer form or hard copy and provide to the appellant.

Hearing dated 18.11.2020:

The respondent present pleaded that in compliance of the order of the Commission, the information has been supplied to the appellant by hand on 13.1.2020 with a copy to the Commission.

The appellant is absent on 2nd consecutive hearing nor has communicated any discrepancy. It is presumed that the appellant has received the information and is satisfied.

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

Chandigarh Dated18.11.2020 (KhushwantSingh) State InformationCommissioner

Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: - <u>www.infocommpunjab.com</u>



Sh.Sukhman Singh, S/o Sh.Surjit Singh, R/o VillageKattianWali,TehsilMaolut, Distt. SriMukatsarSahib.

...Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,

O/o SDM, SriMukatsarSahib......Respondent

Complaint Case No. 464 of 2019

PRESENT: None for theComplainant

Sh.Rajinder Singh, Superintendant for the Respondent

ORDER:

The complainant through RTI application dated 24.08.2018 has sought information regarding status of the application dated 10.05.2017 submitted to DTO Sri Mukatsar for issue of RC regarding Bullet Motorcycle and other information concerning the office of SDM Sri Mukatsar Sahib. The complainant was not provided the information after which he filed complainant in the Commission on16.05.2019.

The case was first heard on 10.09.2019. Both the parties were absent. There had been an enormous delay of one year in attending to the RTI application. The PIO was issued a **show cause notice under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 for not supplying the information within the statutorily prescribed period of time. The PIO** was directed to file reply on an affidavit. The PIO was again directed to send complete information to the appellant within 10 days.

The case was again heard on **04.12.2019.** Both the parties were absent. The PIO had also not sent reply to the show cause notice. The PIO was given one more opportunity and directed to file a reply to the show cause notice on an affidavit and be present on the next date of hearing otherwise the Commission will be constrained to take action under section 20 of the RTI Act.

On the date of next hearing on **02.03.2020**, both the parties were absent. The PIO had also not sent reply to the show cause notice. The PIO was given one last opportunity to file a reply to the show cause on an affidavit and be present on the next date of hearing, otherwise, it will be presumed that the PIO has nothing to say on the matter and the Commission will act as per provisions of section 20 of the RTIAct.

On the date of last hearing on **19.08.2020**, both the parties were absent. As per information by DC office, due to strike, no staff of SDM office had appeared. The case was adjourned.

Hearing dated 18.11.2020:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Sri Mukatsar Sahib. The respondent present pleaded that the information has already been supplied to the complainant vide letter dated 06.11.2018 and the complainant has also withdrawn his complainant vide email on 02.07.2020. The respondent has sent copy of email to theCommission.

The complainant has been absent on all consecutive hearings nor has communicated any discrepancy. It is presumed that the complainant has received the information and is satisfied.

The Commission has also received a reply to the show cause notice from the PIO which is taken on the file of the Commission.

Having gone through the reply, I accept the plea of the PIO and drop the show cause.

Since the information has been provided and the reply of the PIO on the above matter is satisfactory, no further course of action is required. The case is **disposed off and closed**.

Chandigarh Dated18.11.2020 Sd/-(KhushwantSingh) State InformationCommissioner

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. Sandeep Kumar, S/o Sh Om Parkash, R/o Street No-2, Near ShaniDevMandir, Patel Nagar, Malout, Distt. SrimukatsarSahib.

...Appellant

..... Respondent

Versus

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

First Appellate Authority, O/o DC, SriMukatsarSahib.

Appeal Case No. 2391 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Sandeep Kumar as the Appellant

Sh.Joginder Singh, Suptd.-cum-APIO – Sri Mukatsar Sahib for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 06.02.2019 has sought information regarding social welfare associations registered in District Mukatsar Sahib from 01.01.2014 to 31.01.2019 and other information concerning the office of DC,Sri Mukarsar Sahib. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 14.03.2019 which took no decision on theappeal.

The case was first heard on 11.12.2019. The respondent present from the office of DIC Sri Mukatsar Sahib pleaded that the RTI application was received by them from the office of DC on 11.02.2019 and the information regarding point-1 had been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 05.04.2019. The information relating to points 2,3& 4 did not relate to them. The PIO-DIC was exempted. The PIO-DC, Sri Mukatsar Sahib was directed to transfer the RTI application to the concerned PIO and ensure that the information is provided as per the RTI application.

The case was again heard on **03.03.2020.** Both the parties were absent. The case wasadjourned.

On the date of hearing on **03.08.2020**, the respondent present from the office of District Welfare Office, Sri Mukatsar Sahib pleaded that the information does not relate to their office.

Having gone through the record, the Commission observed that since the RTI application is moving from one desk to another and the information is not being provided to the appellant, the RTI application was sent back to the Deputy Commissioner, Sri Mukatsar Sahib with the direction to send it to the department under whose custody the information lies and the concerned department was directed to provide the information to the appellant as per the RTI Act.

On the date of hearing on **08.09.2020**, the respondent present pleaded that the available information has been provided to the appellant and a copy of the same submitted to the Commission. The Commission had received a copy of the information on 07.09.2020 which was taken on the file of the Commission. The appellant was not satisfied.

Appeal Case No. 2391 of 2019

Having gone through the RTI application and the information provided, the Commission observed that the RTI application has been suitably replied and the information has been provided to the best possible extent. However, the PIO was directed to respond to the RTI application on an affidavit that the available information has been provided and no further information is available in their record.

Hearing dated 18.11.2020:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC, Sri Mukatsar Sahib. The respondent present pleaded that as per order of the Commission, affidavits have been sent to the Commission. The appellant has not received the affidavits.

The Commission has received affidavits from the PIO which are being sent to the appellant in original. A copy of affidavits isretained.

With the above, information stands provided.

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

Chandigarh Dated18.11.2020 Sd/-(KhushwantSingh) State InformationCommissioner



Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: -<u>www.infocommpunjab.com</u>

Sh.YogeshMahajan, S/o Sh.Kuldeep Raj Mahajan, Opposite Water Tank, Municipal Market, MissionRoad,Pathankot.

...Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,

O/o XEN, Water Supply & Sanitation, Division, Malout, Distt. Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

nt

Appeal Case No. 1274 of 2020

PRESENT: None for the Appellant

None for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 06.01.2020 has sought information regarding works undertaken/carried out during the period 06.01.2019 to 06.01.2020 in Sub Division Killanwali, Sub-Division Lambi, Sub Division Malout, Sub Division Gidderbaha – work order book in all divisions – comparative statements of other works for which no tender were called and other information concerning the office of Xen Water Supply & Sanitation Division, Malout. The appellant was not satisfied with the information provided by the PIO vide letter dated 18.02.2020 & 19.02.2020 after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority 28.02.2020 which took no decision on theappeal.

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Sri Mukatsar Sahib. The appellant is absent and vide email has informed that the PIO has not provided the information.

The respondent is absent. The respondent is directed to provide the sought information within fifteen days.

With the above directions the case is disposed off.

Sd/-

(KhushwantSingh) State InformationCommissioner

Chandigarh Dated18.11.2020



Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: -<u>www.infocommpunjab.com</u>

Sh.MadanLal, S/o Sh Om Parkash, Jain Niwas, MCB Zone-2, H No-10803, Street No-18, Parinda Road, Guru TegBahadur Nagar, Bathinda.

Versus

...Appellant

Public Information Officer, O/o Nagar Council, Jaito, DisttFaridkot.

First Appellate Authority, O/o Deputy Director, Local Bodies,FerozepurCantt

Respondent

Appeal case No.2176 of 2020

PRESENT: None for theAppellant

Sh.Gurdas Singh, PIO-NC Jaito for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 07.03.2020 has sought information regarding all receipts registers from 01.10.2017 to 01.03.2018, copy of page 22 of RTI Register, July, 2018 –page 10 of May, 2018- Page 39 of August 2018, page 40 of August 2018 and other information concerning the office of Nagar Council, Jaito. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority 07.04.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC, Faridkot. The respondent present pleaded that the appellant was asked vide letter dated 09.03.2020 to deposit requisite fee of Rs.220/- but the appellant has not deposited the same.

The appellant is absent and vide letter received in the Commission on 13.11.2020 has sought exemption.

If the appellant still wants information ,he is directed to deposit the requisite fee a raised by the PIO and get the relevant information.

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

Sd/-

(KhushwantSingh) State InformationCommissioner

Chandigarh Dated18.11.2020