

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com
E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh Sohan Singh, S/o Sh Sucha Singh,
Village Bara, P.O Pathreri, Jattan,
Tehsil & Distt Roopnagar.

... Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
PSPCL,
Patiala.

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 858 of 2018

Present: **Sh.Sohan Singh as Complainant**
 Sh.Bawa Singh, AEE-cum-PIO, Sub Division, PSPCL Sukhrampur for the
 Respondent

Order: The case was last heard on **13.11.2018**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The complainant through RTI application dated 23.04.2018 has sought information regarding name of the officer responsible for delay of 4 years in conducting the enquiry and in issuing charge sheet to the complainant and other information concerning the office of PSPCL Patiala. The complainant was not provided the information after which he filed complaint to the Commission on 07.08.2018.

The respondent present has informed that the information which has been sought by the appellant is available on the website of the department and the complainant can download the information from the website of the department. The respondent further informed that the complainant has already been informed of the same. The complainant is absent to plead his case and point out the discrepancy if any.

I have seen the file and observed that the PIO has not responded to the RTI application within the time prescribed under the RTI Act. The PIO is hereby directed to explain the reasons for delay in attending to the RTI application. The reply should be submitted on an affidavit.”

Hearing dated 19.12.2018:

The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the complainant on 18.06.2018. The complainant has received the information.

Regarding delay in attending to the RTI application, the respondent has submitted an affidavit stating therein that the complainant filed RTI application with PSPCL Patiala which was received by them only on 05.06.2018 through Deputy Chief Engineer, PSPCL Roopnagar and the information was sent to the complainant vide letter dated 18.06.2018. The plea is accepted.

Since the information has been provided, no further course of action is required.

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

Chandigarh
Dated: 19.12.2018

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com
E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh. Tejinder Singh,
R/o Village Bholapura,
PO Ramgarh, Chandigarh Road,
Ludhiana.

... Appellant

Vs

Public Information Officer,
SDM, Licensing Authority & Registering,
Samrala, District Ludhiana.

First Appellate Authority,
DC. Ludhiana.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1264 of 2018

Present Sh. Tejinder Singh as Appellant
 Mrs. Sarabjit Kaur, Superintendent O/o SDM Samrala and Sh. Davinder Kumar,
 PIO, STC, Punjab, Chandigarh for the Respondent

ORDER: The case was first heard on **18.06.2018**. The Commission observed that the PIO in her reply mentioned that point no.2 & 5 did not relate to their department but has not forwarded the RTI application to the concerned department. PIO was directed to forward the same to the concerned department immediately. The PIO of that department was also directed to provide the information to the appellant and be present on the next date of hearing alongwith proof of sending the information.

The case was again heard on **25.07.2018**. The respondent was absent. The appellant informed that he has received the information relating to points No.1,7& 8 vide letter dated 25.6.2018. He further informed that the PIO in his letter has mentioned that the remaining information relates to the department of STA Ludhiana and STC, Punjab Chandigarh but has not forwarded the RTI application to the concerned departments.

The PIO was directed to provide the complete information relating to them and forward the RTI application to the concerned department for remaining information. He was also directed to be present on the next date of hearing with solid reasons for not complying with the orders of the Commission. The PIO of STA Ludhiana and PIO of STC Punjab, Chandigarh were also directed to provide the information to the appellant and be present on the next date of hearing.

The case again came up for hearing on **24.09.2018**. The respondent present from the office of SDM (Licensing & Registering Authority) Samrala pleaded that as per the orders of the Commission, the RTI application was transferred to the concerned departments on 13.08.2018 but no information has been provided by the concerned departments till now.

The PIO-SDM Samrala did not submit explanation for delay in transferring the RTI application and the PIO-SDM Samrala was given last opportunity to explain the reasons for delay in transferring the RTI application to the concerned departments. The PIO, STA Ludhiana and the PIO-STC Punjab Chandigarh were also directed to provide the information to the appellant and be present personally on the next date of hearing with reasons for delay in providing the information.

The case was last heard on **05.11.2018**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The respondent from the office of SDM (Licensing Authority & Registering), Samrala is present who pleaded that the RTI application has already been transferred to the concerned departments. Sh. Ravinder Singh Clerk, from the office of STA Ludhiana is also present who informed that the information for which the application was forwarded to them by the PIO-cum-SDM Samrala vide letter dated 20.08.2018 does not pertain to them and they have already written a letter to the PIO-SDM Samrala that the same be collected from the office of State Transport Commissioner, Punjab, Chandigarh. It seems that the application is being transferred from one desk to the other and is not being attended.

The PIO-SDM Samrala was asked to explain the reasons for delay in transferring the RTI application within the time prescribed under the RTI Act. The explanation from the Superintendent and the clerk that the RTI application was transferred to the concerned department vide letter dated 13.08.2018 is not appropriate to justify the enormous delay of 8 months in transferring the RTI application. The PIO is directed to collect all the information from the concerned departments and send it to the appellant. The PIO is also directed to be present personally on the next date of hearing and explain the reasons for such enormous delay of 8 months in transferring the RTI application. “

Hearing dated 19.12.2018:

The respondent PIO-SDM Barnala has pleaded that in compliance with the orders of the Commission, the information regarding points 2,3,4 &5 concerning the office of STC Punjab Chandigarh has been provided to the appellant by collecting the same from them. Regarding information relating to point 9, the SRTA Ludhiana has asked for the deposit of a fee of Rs.16318/- for total 8154 driving tests conducted from 01.08.2017 to 22.11.2017. Regarding delay in transferring the RTI application, the PIO has pleaded that the delay has occurred on the part of the concerned clerk since it was not clear to him, from which department the information has to be supplied but it was not intentional. The plea of the PIO-SDM Samrala is taken on the record.

It is observed that during the last hearing, the representative present from the office of SRTA Ludhiana had denied having the information and because of the dilly dallying of all the public authorities involved in this particular case, the PIO-SDM Samrala was made deemed PIO. The PIO-SDM Samrala was asked to collect the information from the concerned departments and send it to the appellant.

However, now the SRTA Ludhiana vide his report dated 15.11.2018 has asked for the deposit of requisite fee, even though it had denied having the information in its earlier statement. This is clearly an indication that the SRTA has misled the Commission about the information in its possession, which tantamount to serious obstruction in the efficient working of the spirit of the RTI Act. I direct that an enquiry be conducted into the matter and the official responsible for giving misleading statement be identified. I also direct the SRTA Ludhiana to provide the information to the appellant free of cost since there has been an enormous delay in providing the information. The information be provided via CD, since similar information has already been provided via CDs by SDM Fatehgarh Sahib, SDM Malerkotla & SDM Anandpur Sahib. The information to be provided within 10 days and send compliance report to the Commission.

To come up on **12.02.2019 at 11.00 AM** for further hearing.

Chandigarh
Dated: 19.12.2018

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

CC to : Regional Transport Authority,
Ludhiana.

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com
E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh.Ravinder Dhingra,
R/o H.No.733, First Floor,
Sector 43-A, Chandigarh.

... Appellant

Public Information Officer,
O/o City Police Station,
Main Bazar Kharar.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Punjab Police Head Quarter,
Sector 9, Chandigarh.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1273 of 2018

Present: Sh.Ravinder Dhingra as Appellant
Sh.Pardeep Kumar, HC, Chowki, Sunny Enclave, Kharar on behalf of the
Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on **19.06.2018**. The respondent was absent. The PIO was directed to provide the information to the appellant within a week and be present on the next date of hearing alongwith proof of having provided the information.

The case was again heard on **24.07.2018**. Sh.Avtar Singh, ASI Police Choki Sunny Enclave was present. The PIO was directed to submit copy of complaint to the Commission alongwith objection of Smt.ChandaniKukreja in the complaint. Sh.Rajesh Traffic Incharge Mohali was also directed to be present personally on the next date of hearing.

The case was again heard on **21.08.2018**. Sh.RajeshHastir, Inspector Police Station Mullanpur was present. The respondent brought the information. The appellant was not satisfied. The appellant pleaded that he has sought information relating to Police Station, Kharar and not Police Chowki, Sunny Enclave or Mullanpur. The respondent also pleaded that he will rectify and provide the information pertaining to Police Station Kharar within 10 days.

The PIO Police Station, Kharar was directed to review the RTI application and provide the information as per the RTI application within 10 days.

The case came up for hearing again on **18.09.2018**. The respondent brought the information regarding Police Station Kharar However, since the appellant was absent, the respondent was directed to send the information duly certified to the appellant within 5 days through registered post. The same was also being attached with the orders of the Commission.

The case was last heard on **05.11.2018**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“In the hearing on 24.07.2018, the PIO was directed to submit copy of complaint to the Commission alongwith the objection of Smt.Chandani Kukreja whereby she did not want the complaint to be handed over to Sh.Ravinder Dhingra. In the last hearing, the respondent had provided the objections but did not submit the complaint to the commission to take a view whether the copy of the complaint is to be provided to the appellant or not.

The PIO is directed to bring entire case file including the copy of complaint to the Commission for further consideration of the case.”

Hearing dated 19.12.2018:

The respondent has brought the entire case file. I have checked the original complaint available in the file of the PIO and found that the original complaint does not contain the name of the appellant. However, the appellant says that this complaint is fabricated one as the original one had his name mentioned. Since the Commission is not in a position to investigate this particular matter, whether it is fabricated or not, the appellant is advised to go the appropriate forum to get his assumptions clarified. However, the information has been provided to the best possible extent.

The appellant has pleaded that since he has been harassed a lot, the PIO be penalized for delay in providing the information. However, since this was a complicated personal matter and the PIO was complying the orders of the Commission from time to time, I find no malafide on the part of the PIO in providing the information, thus no case for penalty is made out.

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

Chandigarh
Dated:19.12.2018.

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com

[E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in)

ShTejinder Singh,
R/o Village Bholapura,
PO Ramgarh, Chandigarh Road,
Ludhiana.

... Appellant

Public Information Officer,
SDM (Licensing & Registering Authority),
Ajnala, Distt. Amritsar.

First Appellate Authority,
DC, Amritsar.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1326 of 2018

Present Sh. Tejinder Singh for the Appellant
 Sh.Pargat Singh, Clerk O/o SDM (Licensing & Registering Authority) Ajnala and
 Sh.Davinder Kumar, PIO-STC Punjab Chandigarh on behalf of the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on **18.06.2018**. It was observed that the PIO in his reply has mentioned that point no.2, 5 &9 relate to the department of State Transport Authority Amritsar but has not forwarded the RTI application to the concerned department. PIO was directed to forward the same to the concerned department immediately. The concerned PIO of that department was also directed to provide the information to the appellant and be present on the next date of hearing alongwith proof of sending the information.

The case was again heard on **25.07.2018**. The respondent was absent. The appellant informed that the point No.9 of the information received from the PIO STA Amritsar is not clear for which the PIO was asked to explain the reasons for giving two different information on point No.9. The appellant informed that the PIO has mentioned in his letter that the point No.5 relates to STC Punjab Chandigarh but has not forwarded the application to the concerned departments.

The PIO was directed to be present on the next date of hearing with solid reasons for not complying with the orders of the Commission. The PIO of STA Amritsar and PIO of STC Punjab, Chandigarh was also directed to provide the information to the appellant and be present on the next date of hearing.

The case came up for hearing again on **24.09.2018**. It was observed that there were discrepancies in the information provided. The Commission taken a serious view of this non-serious attitude of the PIO while dealing with the RTI application since the information regarding points 5 & 9 still remained elusive.

The PIO-STA Amritsar mentioned that the point No.5 relates to STC Punjab Chandigarh but had not forwarded the RTI application to them. The PIO STC Amritsar was directed to transfer the RTI application to the concerned department and be personally present on the next date of hearing. For the information regarding point No.9, the concerned PIO (PIO-SDM, Ajnala or the PIO-STA Amritsar) was directed to provide the information.

The PIO,SDM Ajnala given one more opportunity to be present personally with the reasons for not providing the information as per RTI application. The PIO, STC Punjab, Chandigarh was also directed to provide the information regarding point No.5 and be present personally on the next date of hearing.

Appeal Case No. 1326 of 2018

The case was last heard on **05.11.2018**. Sh.Pargat Singh, Clerk O/o SDM Ajnala was present. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The appellant is present who informed that he has received the information regarding point No.9 but the information regarding point No.5 is yet not received. The PIO SDM, Ajnala is directed to collect the information regarding point No.5 from the concerned department and sent it to the appellant within 15 days since they have not transferred the application to the concerned department.”

Hearing dated 19.12.2018:

The respondent present from the office of STC, Punjab Chandigarh informed that the information regarding point No.5 has been provided to the appellant and the appellant has received the same.

Since the information has been provided, no further course of action is required.

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

Chandigarh
Dated: 19.12.2018

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

CC to : State Transport Commissioner, Punjab,
Chandigarh.

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com

E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh.Sudesh Khosla,
C/o Khosla Agro Chowk,
Near Bye Pass Chowk,
Amritsar Road, Batala.

Appellant.

Versus

Public Information Officer,
Registrar of Firms and Societies,
Room No-12, 3rd Floor, 17 Bays Building,
Sec-17, Bear G.P.O, Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority,
Director of Industry & Commerce,
17, Bays Building, Sec-17, Chandigarh.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1348 of 2018

Present: None for the Appellant
Sh.Sarabjit Singh PIO-Registrar of Firms & Societies and Sh.Jaswant Rai
Superintendent for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on **02.07.2018**. The respondent was absent. The PIO was directed to provide the information to the appellant in accordance with RTI Act within 10 days and be present on the next date of hearing alongwith reasons for delay in providing the information.

The case was again heard on **01.08.2018**: Sh.Satnam Singh, Sr.Assistant O/o Registrar of Firms and Societies was present. The PIO was directed to provide the information duly attested within 5 days of the receipt of copy of the list from the appellant. The PIO was also directed to explain the valid reasons for not providing the information and why he should not be penalized under the RTI Act.2005.

The case came up for hearing again on **05.09.2018**. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided. The advocate on behalf of the appellant informed that the information has been received as per RTI application.

Since the information was delayed, the **PIO was directed 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** and for not complying with the orders of the Commission, he should file an affidavit in this regard.

The case again came up for hearing on **.18.09.2018**. The PIO was absent and did not sent any reply to the show cause notice. The PIO was granted one more opportunity and was directed to appear before the Commission on the next date of hearing alongwith the written reply on an affidavit regarding (i) delay in providing the information, (ii) for his absence and (iii) non-reply to the show cause notice.

The case last came up for hearing on **05.11.2018**. Sh.Satnam Singh, Sr.Assistant O/o Registrar of Firms & Societies was present. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“In the last hearing, the PIO was asked to appear personally and reply to the show cause notice issued to the PIO. The PIO has chosen not to appear before the Commission but has preferred to send an affidavit through an Assistant without any authority letter. The Commission has taken a serious view of this and does not accept his plea.

Appeal Case No. 1348 of 2018

The PIO is hereby afforded one last opportunity to appear personally before the Commission and plead his case for show cause issued to the PIO for non compliance of the orders of the Commission.”

Hearing dated 19.12.2018:

In the last hearing, the PIO was afforded one last opportunity to appear personally before the Commission and plead his case for show cause notice issued to the PIO on 05.09.2018.

The PIO is present and has submitted an affidavit stating therein that the deponent has been assigned the additional duties of the post of Joint Director(Plan-Coordination), Joint Director (Credit) and Nodal Officer of various important schemes of the department besides the present assignment of posting as Registrar of Firms and Societies, Punjab and the deponent remains busy in attending to the important meetings chaired by Higher Officers, so could not appear personally before the Commission.

The PIO further pleaded that since there is a shortage of staff in the office and the record is being maintained manually, the record could not be located in time which caused delay in providing the information. The PIO pleaded that the delay is not intentional and requested that the appeal of the appellant be disposed. The plea is accepted. However, the PIO is warned that he takes the RTI Act with seriousness that it deserves, and tends to the RTI applications with due diligence in future.

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

Chandigarh
Dated: 19.12.2018

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com

E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh. Mohinder Singh, S/o Sh.Bant Singh,
H No-1, Gulmohar Complex, Desu Majra,
Sector-125, Mohali

Appellant.

Versus

Public Information Officer,
Circle Education Officer,
Jalandhar.

First Appellate Authority,
Circle Education Officer,
Jalandhar.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1715 of 2018

Present: Sh.Mohinder Singh as Appellant
Sh.Satpal, Principal, Govt. Girls Sr.Secondary School, Jandiala for the
Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on **25.09.2018**. The appellant informed that no information has been provided to him. The respondent was absent. In the interest of justice, one more opportunity was granted and the PIO was directed to provide the information to the appellant within 10 days and be present on the next date of hearing.

The case was last hearing on **05.11.2018**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The respondent present has pleaded that he has been deputed to handle this RTI as deemed PIO. The respondent has informed that the office of Circle Education Officer Jalandhar has been closed and the related record has been transferred to the concerned Districts. The respondent further pleaded for a copy of the RTI application and has ensured to provide the information within 15 days. A copy of the RTI application has been provided by the appellant to the respondent.

The respondent is directed to collect the information from the concerned departments and send to the appellant within 15 days.”

Hearing dated 19.12.2018:

The respondent present has submitted an affidavit of the PIO whereby the PIO has stated that the information sought by the appellant regarding letter No.2/82-2011 dated 30.05.2011 relating to Ms.Sandeep Kaur D/o Sh.Nanak Singh was not received in the office of Circle Education Officer Jalandhar and D.E.O.(SE) Jalandhar. The PIO further stated in the affidavit that they have tried their best to trace out the information but the information being not traceable, they are unable to provide.

The appellant pleaded that the affidavit is not addressed to him. The Commission directs the PIO to send the same at the address of the appellant within a week

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

Chandigarh
Dated: 19.12.2018

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com

E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh. Rajesh Gupta,
H NO-5326-A,
Sector-38-W, Chandigarh.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
Chief Administrative, GMADA,
Sector-62, Mohali.

First Appellate Authority,
Chief Administrative, GMADA,
Sector-62, Mohali.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 2749 of 2018

Present: None for the Appellant
 Smt.Suman Bala, PIO O/o Chief Administrator, GAMADA for the Respondent

Order:

The case was last heard on **12.11.2018**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The appellant through RTI application dated 19.03.2018 has sought information regarding proposals alongwith supporting documents received by GAMADA from aspiring stakeholders for setting up of a World Class Technology University in IT City SAS Nagar and other information concerning the office of Chief Administrator, GAMADA Mohali.. The appellant was not provided the information after which he filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 14.05.2018 which took no decision on the appeal.

The respondent present has pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant on 06.11.2018 and a copy is submitted to the Commission. The appellant is absent to point out any discrepancy in the information. The appellant is afforded one more opportunity to be present personally or through his representative on the next date of hearing to point out the discrepancy, if any otherwise the case will be decided ex-parte.

During hearing, it has come to the notice of the Commission that the appellant had sought the same information in Appeal case No.1718 and that information has been again provided to the appellant in appeal case No.2749. Keeping this in view, the appellant is directed not to file RTI applications repeatedly for the similar information.

However, I have observed that the PIO has not attended the RTI application within the time prescribed under the RTI Act. The PIO is hereby directed to submit written reply on an affidavit for enormous delay in handling the RTI application.”

Hearing dated 19.12.2018:

The respondent present has submitted an affidavit whereby the PIO has stated that the information has already been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 06.11.2018. Regarding delay in providing the information, the PIO has stated in the affidavit that the delay occurred on the part of the then Superintendent-cum-APIO Sh.Gulab Singh(retd) and the explanation was called from him vide letter dated 21.11.2018 but since no reply was received, action has been recommended against Sh.Gulab Singh, APIO(Retd) under the prevailing rules. The plea of the respondent is taken on record.

In the last hearing, the appellant was afforded one more opportunity to point the discrepancies. The appellant is absent without intimation to the Commission. It is presumed that the appellant has received the information and is satisfied.

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

Chandigarh
Dated: 19.12.2018

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com

E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh. Rajesh Gupta,
H NO-5326-A,
Sector-38-W, Chandigarh.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
Chief Administrative, GMADA,
Sector-62, Mohali.

First Appellate Authority,
Chief Administrative, GMADA,
Sector-62, Mohali.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 2750 of 2018

Present: None for the Appellant
 Smt.Suman Bala, PIO O/o Chief Administrator, GAMADA for the Respondent

Order:

The case was last heard on **12.11.2018**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The appellant through RTI application dated 19.03.2018 has sought information regarding detail meaning of On a lease-cum-freehold sale basis at which 50 acre of land was allotted/being allotted for setting up of a World Class Technology Univesity in IT City SAS Nagar and other information concerning the office of Chief Administrator, GAMADA Mohali.. The appellant was not provided the information after which he filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 14.05.2018 which took no decision on the appeal.

The respondent present has pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant on 09.11.2018 and a copy is submitted to the Commission. The appellant is absent to point out any discrepancy in the information. The appellant is afforded one more opportunity to be present personally or through his representative on the next date of hearing to point out the discrepancy, if any otherwise the case will be decided ex-parte.

I have seen the file and observed that the PIO has not attended the RTI application within the time prescribed under the RTI Act. The PIO is hereby directed to submit written reply on an affidavit for enormous delay in handling the RTI application.”

Hearing dated 19.12.2018:

The respondent present has submitted an affidavit whereby the PIO has stated that the information has already been sent to the appellant. Regarding delay in providing the information, the PIO has stated in the affidavit that the delay occurred on the part of the

then Superintendent-cum-APIO Sh.Gulab Singh(retd) and the and an explanation was called from him vide letter dated 21.11.2018. However, since no reply was received, action has been recommended against Sh.Gulab Singh, APIO(Retd) under the prevailing rules. The plea of the respondent is taken on record.

In the last hearing, the appellant was afforded one more opportunity to point the discrepancies. The appellant is absent without intimation to the Commission. It is presumed that the appellant has received the information and is satisfied.

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

Chandigarh
Dated: 19.12.2018

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com

E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Ms Rajni Bhalla,
2344, Sector-38-C,
Chandigarh.

...Appellant.

Versus

Public Information Officer,
Chief Administrative,
GMADA, Mohali.

First Appellate Authority,
Chief Administrative,
GMADA, Mohali.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 2811 of 2018

Present: None for the appellant
Smt.Suman Bala, PIO- GAMADA, for the Respondent

Order: The case was last heard on **12.11.2018**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The appellant through RTI application dated 25.05.2018 has sought information regarding approval of 139 acre area in Sector 123, Sunny Enclave developed by M/s Bajwa Developers and action taken on his letter dated 06.02.2018 and other information concerning the office of Chief Administrator, GAMADA Mohali.. The appellant was not provided the information after which he filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 03.07.2018 which took no decision on the appeal.

The respondent present has pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant on 24.08.2018. The appellant is represented by Sh.T.P.Singh. After hearing both the parties, the Commission is of the view that the information has been provided as per RTI application and the appellant is satisfied.

However, I have observed that the PIO has not attended to the RTI application within the time prescribed under the RTI Act. The PIO is hereby directed to submit written reply on an affidavit for enormous delay in handling the RTI application.

Hearing dated 19.12.2018:

In the last hearing, the PIO was directed to submit reply for delay in providing the information. The respondent has submitted an affidavit stating therein that the information that was sought by the appellant on different points, was to be collected from the different departments which took time, and thus the information was delayed. The PIO pleaded that the information has already been provided to the appellant. The plea of the PIO is accepted.

Since the information has been provided, no further course of action is required.

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

Chandigarh
Dated: 19.12.2018

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com

E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh. Uggar Sen Kansal, S/o Sh Kapur Chand,
H No-2127, Sector-44-C,
Chandigarh.

Appellant.

Versus

Public Information Officer

Chief Engineer, Executive Engineer,
Distribution Division, PSPCL, Budlada,
Distt Mansa.

First Appellate Authority,

Chief Executive Engineer,
PSPCL, Distribution Division,
Budlada, Distt Mansa.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 2924 of 2018

Present: Smt.Promila Garg Representative of Sh.Ugar Sen Kansal for the Appellant
Sh.Parampal Singh, Addl. SE, PSPCL Mansa and Sh.Gurdas Chand AEE
Budhlada for the Respondent

Order:

The case was last heard on **13.11.2018**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The appellant through RTI application dated 24.04.2018 has sought information regarding action taken on the letter No.4164 dated 25.10.2016 sent by the office of Chief Accounts Officer, Pension Audit -2 PSPCL Patiala through advocate Bhagwant Singh in connection with legal notice dated 04.10.2016 and other information concerning the office of Chief Engineer, Executive Engineer, Distribution Division, PSPCL, Budlada, Distt Mansa. The appellant was not provided the information after which he filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 16.07.2018 which took no decision on the appeal.

The respondent present has brought the information and shown to the appellant. The appellant is not satisfied and pleaded that the information is not as per the RTI application as she has sought the action taken report on the letter dated 25.10.2016. The respondent has sought adjournment to again go through the RTI application.

The PIO is directed to relook at the RTI application and provide the information to the appellant as per RTI application.”

Hearing dated 19.12.2018:

The respondent present pleaded that the information available with them has been provided to the appellant and the remaining information i.e. action taken report as and when received, shall be sent to the appellant.

The PIO is directed to provide the remaining information to the appellant once the PIO has received the same.

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

Chandigarh
Dated: 19.12.2018

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner