

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,**  
**Sector 16, Chandigarh.**  
Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100  
Email: - [psic22@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in)  
Visit us: - [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)



**Sh. Gurtej Singh (9876214388)**  
s/o Sh. Chand Singh,  
R/o Mall Singh, Wala Thana Boha,  
Mansa

Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**  
O/o Tehsildar, Mansa

Respondent

**Complaint case No.: 157 of 2022**  
**Hearing through CISCO Webex**

**Present:** Complainant-absent  
Respondent: Sh. Jiwan Garg, Tehsildar(9815355202)

**ORDER**

1. The RTI application is dated 13.07.2020 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. Complaint was filed in the Commission on 25.3.2022 under Section 18 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act). Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for hearing through CISCO WEBEX on 20.9.2022 at 11.00 a.m. i.e. today.
2. In today's hearing complainant is absent in spite of prior intimation through registered post notice issued to him.
3. The respondent states that the sought for information was sent to the complainant on 10.5.2022 but he did not accept the information. He was called several times to collect the information from the respondent's office but he did not bother to collect. A reply in this regard has also been sent to the appellant as well as to the Commission dated 12.09.2022, which is received by the undersigned Bench via an email dated 13.09.2022 and taken on record.
4. It is also observed that no correspondence is received from the complainant after filing the complaint case in the Commission dated 25.03.2022, which means he does not want to pursue this case further as this is a sheer wastage of the precious time and resources of the Commission.
5. With the aforesaid observations, this instant complaint case is **disposed of & closed.** Announced in the Court. Copies of this order be sent to the parties.

**Dated: 20.09.2022**

**(Anumit Singh Sodhi)**  
**State Information Commissioner**  
**Punjab**

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,**  
**Sector 16, Chandigarh.**

Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100

Email: - [psic22@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in)

Visit us: - [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)



**(Regd. Post)** **Sh. Rajiv Kumar Sharda(9815372192)** Complainant  
S/o Sh. Desh Bandhu,  
Kothi No.A-1, Lal Nagar,  
Model Town, Jalandhar-144001.

Versus

**(Regd. Post)** **Public Information Officer**  
O/o Secy., Regional Transport Authority,  
Hoshiarpur

**Remanded Back:**

**(Regd. Post)** **First Appellate Authority**  
O/o Secy., Regional Transport Authority,  
Hoshiarpur

Encl. RTI application

Respondent

**Complaint Case No.: 378 of 2022**  
**Hearing through CISCO Webex**

**Present:** Complainant: Sh. Rajiv Kumar Sharda  
Respondent: Sh. Jatinder Singh

**ORDER**

1. The RTI application is dated 27.10.2021 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. Complaint was filed in the Commission on 9.6.2022 under Section 18 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act). Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for hearing through CISCO WEBEX on 20.9.2022 at 11.00 a.m. i.e. today.
2. In today's hearing both the parties are present.
3. The complainant states that he has received incomplete information.
4. The respondent states that the sought for information has already been provided to the complainant on 19.9.2022 but he is not satisfied.
5. After going through the file, it is observed that this is the complaint case. The attention of the Complainant is drawn to the decision of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India rendered on 12.12.2011 in Civil Appeal Nos. Nos.10787 – 10788 of 2011 (arising out of SLP © No.32768-32769/2010)- Chief Information Commissioner and another Vs. State of Manipur and another, in Para 31 whereof, it has been held that while entertaining a complaint case under Section 18 of the RTI Act , 2005, the Commissioners have no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for an access to the information which is as under:-

(31. We uphold the said contention and do not find any error in the impugned judgment of the High Court whereby it has been held that the Commissioner while entertaining a complaint under Section 18 of the said Act has no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for access to the information).

**Complaint Case No.: 378 of 2022**  
**Hearing through CISCO Webex**

As such, since the complainant has approached the Commission under the provision of Section 18 of the RTI Act, 2005, no directions for providing further information can be given by the Commission.

Since there is an alternative and efficacious remedy of first appeal available to the Complainant under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, which has not been availed in the instant case and the First Appellate Authority has not had the occasion to review the decision of the PIO, as envisaged under the RTI Act by passing a detailed well reasoned speaking order. In case the complainant has any grouse, he is advised to challenge the response of the PIO before the designated First Appellate Authority, as envisaged under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, who will decide the matter in accordance with the provisions of the RTI Act within the prescribed time limit, after giving an opportunity of hearing to all concerned, by passing a speaking order.

If, however, the complainant does not feel satisfied with the decision of the First Appellate Authority, he will be at liberty to file a Second Appeal before the Commission under Section 19(3) of the RTI Act, 2005.

6. In view of the observations noted above, the instant case is **disposed of**. Copies of this decision be sent to the parties **through registered post**.

**Dated: 20.09.2022**

**(Anumit Singh Sodhi)**  
**State Information Commissioner**  
**Punjab**

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,**  
**Sector 16, Chandigarh.**

Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100

Email: - [psic22@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in)

Visit us: - [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)



**(Regd. Post)** **Sh. Rajiv Kumar Sharda(9815372192)** Complainant  
S/o Sh. Desh Bandhu,  
Kothi No.A-1, Lal Nagar,  
Model Town, Jalandhar-144001.

Versus

**(Regd. Post)** **Public Information Officer**  
O/o Secy., Regional Transport Authority,  
Jalandhar

**Remanded Back:**

**(Regd. Post)** **First Appellate Authority**  
O/o Secy., Regional Transport Authority,  
Jalandhar

Encl. RTI application

Respondent

**Complaint Case No.: 379 of 2022**  
**Hearing through CISCO Webex**

**Present:** Complainant: Sh. Rajiv Kumar Sharda  
Respondent: Absent

**ORDER**

1. The RTI application is dated 27.10.2021 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. Complaint was filed in the Commission on 9.6.2022 under Section 18 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act). Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for hearing through CISCO WEBEX on 20.9.2022 at 11.00 a.m. i.e. today.
2. In today's hearing, complainant is present but nobody appears from the respondent side.
3. After going through the file, it is observed that this is the complaint case. The attention of the Complainant is drawn to the decision of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India rendered on 12.12.2011 in Civil Appeal Nos. Nos.10787 – 10788 of 2011 (arising out of SLP © No.32768-32769/2010)- Chief Information Commissioner and another Vs. State of Manipur and another, in Para 31 whereof, it has been held that while entertaining a complaint case under Section 18 of the RTI Act , 2005, the Commissioners have no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for an access to the information which is as under:-

(31. We uphold the said contention and do not find any error in the impugned judgment of the High Court whereby it has been held that the Commissioner while entertaining a complaint under Section 18 of the said Act has no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for access to the information).

As such, since the complainant has approached the Commission under the provision of Section 18 of the RTI Act, 2005, no directions for providing further information can be given by the Commission.

**Complaint Case No.: 379 of 2022**  
**Hearing through CISCO Webex**

Since there is an alternative and efficacious remedy of first appeal available to the Complainant under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, which has not been availed in the instant case and the First Appellate Authority has not had the occasion to review the decision of the PIO, as envisaged under the RTI Act by passing a detailed well reasoned speaking order. In case the complainant has any grouse, he is advised to challenge the response of the PIO before the designated First Appellate Authority, as envisaged under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, who will decide the matter in accordance with the provisions of the RTI Act within the prescribed time limit, after giving an opportunity of hearing to all concerned, by passing a speaking order.

If, however, the complainant does not feel satisfied with the decision of the First Appellate Authority, he will be at liberty to file a Second Appeal before the Commission under Section 19(3) of the RTI Act, 2005.

4. In view of the observations noted above, the instant case is **disposed of**. Copies of this decision be sent to the parties **through registered post**.

**Dated: 20.9.2022**

**(Anumit Singh Sodhi)**  
**State Information Commissioner**  
**Punjab**

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,**  
**Sector 16, Chandigarh.**

Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100

Email: - [psic22@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in)

Visit us: - [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)



(Regd. Post) **Sh. Rajiv Kumar Sharda(9815372192)** Complainant  
S/o Sh. Desh Bandhu,  
Kothi No.A-1, Lal Nagar,  
Model Town, Jalandhar-144001.

Versus

(Regd. Post) **Public Information Officer**  
O/o Secy., Regional Transport Authority,  
Ludhiana

**Remanded Back:**

(Regd. Post) **First Appellate Authority**  
O/o Secy., Regional Transport Authority,  
Ludhiana

Encl. RTI application

Respondent

**Complaint Case No.: 380 of 2022**  
**Hearing through CISCO Webex**

**Present:** Complainant: Sh. Rajiv Kumar Sharda  
Respondent: Sh. Amardeep

**ORDER**

1. The RTI application is dated 27.10.2021 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. Complaint was filed in the Commission on 9.6.2022 under Section 18 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act). Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for hearing through CISCO WEBEX on 20.9.2022 at 11.00 a.m. i.e. today.
2. In today's hearing, both the parties are present.
3. After going through the file, it is observed that this is the complaint case. The attention of the Complainant is drawn to the decision of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India rendered on 12.12.2011 in Civil Appeal Nos. Nos.10787 – 10788 of 2011 (arising out of SLP © No.32768-32769/2010)- Chief Information Commissioner and another Vs. State of Manipur and another, in Para 31 whereof, it has been held that while entertaining a complaint case under Section 18 of the RTI Act , 2005, the Commissioners have no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for an access to the information which is as under:-

(31. We uphold the said contention and do not find any error in the impugned judgment of the High Court whereby it has been held that the Commissioner while entertaining a complaint under Section 18 of the said Act has no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for access to the information).

As such, since the complainant has approached the Commission under the provision of Section 18 of the RTI Act, 2005, no directions for providing further information can be given by the Commission.

**Complaint Case No.: 380 of 2022**  
**Hearing through CISCO Webex**

Since there is an alternative and efficacious remedy of first appeal available to the Complainant under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, which has not been availed in the instant case and the First Appellate Authority has not had the occasion to review the decision of the PIO, as envisaged under the RTI Act by passing a detailed well reasoned speaking order. In case the complainant has any grouse, he is advised to challenge the response of the PIO before the designated First Appellate Authority, as envisaged under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, who will decide the matter in accordance with the provisions of the RTI Act within the prescribed time limit, after giving an opportunity of hearing to all concerned, by passing a speaking order.

If, however, the complainant does not feel satisfied with the decision of the First Appellate Authority, he will be at liberty to file a Second Appeal before the Commission under Section 19(3) of the RTI Act, 2005.

4. In view of the observations noted above, the instant case is **disposed of**. Copies of this decision be sent to the parties **through registered post**.

**Dated: 20.09.2022**

**(Anumit Singh Sodhi)**  
**State Information Commissioner**  
**Punjab**

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,  
Sector 16, Chandigarh.**

**Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100**

**Email: - [psic22@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in)**

**Visit us: - [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)**



**(Regd. Post)** **Sh. Rajiv Kumar Sharda(9815372192)** Complainant  
S/o Sh. Desh Bandhu,  
Kothi No.A-1, Lal Nagar,  
Model Town, Jalandhar-144001.

Versus

**(Regd. Post)** **Public Information Officer**  
O/o Secy., Regional Transport Authority,  
Mohali

**Remanded Back:**

**(Regd. Post)** **First Appellate Authority**  
O/o Secy., Regional Transport Authority,  
Mohali

Encl. RTI application

Respondent

**Complaint Case No.: 381 of 2022**  
**Hearing through CISCO Webex**

**Present:** Complainant: Sh. Rajiv Kumar Sharda  
Respondent: Sh. Dharminder Singh, Clerk

**ORDER**

1. The RTI application is dated 27.10.2021 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. Complaint was filed in the Commission on 9.6.2022 under Section 18 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act). Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for hearing through CISCO WEBEX on 20.9.2022 at 11.00 a.m. i.e. today.
2. In today's hearing, both the parties are present.
3. After going through the file, it is observed that this is the complaint case. The attention of the Complainant is drawn to the decision of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India rendered on 12.12.2011 in Civil Appeal Nos. Nos.10787 – 10788 of 2011 (arising out of SLP © No.32768-32769/2010)- Chief Information Commissioner and another Vs. State of Manipur and another, in Para 31 whereof, it has been held that while entertaining a complaint case under Section 18 of the RTI Act , 2005, the Commissioners have no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for an access to the information which is as under:-

(31. We uphold the said contention and do not find any error in the impugned judgment of the High Court whereby it has been held that the Commissioner while entertaining a complaint under Section 18 of the said Act has no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for access to the information).

As such, since the complainant has approached the Commission under the provision of Section 18 of the RTI Act, 2005, no directions for providing further information can be given by the Commission.



**Complaint Case No.: 381 of 2022**  
**Hearing through CISCO Webex**

Since there is an alternative and efficacious remedy of first appeal available to the Complainant under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, which has not been availed in the instant case and the First Appellate Authority has not had the occasion to review the decision of the PIO, as envisaged under the RTI Act by passing a detailed well reasoned speaking order. In case the complainant has any grouse, he is advised to challenge the response of the PIO before the designated First Appellate Authority, as envisaged under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, who will decide the matter in accordance with the provisions of the RTI Act within the prescribed time limit, after giving an opportunity of hearing to all concerned, by passing a speaking order.

If, however, the complainant does not feel satisfied with the decision of the First Appellate Authority, he will be at liberty to file a Second Appeal before the Commission under Section 19(3) of the RTI Act, 2005.

4. In view of the observations noted above, the instant case is **disposed of**. Copies of this decision be sent to the parties **through registered post**.

**Dated: 20.09.2022**

**(Anumit Singh Sodhi)**  
**State Information Commissioner**  
**Punjab**

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,  
Sector 16, Chandigarh.**

**Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100**

**Email: - [psic22@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in)**

**Visit us: - [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)**



**(Regd. Post)** **Sh. Rajiv Kumar Sharda(9815372192)** Complainant  
S/o Sh. Desh Bandhu,  
Kothi No.A-1, Lal Nagar,  
Model Town, Jalandhar-144001.

Versus

**(Regd. Post)** **Public Information Officer**  
O/o Secy., Regional Transport Authority,  
Patiala

**Remanded Back:**

**(Regd. Post)** **First Appellate Authority**  
O/o Secy., Regional Transport Authority,  
Patiala

Encl. RTI application

Respondent

**Complaint Case No.: 382 of 2022**  
**Hearing through CISCO Webex**

**Present:** Complainant: Sh. Rajiv Kumar Sharda  
Respondent: Sh. Harjit Singh, Clerk

**ORDER**

1. The RTI application is dated 27.10.2021 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. Complaint was filed in the Commission on 9.6.2022 under Section 18 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act). Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for hearing through CISCO WEBEX on 20.9.2022 at 11.00 a.m. i.e. today.
2. In today's hearing, both the parties are present. Respondent, Sh. Harjeet Singh states that information is not available in the demanded format and an inspection was done by the appellant on 16.09.2022.
3. After going through the file, it is observed that this is the complaint case. The attention of the Complainant is drawn to the decision of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India rendered on 12.12.2011 in Civil Appeal Nos. Nos.10787 – 10788 of 2011 (arising out of SLP © No.32768-32769/2010)- Chief Information Commissioner and another Vs. State of Manipur and another, in Para 31 whereof, it has been held that while entertaining a complaint case under Section 18 of the RTI Act , 2005, the Commissioners have no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for an access to the information which is as under:-

(31. We uphold the said contention and do not find any error in the impugned judgment of the High Court whereby it has been held that the Commissioner while entertaining a complaint under Section 18 of the said Act has no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for access to the information).

As such, since the complainant has approached the Commission under the provision of Section 18 of the RTI Act, 2005, no directions for providing further information can be given by the Commission.

**Complaint Case No.: 382 of 2022**  
**Hearing through CISCO Webex**

Since there is an alternative and efficacious remedy of first appeal available to the Complainant under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, which has not been availed in the instant case and the First Appellate Authority has not had the occasion to review the decision of the PIO, as envisaged under the RTI Act by passing a detailed well reasoned speaking order. In case the complainant has any grouse, he is advised to challenge the response of the PIO before the designated First Appellate Authority, as envisaged under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, who will decide the matter in accordance with the provisions of the RTI Act within the prescribed time limit, after giving an opportunity of hearing to all concerned, by passing a speaking order.

If, however, the complainant does not feel satisfied with the decision of the First Appellate Authority, he will be at liberty to file a Second Appeal before the Commission under Section 19(3) of the RTI Act, 2005.

4. In view of the observations noted above, the instant case is **disposed of**. Copies of this decision be sent to the parties **through registered post**.

**Dated: 20.09.2022**

**(Anumit Singh Sodhi)**  
**State Information Commissioner**  
**Punjab**

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,**  
**Sector 16, Chandigarh.**

Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100

Email: - [psic22@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in)

Visit us: - [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)



**(Regd. Post)** **Sh. Rajiv Kumar Sharda(9815372192)** Complainant  
S/o Sh. Desh Bandhu,  
Kothi No.A-1, Lal Nagar,  
Model Town, Jalandhar-144001.

Versus

**(Regd. Post)** **Public Information Officer**  
O/o Secy., Regional Transport Authority,  
Sangrur

**Remanded Back:**

**(Regd. Post)** **First Appellate Authority**  
O/o Secy., Regional Transport Authority,  
Sangrur

Encl. RTI application

Respondent

**Complaint Case No.: 383 of 2022**  
**Hearing through CISCO Webex**

**Present:** Complainant: Sh. Rajiv Kumar Sharda  
Respondent: Absent.

**ORDER**

1. The RTI application is dated 27.10.2021 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. Complaint was filed in the Commission on 9.6.2022 under Section 18 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act). Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for hearing through CISCO WEBEX on 20.9.2022 at 11.00 a.m. i.e. today.
2. In today's hearing the complainant is present but the respondent is absent.
3. The complainant states that he has not received information since sufficient time has passed.
4. After going through the file, it is observed that this is the complaint case. The attention of the Complainant is drawn to the decision of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India rendered on 12.12.2011 in Civil Appeal Nos. Nos.10787 – 10788 of 2011 (arising out of SLP © No.32768-32769/2010)- Chief Information Commissioner and another Vs. State of Manipur and another, in Para 31 whereof, it has been held that while entertaining a complaint case under Section 18 of the RTI Act , 2005, the Commissioners have no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for an access to the information which is as under:-

(31. We uphold the said contention and do not find any error in the impugned judgment of the High Court whereby it has been held that the Commissioner while entertaining a complaint under Section 18 of the said Act has no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for access to the information).

As such, since the complainant has approached the Commission under the provision of Section 18 of the RTI Act, 2005, no directions for providing further information can be given by the Commission.

**Complaint Case No.: 383 of 2022**  
**Hearing through CISCO Webex**

Since there is an alternative and efficacious remedy of first appeal available to the Complainant under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, which has not been availed in the instant case and the First Appellate Authority has not had the occasion to review the decision of the PIO, as envisaged under the RTI Act by passing a detailed well reasoned speaking order. In case the complainant has any grouse, he is advised to challenge the response of the PIO before the designated First Appellate Authority, as envisaged under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, who will decide the matter in accordance with the provisions of the RTI Act within the prescribed time limit, after giving an opportunity of hearing to all concerned, by passing a speaking order.

If, however, the complainant does not feel satisfied with the decision of the First Appellate Authority, he will be at liberty to file a Second Appeal before the Commission under Section 19(3) of the RTI Act, 2005.

5. In view of the observations noted above, the instant case is **disposed of**. Copies of this decision be sent to the parties **through registered post**.

**Dated: 20.09.2022**

**(Anumit Singh Sodhi)**  
**State Information Commissioner**  
**Punjab**

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,**  
**Sector 16, Chandigarh.**

Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100

Email: - [psic22@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in)

Visit us: - [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)



**(Regd. Post)** **Sh. Rajiv Kumar Sharda (9815372192)** Complainant  
S/o Sh. Desh Bandhu,  
Kothi No.A-1, Lal Nagar,  
Model Town, Jalandhar-144001.

Versus

**(Regd. Post)** **Public Information Officer**  
O/o Secy., Regional Transport Authority,  
Amritsar

**Remanded Back:**

**(Regd. Post)** **First Appellate Authority**  
O/o Secy., Regional Transport Authority,  
Amritsar

Encl. RTI application

Respondent

**Complaint Case No.: 384 of 2022**  
**Hearing through CISCO Webex**

**Present:** Complainant: Sh. Rajiv Kumar Sharda  
Respondent: Absent.

**ORDER**

1. The RTI application is dated 27.10.2021 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. Complaint was filed in the Commission on 9.6.2022 under Section 18 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act). Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for hearing through CISCO WEBEX on 20.9.2022 at 11.00 a.m. i.e. today.
2. In today's hearing,
3. After going through the file, it is observed that this is the complaint case. The attention of the Complainant is drawn to the decision of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India rendered on 12.12.2011 in Civil Appeal Nos. Nos.10787 – 10788 of 2011 (arising out of SLP © No.32768-32769/2010)- Chief Information Commissioner and another Vs. State of Manipur and another, in Para 31 whereof, it has been held that while entertaining a complaint case under Section 18 of the RTI Act , 2005, the Commissioners have no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for an access to the information which is as under:-

(31. We uphold the said contention and do not find any error in the impugned judgment of the High Court whereby it has been held that the Commissioner while entertaining a complaint under Section 18 of the said Act has no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for access to the information).

As such, since the complainant has approached the Commission under the provision of Section 18 of the RTI Act, 2005, no directions for providing further information can be given by the Commission.

**Complaint Case No.: 384 of 2022**  
**Hearing through CISCO Webex**

Since there is an alternative and efficacious remedy of first appeal available to the Complainant under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, which has not been availed in the instant case and the First Appellate Authority has not had the occasion to review the decision of the PIO, as envisaged under the RTI Act by passing a detailed well reasoned speaking order. In case the complainant has any grouse, he is advised to challenge the response of the PIO before the designated First Appellate Authority, as envisaged under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, who will decide the matter in accordance with the provisions of the RTI Act within the prescribed time limit, after giving an opportunity of hearing to all concerned, by passing a speaking order.

If, however, the complainant does not feel satisfied with the decision of the First Appellate Authority, he will be at liberty to file a Second Appeal before the Commission under Section 19(3) of the RTI Act, 2005.

4. In view of the observations noted above, the instant case is **disposed of**. Copies of this decision be sent to the parties **through registered post**.

**Dated: 20.09.2022**

**(Anumit Singh Sodhi)**  
**State Information Commissioner**  
**Punjab**

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,**  
**Sector 16, Chandigarh.**  
Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100  
Email: - [psic22@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in)  
Visit us: - [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)



**Sh. Sanjeev Goyal, (9814197689)**  
S/o Sh. Ashok Kumar(RTI Activist)  
Secretary Grahak Jago,  
# 148, Model Town, Phase-I  
Bathinda

Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**  
O/o M.C., Bathinda

**First Appellate Authority**  
O/o M.C., Bathinda

Respondent

**Appeal Case No.: 354 of 2022**  
**Through CISCO WEBEX**

**Present:** Appellant: Sh. Sanjiv Goyal  
Respondent: Sh. Ranbir Singh, SDO along with Sh. Amardeep Singh Gill (Secy.)

**ORDER**

1. The RTI application is dated 17.9.2021 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter FAA) on 18.10.2021 and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 10.1.2022 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act). Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for hearing through CISCO WEBEX on 4.8.2022 i.e. today.
2. In today's hearing both appellant and respondent are present.
3. Respondent, Sh. Amardeep Singh Gill states that information was sent to the appellant on 16.08.2022.
4. The appellant states that there are discrepancies in the supplied information; rules not supplied (Demanded in point no. 1) and information is not certified of point no. 2.
5. After discussing with both the parties and examining the case file, it is observed that no discrepancies letter is received by the undersigned Bench till yet. Appellant is advised to point out the deficiency, if any, in writing to the respondent PIO with a copy to the Commission within seven days after receipt of the information in near future so that time may not be wasted of the Commission, which also affects the routine work of the public authority..
6. As appellant is visiting the respondent's office tomorrow in another appeal case 353 of 2022, accordingly respondent PIO is advised to supply the information as per Para 4 of this order to the appellant.
7. With the aforesaid observations, this instant appeal case is **disposed of & closed.** Announced in the Court. Copies of this order be sent to the parties.

**Dated: 20.09.2022**

**(Anumit Singh Sodhi)**  
**State Information Commissioner**  
**Punjab**



**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,**  
**Sector 16, Chandigarh.**

Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100

Email: - [psic22@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in)

Visit us: - [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)



**Sh. Sanjeev Goyal(9814197689)**  
S/o Sh. Ashok Kumar(RTI Activist)  
Secretary Grahak Jago,  
# 148, Model Town, Phase-I  
Bathinda

Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**  
O/o M.C., Bathinda

**First Appellate Authority**  
O/o M.C., Bathinda

Respondent

**Appeal Case No.: 351 of 2022**  
**Through CISCO WEBEX**

**Present:** Appellant: Sh. Sanjeev Goyal  
Respondent: Sh. Satish Kumar (Chief Sanitary Inspector)

**ORDER**

1. This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 04.08.2022. The matter was adjourned to 20.9.2022.
2. In today's hearing both appellant and respondent are present.
3. The respondent states that the sought for information has already been provided to the appellant at 5.00 p.m. yesterday. He further states that nothing is left to be supplied.
4. After hearing both the parties and examining the case file, appellant is advised to go through the supplied information and point out discrepancies, if any, in writing to the respondent PIO with a copy to the Commission within seven days from today.
5. Respondent PIO is directed to remove discrepancies if any pointed out by the appellant in the supplied information within seven days, after receipt of the deficiency letter, under intimation to the Commission.
6. With the aforesaid directions, this instant appeal case is **disposed of & closed**. Announced in the Court. Copies of this order be sent to the parties.

**Dated: 20.09.2022**

**(Anumit Singh Sodhi)**  
**State Information Commissioner**  
**Punjab**

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,  
Sector 16, Chandigarh.**

**Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100**

**Email: - [psic22@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in)**

**Visit us: - [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)**



**(Regd. Post)** **Sh. Pawan Kumar (7696458517)** Complainant  
s/o Sh. Som Nath,  
Ward No.13, Bagh Colony,  
Rama, District Bathinda – 151301.  
**Encl:** Original Affidavit Versus

**Public Information Officer**  
O/o Nagar Council, Rama,  
Distt. Bathinda

**Regd. Post** **Sh. Sukhdev Singh (EO-cum-PIO)** Respondent  
O/o Nagar Council, Rama,  
Distt. Bathinda

**Complaint Case No.: 1317 of 2021**  
**Hearing through CISCO WEBEX**

**Present** (i) Complainant – Sh. Keshav on behalf of the complainant  
(ii) For the respondent: Sh. Shubham Gupta, Advocate at PSIC office

**ORDER**

1. Refer earlier order dated 23.8.2022 vide which respondent was directed to file a point-wise reply/affidavit that there was no EO during the stated time along with directions to supply the complete information as per RTI application. The case was adjourned to 20.9.2022.
2. In today's hearing both the parties are present.
3. Representative of the complainant, Sh. Keshav states that nothing has been supplied to his client till date.
4. Respondent, Sh. Shubham Gupta states that a reply to the show cause along with reply relates with RTI application had already been sent to the Commission via an email dated 16.09.2022, which is received and taken on record. After gone through the sent reply and affidavit, is found satisfactory and show cause is dropped.

It is observed that affidavit in original is also submitted by the respondent during the hearing, which was to be sent to the complainant. Accordingly, the original affidavit is being sent to the complainant along with this order through registered post. A copy of the same is taken for record.

Respondent, Sh. Shubham Gupta also states that complainant could visit the respondent's office if he wants to inspect the official record. An inspection for Tuesday i.e. 27.9.2022 with the directions to show the official record to the complainant and supply the information on its identification as per RTI application.

5. The attention of the Complainant is drawn to the decision of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India rendered on 12.12.2011 in Civil Appeal Nos. Nos.10787 – 10788 of 2011 (arising out of SLP © No.32768-32769/2010)- Chief Information Commissioner and another Vs. State of Manipur and another, in Para 31 whereof, it has been held that while entertaining a complaint case under Section 18 of the RTI Act, 2005, the Commissioners have no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for an access to the information which is as under:-

(31. We uphold the said contention and do not find any error in the impugned judgment of the High Court whereby it has been held that the Commissioner while entertaining a complaint under Section 18 of the said Act has no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for access to the information).

5. Despite of being a complaint case, respondent PIO replied suitably and complied with the orders of the Commission. Therefore, this instant complaint case is **disposed of & closed**. Announced in the Court. Copies of this order be sent to the parties.

**Dated: 20.09.2022**

**(Anumit Singh Sodhi)**  
**State Information Commissioner**  
**Punjab**