

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Madhya Marg, Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864100-101, Fax 0172 2864110

Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com, Email: pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in



Sh. Satish Chander
S/o Sh. Subhash Chander,
R/o H. No. 1555, Sector- 23 –B,
Chandigarh.

.....Appellant

Vs

Public Information Officer,
O/o Superintendent,
Punjab Public Service Commission,
Patiala.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Secretary,
Punjab Public Service Commission,
Patiala.

.....Respondents

Appeal Case No. 3605 of 2019

(Video Conference Proceedings)

ORDER

The information-seeker sought information vide his letter dated 30.07.2019 from the respondents, the sought for information is as under:-

- 1) ਮਿਸਲ ਦੀ ਨੋਟਿੰਗ/ਪੱਤਰ ਵਿਹਾਰ ਦੀ ਕਾਪੀ।
- 2) ਇੰਟਰਵਿਊ ਸ਼ਾਮਲ 9 ਉਮੀਦਵਾਰਾਂ ਦੇ ਏ.ਸੀ.ਆਰ. ਦੇ ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਦੀ ਮੁਕੰਮਲ ਕਾਪੀ।
- 3) 9 ਉਮੀਦਵਾਰਾਂ ਦੇ ਏ.ਸੀ.ਆਰ. ਦੇ ਨੰਬਰ ਕੈਲਕੂਲੇਟ ਕਰਨ ਸੰਬੰਧੀ ਕਮਿਸ਼ਨ ਵਲੋਂ ਨਿਰਧਾਰਤ ਪ੍ਰੋਸੀਜ਼ਰ ਅਤੇ ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਉਮੀਦਵਾਰਾਂ ਦੀ ਕੀਤੀ ਕੈਲਕੂਲੇਸ਼ਨ ਦੇ ਰਿਕਾਰਡ (ਜਿਸ ਤੋਂ ਇਹ ਪਤਾ ਚਲ ਸਕੇ ਕਿ ਇਹਨਾਂ ਉਮੀਦਵਾਰਾਂ ਦੀ ਏ.ਸੀ.ਆਰ. ਦੇ ਨੰਬਰ ਕਿਸ ਤਰ੍ਹਾਂ ਕਲਕੂਲੇਟ ਕੀਤੇ ਗਏ ਹਨ) ਦੀ ਮੁਕੰਮਲ ਕਾਪੀ।

2. The respondent-PIO gave reply to the information-seeker vide his letter dated 1.8.2019:-

- 1) ਮਿਸਲ ਦੀ ਨੋਟਿੰਗ ਕਮਿਸ਼ਨ ਦਾ ਇੰਟਰਨਨ ਮਾਮਲਾ ਹੈ। ਇਸ ਲਈ ਇਹ ਸੂਚਨਾ ਮੁਹੱਈਆਂ ਨਹੀਂ ਕਰਵਾਈ ਜਾ ਸਕਦੀ।

Contd.....p/2

-2-

- 2) 09 ਉਮੀਦਵਾਰਾਂ ਦੀਆਂ ਏ.ਸੀ.ਆਰ. ਦੀਆਂ ਕਾਪੀਆਂ ਥਰਡ ਪਾਰਟੀ ਹੋਣ ਕਾਰਨ ਮੁਹੱਈਆ ਨਹੀਂ ਕਰਵਾਈਆਂ ਜਾ ਸਕਦੀਆਂ।
- 3) ਜਿਥੋਂ ਤਕ ਉਮੀਦਵਾਰਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਏ.ਸੀ.ਆਰ. ਦੇ ਨੰਬਰ ਅਵਾਰਡ ਕਰਨ ਦਾ ਸੰਬੰਧ ਹੈ, ਇਹ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਸਰਕਾਰ ਦੀਆਂ ਹਦਾਇਤਾਂ ਮਿਤੀ 06.09.2001 (ਉਤਮ-4, ਬਹੁਤ ਅੱਛਾ-3, ਅੱਛਾ-2 ਅਤੇ ਔਸਤ-1) ਦੇ ਆਧਾਰ ਤੇ ਅਵਾਰਡ ਕੀਤੇ ਗਏ ਹਨ। ਜਿਥੇ ਕਿਸੇ ਉਮੀਦਵਾਰ ਦੀ ਇਕ ਸਾਲ ਦੀ ਰਿਪੋਰਟ ਵਿਚ ਦੋ ਵਖਰੀਆਂ-ਵਖਰੀਆਂ ਗਰੇਡਿੰਗਜ਼ ਹਨ, ਉਥੇ ਦੋਨਾਂ ਗਰੇਡਿੰਗਜ਼ ਦੀ ਨੰਬਰਾਂ ਅਤੇ ਏ.ਸੀ.ਆਰ. ਦੇ ਪੀਰੀਅਡ ਦੀ ਔਸਤ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਨੰਬਰ ਅਵਾਰਡ ਕੀਤੇ ਗਏ ਹਨ।

3. On receipt of the reply from the respondent-PIO, the information-seeker being unsatisfied, filed first appeal on 6.8.2010. In response to the first appeal, the respondents relied upon the above reply given by the respondent-PIO. Then the information-seeker filed 2nd appeal with the Commission on 01.10.2019. On receipt of the appeal from the information-seeker, the Commission issued hearing notice dated 9.10.2019 for supplying the information. In response to hearing notice, the respondent-PIO gave reply vide his letter dated 22.10.2019, the contents of which are as under:-

ਉਪਰੋਕਤ ਵਿਸ਼ੇ ਸੰਬੰਧੀ ਆਪ ਦੇ ਹੁਕਮ ਨੰਬਰ: ਪੀਐਸਆਈਸੀ/ਲੀਗਲ/2019/17767 ਮਿਤੀ 09/10/2019 ਦੇ ਹਵਾਲੇ ਨਾਲ ਸੂਚਿਤ ਕੀਤਾ ਜਾਂਦਾ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਪ੍ਰਾਰਥੀ ਵਲੋਂ ਦਿਤੀ ਗਈ ਆਰ.ਟੀ.ਆਈ. ਅਪਲੀਕੇਸ਼ਨ ਸੰਬੰਧੀ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਲੋਕ ਸੇਵਾ ਕਮਿਸ਼ਨ ਦੇ ਫੈਸਲੇ ਮਿਤੀ 03.04.2014 (ਕਾਪੀ ਨੰਬਰ) ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਪ੍ਰੀਖਿਆ/ਇੰਟਰਵਿਊ ਨਾਲ ਸੰਬੰਧਿਤ ਨੋਟਿੰਗ ਪੱਤਰ ਵਿਹਾਰ ਦੀਆਂ ਕਾਪੀਆਂ ਆਰ.ਟੀ.ਆਈ. ਅਧੀਨ ਸਪਲਾਈ ਨਹੀਂ ਕੀਤੀਆਂ ਜਾ ਸਕਦੀਆਂ ਹਨ। ਇਸ ਲਈ ਪ੍ਰਾਰਥੀ ਨੂੰ ਨੋਟਿੰਗ ਦੀਆਂ ਕਾਪੀਆਂ ਮੁਹੱਈਆ ਨਹੀਂ ਕਰਵਾਈਆਂ ਗਈਆਂ ਹਨ। ਪ੍ਰਾਰਥੀ ਨੂੰ ਇਹ ਵੀ ਸੂਚਿਤ ਕੀਤਾ ਗਿਆ ਸੀ ਕਿ ਏ.ਸੀ.ਆਰ. ਦੇ ਨੰਬਰਾਂ ਦੀ ਕੈਲਕੁਲੇਸ਼ਨ ਕਿਸੇ ਨੋਟਿੰਗ ਵਿਚ ਨਹੀਂ ਕੀਤੀ ਗਈ ਹੈ।

2. ਦੂਜੇ ਉਮੀਦਵਾਰਾਂ ਦੀਆਂ ਏ.ਸੀ.ਆਰ. ਦੀਆਂ ਕਾਪੀਆਂ ਥਰਡ ਪਾਰਟੀ ਸੂਚਨਾ ਅਧੀਨ ਪ੍ਰਾਰਥੀ ਨੂੰ ਮੁਹੱਈਆ ਨਹੀਂ ਕਰਵਾਈਆਂ ਜਾ ਸਕਦੀਆਂ ਹਨ। 09 ਉਮੀਦਵਾਰਾਂ ਦੀਆਂ ਏ.ਸੀ.ਆਰ. ਦੇ ਨੰਬਰਾਂ ਦੀ ਕੈਲਕੁਲੇਸ਼ਨ ਦੀਆਂ ਸਮਰੀ ਸੀਟਾਂ ਇਸ ਦਫ਼ਤਰ ਦੇ ਪੱਤਰ ਮਿਤੀ 30.08.2019 ਰਾਹੀਂ ਪ੍ਰਾਰਥੀ ਨੂੰ ਮੁਹੱਈਆ ਕਰਵਾਈਆਂ ਜਾ ਚੁੱਕੀਆਂ ਹਨ।

3. ਏ.ਸੀ.ਆਰ. ਦੇ ਨੰਬਰਾਂ ਦੀ ਕੈਲਕੁਲੇਸ਼ਨ ਸੰਬੰਧੀ ਅਪਣਾਏ ਗਏ ਪ੍ਰੋਸੀਜ਼ਰ ਸੰਬੰਧੀ ਪ੍ਰਾਰਥੀ ਨੂੰ ਕੈਲਕੁਲੇਸ਼ਨ ਸੰਬੰਧੀ ਪ੍ਰਾਰਥੀ ਨੂੰ ਕਮਿਸ਼ਨ ਦੇ ਪੱਤਰ ਮਿਤੀ 30.08.2019 ਰਾਹੀਂ ਸੂਚਿਤ ਕੀਤਾ ਜਾ ਚੁੱਕਾ ਹੈ।

4. The appellant has requested for information at 3 points, the respondent has provided information at Point at Sr. No. 2 and 3 and the appellant is satisfied with the same. However, regarding issue at Sr. No.1, the respondent have denied to provide and he/she submitted copy of minutes of the meeting No.8/2014 of Punjab Public Service Commission held on 3.4.2014 at 11.00 A.M. are also reproduced below:-

“Regarding supply of information to the RTI related applications: The Commission

Contd.....p/3

discussed the report submitted by the Sub Committee. Regarding the information about decisions taken by the Commission with reference to the interviews of candidate's, the Commission decided that the same should not be given. Further regarding the noting and drafting portions of the file relating to an examination/ interview/selection are not supposed to be given, whereas noting and drafting portion of the file relating to other matters should be given after the approval of the Member in-charge of the department has been taken. In such cases, where the Member feels that a decision should be taken at the level of the Commission, the same may be discussed in the Commission's meeting accordingly, subject to above mentioned change, the report of the Sub Committee was approved by the Commission. It was also discussed and decided by the Commission that when the candidates come for the inspection of their answers' sheets, the pages/portion from where the identity of the paper evaluator can be gauged, should be masked by the examination branch, so that the confidentiality of the evaluator is kept intact."

5. The information can be denied under the RTI Act, 2005 only, if it falls in Sections 8, 9 and 10 of the Act. Therefore before the final view is taken by the Commission on the validity of minutes of the meeting dated 3.4.2014 as mentioned above, Punjab Public Service Commission was directed to reconsider/re-examine legality of its decision dated 3.4.2014 and inform the Commission before the next date of hearing. Appellant was also advised to submit his observations in writing with regard to the stand taken by Punjab Public Service Commission.

6. In response to the previous order dated 15.11.2019, the appellant submitted the observations vide his letter dated 15.10.2019, necessary extract is reproduced below:-

"2. In this connection, it is submitted that the plea taken by o/o PPSC, Patiala that in view of the proceedings dated 3.4.2014, information under RTI Act 2005 cannot be provided, is not tenable. Section 22 of RTI Act, 2005 provides that provisions of this Act have overriding effect. Further the information sought in point No.1 of my RTI application relates to the noting portion of the concerned file. As per provisions contained in Section 2(j)(ii) of RTI Act, certified copies of the noting is to be provided under this Act. Information sought in this point does not fall in the prohibited information under any Section of the RTI Act, 2005 and the same is not third party information in view of the submissions made in the succeeding para.

3. It is further submitted that as mentioned my appeal submitted in the Commission, I am also part of this selection process and is personally effected, therefore, the sought for information cannot be treated as third party information. Moreover, the sought for

information relates to the recruitment of PCS (EB) cadre officers which is the Premier State service. In order to ensure fair selection there should be transparency in the selection process. Now the selection process is over, therefore, the documents on the basis of which the selection has been done have now become part and parcel of the official record and any individual cannot claim the same as third party information.

4. In addition to above, it is also submitted that the information so far provided by PPS does not match with the information provided by other concerned departments. The outstanding ACR for the period of 01.04.2012 to 05.08.2012 and NRC for the period of 01.04.2016 to 13.07.2016 which is available with PPSC (as per gist provided to me under RTI Act by PPSC) is not available anywhere. So I need full record of Shri Kuldeep Singh alongwith noting portion of the file to check the source from which PPSC has obtained these particular documents.

5. The information provided to the undersigned by PPSC is not attested whereas the provision 2(j)(ii) of the RTI Act, 2005, the same should be certified.

7.. In response to the previous order dated 24.10.2019, the Punjab Public Service Commission has informed this Commission about their decision vide their letter dated 14.11.2019, the necessary extract of the same is placed on the next date:-

1. ਕਮਿਸ਼ਨ ਦੀਆਂ ਇੰਟਰਵਿਊ/ਪ੍ਰੀਖਿਆਵਾਂ ਨਾਲ ਸੰਬੰਧਤ ਨੋਟਿੰਗਜ਼ ਵਿਚ ਇਕ ਉਮੀਦਵਾਰ ਦੀ ਪਾਤਰਤਾ ਨਾਲ ਸੰਬੰਧਤ ਪ੍ਰੋਸੀਜ਼ਰ ਨਹੀਂ ਹੁੰਦਾ, ਸਗੋਂ ਸਾਰੇ ਹੀ ਉਮੀਦਵਾਰਾਂ ਦੀਆਂ ਅਰਜੀਆਂ ਸੰਬੰਧੀ ਡਿਟੇਲ ਅਤੇ ਉਹਨਾਂ ਦੀ ਪਾਤਰਤਾ ਜਾਂ ਅਪਾਤਰਤਾ ਸੰਬੰਧੀ ਫੈਸਲਾ ਕੀਤਾ ਗਿਆ ਹੁੰਦਾ ਹੈ। ਕਿਸੇ ਇਕ ਉਮੀਦਵਾਰ ਨੂੰ ਨੋਟਿੰਗ ਦੀਆਂ ਕਾਪੀਆਂ ਮੁਹੱਈਆ ਕਰਵਾਉਣ ਨਾਲ ਦੂਸਰੇ ਉਮੀਦਵਾਰਾਂ ਨਾਲ ਸੰਬੰਧਿਤ ਸੂਚਨਾ ਉਸ ਉਮੀਦਵਾਰ ਕੋਲ ਪਹੁੰਚ ਜਾਂਦੀ ਹੈ। ਕਮਿਸ਼ਨ ਵਲੋਂ ਐਕਟ ਦੀਆਂ ਧਾਰਾਵਾਂ ਅਧੀਨ ਕਿਸੇ ਇਕ ਉਮੀਦਵਾਰ ਸੰਬੰਧੀ ਨੋਟਿੰਗ ਤੇ ਕੋਈ ਗਈ ਕਾਰਵਾਈ ਤੋੜ ਮਰੋੜ ਕੇ ਜਾਂ ਅਧੀ-ਅਧੂਰੀ ਉਪਲਬਧ ਨਹੀਂ ਕਰਵਾਈ ਜਾ ਸਕਦੀ ਅਤੇ ਨਾਂ ਹੀ ਥਰਡ ਪਾਰਟੀ ਸੂਚਨਾ ਬਰੀਚ ਕਰਕੇ ਦਿਤਾ ਜਾ ਸਕਦੀ ਹੈ ਜੋ ਕਿ ਆਰ.ਟੀ.ਆਈ. ਐਕਟ ਦੀ ਆਪਣੇ ਆਪ ਵਿਚ ਹੀ ਉਲੰਘਣਾ ਹੈ।

2. ਕਮਿਸ਼ਨ ਵਲੋਂ ਕਰਵਾਏ ਜਾਂਦੇ ਇਮਤਿਹਾਨ ਬਹੁਤ ਹੀ ਸੈਨਸਟਿਵ ਹੁੰਦੇ ਹਨ। ਜਿਸ ਵਿਚ ਜੇਕਰ ਇਕ ਉਮੀਦਵਾਰ ਨੂੰ ਦੂਸਰੇ ਉਮੀਦਵਾਰਾਂ ਦੀ ਪਾਤਰਤਾ ਜਾਂ ਅਪਾਤਰਤਾ ਸੰਬੰਧੀ ਸੂਚਨਾ ਉਪਲਬਧ ਕਰਵਾਈ ਜਾਂਦੀ ਹੈ ਤਾਂ ਉਮੀਦਵਾਰਾਂ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਇਸ ਸੂਚਨਾ ਦਾ ਦੁਰਉਪਯੋਗ ਕਰਕੇ ਇਕ ਦੂਸਰੇ ਵਿਰੁਧ ਰਿਟ ਪਟੀਸ਼ਨਾਂ ਦਾਇਰ ਕੀਤੀਆਂ ਜਾ ਸਕਦੀਆਂ ਹਨ। ਇਸ ਕਰਕੇ ਇਸ ਤਰ੍ਹਾਂ ਦੀ ਕੋਈ ਵੀ ਸੂਚਨਾ ਉਪਲਬਧ ਕਰਵਾਉਣ ਨਾਲ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਲੋਕ ਸੇਵਾ ਕਮਿਸ਼ਨ ਆਪ ਹੀ ਆਰ.ਟੀ.ਆਈ. ਐਕਟ ਦੀ ਉਲੰਘਣਾ ਕਰੇਗੇ ਜਿਸ ਨਾਲ ਬੇਲੋੜੀ ਲਿਟੀਗੇਸ਼ਨ ਦਾ ਵੀ ਸਾਹਮਣਾ ਕਰਨਾ ਪੈ ਸਕਦਾ ਹੈ। ਇਸ ਕਰਕੇ ਮਿਸਲ ਦੀ ਨੋਟਿੰਗ /ਪੱਤਰ ਵਿਹਾਰ ਦੀ ਕਾਪੀ ਦੇਣ ਸੰਬੰਧੀ ਕਮਿਸ਼ਨ ਦੀ ਮੀਟਿੰਗ ਮਿਤੀ 03.04.2014 ਦੇ ਲੜੀ ਨੰਬਰ 16 ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਇਗਜ਼ਾਮ/ ਇੰਟਰਵਿਊ/ਸਿਲੈਕਸ਼ਨ ਨਾਲ ਸੰਬੰਧਤ ਨੋਟਿੰਗ ਅਤੇ ਡਰਾਫਟਿੰਗ ਦੀਆਂ ਕਾਪੀਆਂ ਆਰ.ਟੀ.ਆਈ. ਐਕਟ ਅਧੀਨ ਕਮਿਸ਼ਨ ਵਲੋਂ ਸਪਲਾਈ ਨਹੀਂ ਕੀਤੀਆਂ ਜਾਂਦੀਆਂ ਹਨ।

8. On 10.11.2019, the order was reserved and to be pronounced in due course of time. It was mentioned in that order that attested copies of summary sheets

were sent to the appellant through registered post on 14.11.2019. They further stated that their Commission has decided not to provide attested photocopies of notings and correspondence in this case.

9. After hearing both the parties and going through the record available on the case file, it is observed that the applicability of the RTI Act, 2005 on the Public service Commission has been crystallized by various Hon'ble High Courts such as Delhi High Court in the matter of UPSC vs. Dr. Mahesh Mangala CWP No.7431 of 2011 and the Kerala High Court in Kerala Public Service Commission vs. SIC CWP No.33718 of 2010 and finally by Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Bihar Public Service Commission vs. Sayeed Hussain Abbas Civil Appeal No.9051 of 2012, wherein it has been held that the RTI Act, is duly applied to Public Service Commission.

10. Now an authority can refuse to provide information under the contingencies laid down in Section 8 of the Act, which is not relevant in this case. The PPSC in the present case has refused to give information regarding point at Sr. No. (i) by stating that it is an internal matter of the Commission. It is submitted that this stand cannot be sustained because the courts of law have consistently held that "file notings/correspondence" are a part and parcel of the information under Section 2(f) of the RTI Act, 2005 and in the absence of the same it cannot be construed that complete information has been given to the applicant, in the case titled as Praveen Kumar vs. CV/CIC/CVCOM/A/ 2017/ 120855/SD, it has been held that file notings/correspondence have to be provided and they are not barred under Section 8 of the RTI Act, 2005.

11. It is pertinent to mention here the observation made by Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in case titled Union Public Service Commission vs. Central Information Commission and other reported as 139 (2007) DLT 608. Relevant para is reproduced here:-.

"As regards the stand taken by the UPSC of taking cover under Section 8(1) (d) of the RTI Act, the Court felt that that is wholly inappropriate. First of all, the information that is sought by the respondents 2 to 24 does not fall within the expression of "intellectual property." The data collected by the UPSC is of an event which has already taken place and its disclosure would have no bearing whatsoever on the next year's examination. Therefore, even if it is assumed that it is "information" within the meaning of Section 8(1)(d) of the RTI Act, its disclosure would not harm the competitive position of any third party. In any event, the UPSC being a public body is required to act and conduct itself in a fair and transparent manner. It would also be in public interest that this fairness and transparency is displayed by the revealing of the information sought. Moreover, Section 8(2), read in its proper prospective, indicates that access to information ought to be provided by a public authority even where it is otherwise entitled

Contd.....p/6

to withhold the same, if the public interest in disclosure outweighs the harm to the protected interest. The disclosure of information, as directed by the CIC, does not, in any way, in the Court's view, harm the protected interest of UPSC or any third party."

To strengthen further the observations mentioned above Hon'ble Kerala High Court stated in case titled Kerala Public Service Commission and Ors vs. The State Information Commission and others reported as Manu/SC/0126/2016 stated that :-

"Performance audit of constitutional institutions would only strengthen the confidence of the citizenry in such institutions. The Public Service Commission (PSC) is a constitutional institution. There is nothing that should deter disclosure of the contents of the materials that the examinees provided as part of their performance in the competition for being selected to public service. The confidence that may be reposed by the examinees in the institution of the PSC does not inspite the acceptability of a fiduciary relationship that should kindle the exclusion of information in relation to the evaluation or other details relating to the examination. Once the evaluation is over and results are declared, no more secret is called for. Dissemination of such information would only add to the credibility of the PSC, in the constitutional conspectus in which it is placed. The court further observed that the identity of the examiners has to be insulated from public gaze, having regard to issues relatable to vulnerability and exposure to corruption if the identities of the examiners are disclosed in advance.

Therefore, the PPSC could have invoked the provisions of Section 10 of the RTI Act and could sever the information in the instant case.

In the case titled as Kerala Public Service Commission and others vs. The State Information Commission and others dealt with question that "whether the Division Bench of the Kerala High Court by impugned judgment has rightly held that examinee can get the scan copies of their answer sheet, tabulation-sheet containing interview marks under Right to Information from PSC".

12. It is relevant to mention here the view formulated by Hon'ble Delhi High Court titled The Manipur Public Service Commission vs. The Manipur Information Commission and others in which it was held that by the High Court of Delhi in Mukesh Kumar vs. Chief Information Commissioner, CIC, "wherein the petitioner sought for information relating to Delhi Higher Judicial Services Examination including copies of proceeding drawn/note drawn and copies of interview marks and so forth and the High Court of Delhi vide its judgment and order dated 19.09.2017 held that the results of a public examination for selecting candidates for appointment to the Delhi High Judicial Service Examination have been placed in public domain and there is no question of

-7-

claiming any exemption under Section 8(1)(e) of the RTI Act and accordingly, the respondent was directed to disclose a tabulated statement of the marks awarded to all candidates except the handwritten record, the disclosure of which would inevitably disclose the identity of the members of the interview panel.”

13, The Government of India, Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievance and Pensions, Department of Personnel and Training vide its Circulate No.1/20/2009-IR dated 23.06.2009 has clearly notified that file noting can be disclosed except file noting containing information exempt under Section 8 of the RTI Act. The scheme of the RTI Act, its objects and reasons indicate that disclosure of information is the rule and non-disclosure the exception. A public authority which seeks to withhold the information available with it has to show that information sought is of the nature specified in Section 8 of the RTI Act, 2005. In the instant case, during the proceedings, the respondents have not submitted that the information is being denied since the information sought for by the appellant falls in the exempted category as mentioned in Section 8 of the Right to Information Act, 2005. Moreover, the apprehension of the respondent-Commission in its response stating that with the supply of information to the appellant, may lead to litigation in future, as mentioned herein, is not acceptable under the provisions of RTI Act, 2005. Hence, the respondents are directed to supply notings and correspondence to the appellant as sought by him before the next date of hearing.

14. To come up on 30.01.2020 at 3.00 P.M. to be heard through Video Conference Facility available in the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Patiala.

Dated:07.01.2020.

Sd/-
(Suresh Arora),
Chief Information Commissioner,
Punjab.