



Sh. Gurbhawan Singh, S/o Sh. Baaj Singh,
Village Attari, PO Vadhai, Tehsil &
Distt Sri Muktsar Sahib-152026.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
0/o SSSB, PB, Mohali.

First Appellate Authority
0/o Secretary, SSSB, PB, Mohali.

Respondents

APPEAL CASE NO. 284 OF 2024

Present :- (i) Sh. Gurbhawan Singh the appellant
(ii) For the respondent: Sh. Charjinder Singh, Sr. Assistant (9878358968)

ORDER

This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 28.08.2025 vide which the respondent was directed to bring original record in the Commission.

2. Respondent Sh. Charjinder Singh states that he has brought original record today in the Commission.

3. The appellant has gone through the same and states that he has received complete information except attested copies of information.

4. Respondent has assured the bench that the same will be provided to the appellant tomorrow itself. The appellant has expressed his satisfaction over the same.

5. In view of the above no further cause of action is left, hence the above said appeal case filed by the appellant is **disposed of and closed**. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Sd/-

(Dr. Bhupinder S Batth)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

Date :16.12.2025



Shri Rajnish Bharara, (99188 96100)
520, Preet Colony, Zirakpur,
District Mohali – 140603

Appellant.

Versus

Public Information Officer,
0/o Block Development and Panchayat Officer,
Block Derabassi, District Mohali.

First Appellate Authority,
0/o District Magistrate, Mohali.

Respondents

APPEAL CASE NO. 1915 OF 2023

Present :- (i) Sh. Rajnish Bharara the appellant
(ii) For the respondent: Sh. Rajesh Kumar, Panchayat Secretary, Sh. Navdeep Singh, Patwari (9915672606) and Sh. Rajbeer Singh, Patwari (7986558814)

ORDER

This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 30.07.2025 vide which last opportunity was given to Sh. Navdeep Singh, Patwari.

2. Today the appellant states that he has received information except copy of coloured Map of village satabgarh. He has also sent his submissions via mail which is taken on record. The appellant further states that he has not been provided the information within the time as prescribed under the RTI Act 2005. For this the Appellant demands that the Respondent be penalized and he be compensated for the detriment suffered

3. Respondent states that the above said information demanded by the appellant cannot be provided under the RTI Act 2005 as the government has fixed the revenue fees.

4. After hearing the respondent and going through the case file, the Commission is of the considered opinion that the Respondent has provided appropriate and permissible reply to the Appellant. The appellant may note that as the government has fixed the revenue fees to procure such information, he should pay the fees and get the information.



APPEAL CASE NO. 1915 OF 2023

5. The perusal of documents available on the case files, shows that the reply has been sent to the appellant but not within stipulated period as prescribed under the RTI Act 2005. The respondent has tendered unconditional apology regarding delay occurred in this case and made oral submissions in this regard and promised that he will not commit such mistake in future. After hearing the respondent, the reasons of delay occurred in this case has been explained which reveals that the delay was not deliberate. Therefore this is not a fit case for imposition of penalty.

6. It has also been noted that Hon'ble Delhi High Court in W.P.(C) 11271/2009 Registrar of Companies & Ors v. Dharmendra Kumar Garg & Anr. (delivered on: 01.06.2012) has held as under:

"61. Even if it were to be assumed for the sake of argument, that the view taken by the learned Central Information Commissioner in the impugned order was correct, and that the PIOs were obliged to provide the information, which was otherwise retrievable by the querist by resort to Section 610 of the Companies Act, it could not be said that the information had been withheld malafide or deliberately without any reasonable cause. It can happen that the PIO may genuinely and bona fide entertain the belief and hold the view that the information sought by the querist cannot be provided for one or the other reasons. Merely because the CIC eventually finds that the view taken by the PIO was not correct, it cannot automatically lead to issuance of a showcause notice under Section 20 of the RTI Act and the imposition of penalty. The legislature has cautiously provided that only in cases of malafides or unreasonable conduct, i.e., where the PIO, without reasonable cause refuses to receive the application, or provide the information, or knowingly gives incorrect, incomplete or misleading information or destroys the information, that the personal penalty on the PIO can be imposed. This was certainly not one such case. If the CIC starts imposing penalty on the PIOs in every other case, without any justification, it would instill a sense of constant apprehension in those functioning as PIOs in the public authorities, and would put undue pressure on them. They would not be able to fulfill their statutory duties under the RTI Act with an independent mind and with objectivity. Such consequences would not auger well for the future development and growth of the regime that the RTI Act seeks to bring in, and may lead to skewed and imbalanced decisions by the PIOs Appellate Authorities and the CIC. It may even lead to unreasonable and absurd orders and bring the institutions created by the RTI Act in disrepute."



APPEAL CASE NO. 1915 OF 2023

7. In view of the foregoing, no further cause of action is left, hence the above said appeal case filed by the appellant is **disposed of and closed**. Copy of the order be sent to the parties

Sd/-

Date :16.12.2025

(Dr. Bhupinder S Batth)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab