

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
RED CROSS BUILDING, NEAR ROSE GARDEN,
SECTOR 16, CHANDIGARH.
Ph: 0172-2864112, Email: - psic23@punjabmail.gov.in
Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Shri Suresh Kumar, (75080 44706)
S/o Shri Ram Dass,
R/o Kala Chack, Sujanpur,
Tehsil & District Pathankot-145023

...Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Director School Education (secondary),
Vidya Bhawan (Punjab School Education Board)
Block E , 5th Floor, Phase-VIII
SAS Nagar (Mohali) - PUNJAB (INDIA)
Pin-Code. 160062

Public Information Officer,
O/o Special Secretary,
Department of Health & Family Welfare, Punjab,
Parivar Kalyan Bhawan, Himalaya Marg,
Sector 34-A, Chandigarh-160022

...Respondents

APPEAL CASE NO. 4337 OF 2024

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of PIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of Order, if any of FAA	Date of Appeal/ Complaint Filed in Commission
16.04.2024	-	19.04.2024	-	03.07.2024

Present:

Appellant: Adv. Arushi Garg (Counsel for appellant)

Respondent: Sh. Prince Popli (Clerk) (O/o DSECS, Pb.)
Sh. Baljinder Singh (Sr. Asstt.)(O/o Special Secy. Dept. Of Health &..)

Final Order :

1. The Appellant filed above mentioned appeal cases in the Commission. Accordingly, the case is fixed for today.
2. This RTI case was originally filed with the Office of the Special Secretary, Department of Health & Family Welfare, Punjab, and was subsequently transferred to the concerned department, i.e., the Office of the Director, School Education (Secondary), Punjab.
3. During the hearing, **Sh. Prince Popli (Clerk), O/o Director, School Education (Secondary), Punjab**, appeared on behalf of the PIO and stated that the sought information had already been sent to the appellant via post on **17.01.2025**. Additionally, a copy of the same was handed over to the appellant's advocate during today's proceedings.
4. Further, **Sh. Prince Popli** submitted that the **information requested in this RTI application had already been provided** in another similar RTI application filed earlier by the appellant on **27.06.2024**, vide **Memo No. 695693/2024151338**. He, therefore, **requested the Commission to close the case.**
5. The appellant's advocate was not aware of the case details and continued seeking adjournments without making any substantial representations regarding the matter.
6. After reviewing the point-wise reply and the information provided by the respondent, the Commission finds the response satisfactory and concludes that the information has been supplied to the best possible extent.
7. Considering the large pendency of cases in the Commission and in the interest of ensuring hearing opportunities for genuine litigants, **the case is disposed of.**

(Sandeep Singh Dhaliwal)
State Information Commissioner, Punjab.
Chandigarh
22.01.2025

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
RED CROSS BUILDING, NEAR ROSE GARDEN,
SECTOR 16, CHANDIGARH.
Ph: 0172-2864112, Email: - psic23@punjabmail.gov.in
Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Shri Suresh Kumar, (75080 44706)
S/o Shri Ram Dass,
R/o Kala Chack, Sujampur,
Tehsil & District Pathankot-145023

...Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o District Education Officer,
Secondary Education, Gurdaspur.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Director,
Department of School Education, Punjab,
S.A.S Nagar (Mohali).

....Respondents

APPEAL CASE NO. 4430 OF 2024

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of PIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of Order, if any of FAA	Date of Appeal/ Complaint Filed in Commission
18.04.2024	-	19.05.2024	-	05.07.2024

Present:

Appellant: Adv. Arushi Garg (Counsel for appellant)

Respondent: Sh. Rajesh Kumar (Sr. Assistant)

Final Order :

1. The Appellant filed above mentioned appeal cases in the Commission. Accordingly, the case is fixed for today.
2. The present case pertains to an RTI application seeking information regarding the **enquiry report on tree cutting by the DEO, Gurdaspur and Annual Confidential Report (ACR)(2021-2022 dated 15.09.2022).**
3. During the hearing, **Sh. Rajesh Kumar (Sr. Assistant), O/o Director, School Education (Secondary), Punjab,** represented the PIO and submitted a written response before the Commission vide letter **Ref. No. 174 dated 22.01.2025** from **PIO-cum-DEO (SE), Gurdaspur.**
4. As per the submission, the sought information is related to an **ongoing enquiry**, and the appellant had already been informed through letters dated **03.04.2024** and **05.09.2024** that disclosure of this information is **denied under Section 8(1)(h) of the RTI Act, 2005**, as it may impede the investigation. Copies of these letters were placed on record.
5. Further, the respondent submitted that the **appellant has been filing multiple RTI applications** to allegedly **harass the department and various officials.** Due to this, **DEO (SE), Punjab, has issued a charge sheet against the appellant** vide **Ref. No. 553247 dated 24-09-2024/25-09-2024.**
6. It is also stated that the appellant had sought access to the **Annual Confidential Report (ACR)(2021-2022 dated 15.09.2022).** As per the applicable rules, the **ACR is a confidential document**, and its disclosure is restricted. Additionally, as the enquiry is still pending, the information **cannot be provided at this stage.**

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

RED CROSS BUILDING, NEAR ROSE GARDEN,

SECTOR 16, CHANDIGARH.

Ph: 0172-2864112, Email: - psic23@punjabmail.gov.in

Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



APPEAL CASE NO. 4430 OF 2024

7. After considering the facts of the case, the Commission holds that the information sought falls under the exemption provided in Section 8(1)(h) of the RTI Act, 2005. Therefore, the reply submitted by the respondent is upheld. However, the PIO is directed to provide the enquiry report to the appellant upon its completion, with a copy to the Commission.

8. It is further observed that the appellant's counsel, Adv. Arushi Garg, was not aware of the case details and continued seeking adjournments without making any substantial representation regarding the matter. Given the large pendency of cases before the Commission, unnecessary delays affect the hearing process for genuine appellants awaiting justice.

Accordingly, the case is **CLOSED**.

(Sandeep Singh Dhaliwal)

State Information Commissioner, Punjab.

Chandigarh

22.01.2025

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

RED CROSS BUILDING, NEAR ROSE GARDEN,
SECTOR 16, CHANDIGARH.

Ph: 0172-2864112, Email: - psic23@punjabmail.gov.in

Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Shri Suresh Kumar, (75080 44706)
S/o Shri Ram Dass,
R/o Kala Chack, Sujampur,
Tehsil & District Pathankot-145023

...Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Director Public Instructions,
(Colleges), Punjab,
S.A.S. Nagar (Mohali).

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Director Public Instructions,
(Colleges), Punjab,
S.A.S. Nagar (Mohali).

....Respondents

APPEAL CASE NO. 4431 OF 2024

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of PIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of Order, if any of FAA	Date of Appeal/ Complaint Filed in Commission
18.04.2024	-	19.05.2024	-	05.07.2024

Present:

Appellant: Adv. Arushi Garg (Counsel for appellant)

Respondent: Sh. Varinder Singh (O/o DPI(colleges))

Final Order :

1. The Appellant filed above mentioned appeal cases in the Commission. Accordingly, the case is fixed for today.

2. The present RTI case was originally filed with the **Office of the DPI (Colleges), Punjab**, whereas the appellant had intended to seek information from the **Office of the Director, School Education (Secondary), Punjab**.

3. During the hearing, **Sh. Varinder Singh (O/o DPI (Colleges))**, representing the PIO, submitted a letter **Ref. No. 121 dated 24.12.2024** from the **Deputy Director Higher Education Department, Coordination Cell, Punjab**, wherein it is mentioned that the **appellant had informed via telephone** that he had mistakenly filed the RTI in the **Office of DPI (Colleges)** instead of the **Office of the Director, School Education (Secondary), Punjab**. He further stated that the appellant has **filed a fresh RTI application in the correct office** and, therefore, **does not wish to pursue this case in the Office of DPI (Colleges), Punjab**. Accordingly, the respondent requested the Commission to **dispose of the present case**.

4. However, **Adv. Arushi Garg (Counsel for the appellant)** stated that she **is not aware** whether the appellant had filed a fresh RTI application in the concerned department.

5. In view of the above submissions, the Commission observes that the **RTI application was initially misaddressed** and subsequently **transferred to the appropriate office**. At the same time, since the appellant has **already filed a new RTI application in the correct department**, continuing this case would lead to **duplication of proceedings**.

6. Given the **large pendency of cases before the Commission**, it is imperative to avoid redundant litigation and ensure hearing opportunities for **genuine litigants**. Accordingly, the **case is closed**.

(Sandeep Singh Dhaliwal)

State Information Commissioner, Punjab.

Chandigarh

22.01.2025



Shri Jasbir Singh,
Guru Nank Nagar, Village
Bhilapur Jhabewal, PO Ramgarh,
Distt Ludhiana- 141123.

....Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o State Transport Commissioner, Pb.
Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o State Transport Commissioner, Pb.
Chandigarh.

.....Respondent

APPEAL CASE NO. : 671/2023

Present:

Appellant: Shri Jasbir Singh

Respondent: Ms. Raj Kumari (Sr. Assistant)

Final Order :

1. The above mentioned Appeal Case is fixed for hearing before the Bench of Hon'ble State Information Commissioner, Punjab Shri Anumit Singh Sodhi. The Registry Branch vide his office order no. PSIC/Legal/2024/480, dated 04.09.2024 has re-allocated the above mentioned cases to the undersigned bench. Accordingly the case are fixed for hearing today.
2. The appellant had sought information pertaining to the **complaint filed by Sh. Manjit Singh dated 20.10.2020.**
3. During the hearing, **Ms. Rajkumari**, representing the respondent, appeared and informed the Commission that **Sh. Manjit Singh is no longer alive.** She submitted that since the **information sought relates to a deceased individual, it cannot be provided** under the provisions of the **RTI Act, 2005.**
4. The Commission, after considering the facts, **agrees with the respondent's submission** and holds that the requested information **falls under the category of personal information** and is thus **exempt from disclosure under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act, 2005,** unless a **larger public interest** is demonstrated. Furthermore, as the concerned individual **is no longer alive,** the information cannot be disclosed.
5. In view of the above, the Commission **upholds the respondent's reply and disposes of the case accordingly.**

(Sandeep Singh Dhaliwal)

State Information Commissioner, Punjab.
Chandigarh
22.01.2025



Shri Jasbir Singh,
Guru Nank Nagar, Village
Bhilapur Jhabewal, PO Ramgarh,
Distt Ludhiana- 141123.

....Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o State Transport Commissioner, Pb.
Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o State Transport Commissioner, Pb.
Chandigarh.

.....Respondent

APPEAL CASE NO. : 3749/2022,

Present:

Appellant: Shri Jasbir Singh
Respondent: Ms. Raj Kumari (Sr. Assistant)

Final Order :

1. The above mentioned Appeal Case is fixed for hearing before the Bench of Hon'ble State Information Commissioner, Punjab Shri Anumit Singh Sodhi. The Registry Branch vide his office order no. PSIC/Legal/2024/480, dated 04.09.2024 has re-allocated the above mentioned cases to the undersigned bench. Accordingly the case are fixed for hearing today.
2. Both parties were present today and heard. The appellant, Jasbir Singh, sought information regarding the outcomes of complaints filed by him on **04.03.2022** and **15.04.2022**.
3. The respondent PIO, represented by **Ms. Rajkumari**, submitted that the said complaints had been closed by the concerned officials (**Secretary, Regional Transport Authority, Ludhiana**). A reply regarding the same was sent to the appellant via post vide **letter no. 537 dated 10.01.2025**. Additionally, a copy of this reply is handed over to him during the hearing.
4. After reviewing the response, the appellant requested the Commission to provide him with the **action taken report** on his complaints by the **Secretary, Regional Transport Authority, Ludhiana**. In response, **Ms. Rajkumari assured the Commission** that the report would be provided within two days. She further requested the appellant to share his **email ID** for quicker delivery, but the appellant declined, stating that he does not have an email ID.
5. Accordingly, the **Commission directs the respondent to send the said report to the appellant via post**, with a copy to the Commission.
6. In view of the above observations and directions, the case is **disposed of**.

(Sandeep Singh Dhaliwal)
State Information Commissioner, Punjab.
Chandigarh
22.01.2025



Shri Jasbir Singh,
Guru Nank Nagar, Village
Bhilapur Jhabewal, PO Ramgarh,
Distt Ludhiana- 141123.

....Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o State Transport Commissioner, Pb.
Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o State Transport Commissioner, Pb.
Chandigarh.

.....Respondent

APPEAL CASE NO. : 4094/2022,

Present:

Appellant: Shri Jasbir Singh

Respondent: Ms. Raj Kumari (Sr. Assistant)

Final Order :

1. The above mentioned Appeal Case is fixed for hearing before the Bench of Hon'ble State Information Commissioner, Punjab Shri Anumit Singh Sodhi. The Registry Branch vide his office order no. PSIC/Legal/2024/480, dated 04.09.2024 has re-allocated the above mentioned cases to the undersigned bench. Accordingly the case are fixed for hearing today.
2. Both parties were present today and heard. The appellant, **Jasbir Singh**, sought information regarding the **outcomes of complaints dated 11.11.2020 and 02.11.2020**, as mentioned in his RTI application, along with the **complete case file**.
3. The respondent **PIO, represented by Ms. Rajkumari**, submitted that the said complaints had been **closed by the concerned officials**. A reply regarding the same was sent to the appellant via post vide **letter no. 536 dated 10.01.2025**. Additionally, a copy of this reply was handed over to him during the hearing.
4. After reviewing the response, the appellant requested the **Commission** to provide him with the **action taken report along with the complete case file** related to his complaints.
5. In response, **Ms. Rajkumari contended that only the final report can be provided** to the appellant, as the **internal office notings and other file contents contain information about third parties**, which **cannot be disclosed** under the provisions of the RTI Act.
6. The **Commission concurred** with this submission and directed that only the **final report of the said complaints** be provided to the appellant within two days. The appellant also agreed to this.
7. Accordingly, the case is **disposed of** in view of the above directions and decision.

(Sandeep Singh Dhaliwal)

State Information Commissioner, Punjab.

Chandigarh

22.01.2025

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

RED CROSS BUILDING, NEAR ROSE GARDEN,
SECTOR 16, CHANDIGARH.

Ph: 0172-2864112, Email: - psic23@punjabmail.gov.in

Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Shri Jasbir Singh,
Guru Nank Nagar, Village
Bhilapur Jhabewal, PO Ramgarh,
Distt Ludhiana- 141123.

....Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o State Transport Commissioner, Pb.
Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o State Transport Commissioner, Pb.
Chandigarh.

.....Respondent

APPEAL CASE NO. : 5950/2022

Present:

Appellant: Shri Jasbir Singh

Respondent: Ms. Raj Kumari (Sr. Assistant)

Final Order :

1. The above mentioned Appeal Case is fixed for hearing before the Bench of Hon'ble State Information Commissioner, Punjab Shri Anumit Singh Sodhi. The Registry Branch vide his office order no. PSIC/Legal/2024/480, dated 04.09.2024 has re-allocated the above mentioned cases to the undersigned bench. Accordingly the case are fixed for hearing today.
2. Both parties were present today and heard. The appellant, **Jasbir Singh**, sought information regarding the **outcome of the complaint dated 05.07.2022**, as mentioned in his RTI application, along with the **complete case file**.
3. The respondent **PIO, represented by Ms. Rajkumari**, submitted that the said **complaint is still pending** and, therefore, cannot be provided at this stage under the provisions of the **RTI Act**. However, she assured that the information would be provided upon completion of the inquiry.
4. In view of the above, the **Commission upholds the response of the respondent** and directs that the final report be provided to the appellant upon completion of the inquiry.
5. Accordingly, the case is **disposed of** with the above direction.

(Sandeep Singh Dhaliwal)

State Information Commissioner, Punjab.

Chandigarh

22.01.2025



Shri Jasbir Singh,
Guru Nank Nagar, Village
Bhilapur Jhabewal, PO Ramgarh,
Distt Ludhiana- 141123.

....Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o State Transport Commissioner, Pb.
Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o State Transport Commissioner, Pb.
Chandigarh.

.....Respondent

APPEAL CASE NO. : 5951/2022,

Present:

Appellant: Shri Jasbir Singh
Respondent: Ms. Raj Kumari (Sr. Assistant)

Final Order :

1. The above mentioned Appeal Case is fixed for hearing before the Bench of Hon'ble State Information Commissioner, Punjab Shri Anumit Singh Sodhi. The Registry Branch vide his office order no. PSIC/Legal/2024/480, dated 04.09.2024 has re-allocated the above mentioned cases to the undersigned bench. Accordingly the case are fixed for hearing today.
2. Both parties were present today and heard. The appellant, **Jasbir Singh**, sought information regarding the **enquiry report pertaining to noting ref. no. 1032 dated 25.02.2021**, as mentioned in his RTI application.
3. The respondent **PIO, represented by Ms. Rajkumari**, submitted that the said complaints had been **closed by the concerned officials**. A reply regarding the same was sent to the appellant vide **letter no. 27466 dated 04.06.2023**. Additionally, a copy of this reply was handed over to him during the hearing.
4. After reviewing the response, the appellant requested the **Commission** to provide him with the **action taken report along with the complete case file** related to his complaints.
5. In response, **Ms. Rajkumari contended that only the final report can be provided** to the appellant, as the **internal office notings and other file contents contain information about third parties**, which **cannot be disclosed** under the provisions of the RTI Act.
6. The **Commission concurred** with this submission and directed that only the **final report of the said complaints** be provided to the appellant within two days. The appellant also agreed to this.
7. Accordingly, the case is **disposed of** in view of the above directions and decision.

(Sandeep Singh Dhaliwal)
State Information Commissioner, Punjab.
Chandigarh
22.01.2025



Shri Gurjinder Singh (Adv.)

S/o Sh. Narinder Singh, R/o House No. 26,
H.M. Sector 59,
Phase 4, Mohali-160059.

.....Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Director Department of
Transport, Pb, Chandigarh.

..... Respondent

Complaint CASE NO. : 219/2023

Present:

Complainant : Absent

Respondent: Absent

Order :

1. The above mentioned complaint Case is fixed for hearing before the Bench of Hon'ble State Information Commissioner, Punjab Shri Anumit Singh Sodhi. The Registry Branch vide his office order no. PSIC/Legal/2024/480, dated 04.09.2024 has re-allocated the above mentioned cases to the undersigned bench. Accordingly the case are fixed for hearing today.
2. This order shall be read in reference to the **previous order of the Commission**, wherein the appellant was directed to **make a submission regarding the case**. However, the appellant **failed to comply** with the direction.
3. In view of the appellant's non-compliance, the **Commission is compelled to presume that he has no further interest in pursuing the case**.
4. Accordingly, based on the **merits of the case**, it is hereby **remanded back to the First Appellate Authority (FAA) for further action**.
5. **The case is closed.**

(Sandeep Singh Dhaliwal)

State Information Commissioner, Punjab.
Chandigarh
22.01.2025

First appellant Authority ,
O/o Director Department of
Transport, Pb, Chandigarh.



Shri Bhoop Ram (Adv.)

S/o Sh. Om Prakash, R/o

VPO Dodewala, Tehsil Abohar,

Distt Fazilka.

....Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,

O/o Deputy Director State

Transport Department,

PUNBUS, Sector -17 Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority,

O/o Director State Transport Department,

PUNBUS, Sector -17 Chandigarh.

....Respondent

Appeal Case NO. : 5489/2022

Present:

Appellant: Absent

Respondent: Absent

Final Order :

1. The above mentioned Appeal Case is fixed for hearing before the Bench of Hon'ble State Information Commissioner, Punjab Shri Anumit Singh Sodhi. The Registry Branch vide his office order no. PSIC/Legal/2024/480, dated 04.09.2024 has re-allocated the above mentioned cases to the undersigned bench. Accordingly the case are fixed for hearing today.

2. Both parties are **absent for the second consecutive hearing.**

3. Upon reviewing the **previous order of the Commission dated 18.04.2023**, it is noted that the appellant was directed to **point out any deficiency** in the information provided to him on **13.04.2023**. It was also stated that **failure to do so would lead the Commission to presume that the information provided was sufficient, and the case would be disposed of.**

4. Despite **two subsequent hearings**, the appellant has **not submitted any response** to date. Meanwhile, the **PIO has submitted a letter** to the Commission vide **Diary No. 313 dated 02.01.2025**, reiterating the **earlier stance that the requisite information has already been provided to the appellant** and requesting the case to be closed.

5. In view of the above, the **Commission, finds that no further action is required in the matter. Accordingly, the case is closed.**

(Sandeep Singh Dhaliwal)

State Information Commissioner, Punjab.

Chandigarh

22.01.2025