

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864120



Email: psic25@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: www.infocommpunjab.com

Sh. Boota Singh, S/o Sh Sohan Singh,
R/o Village Jatt Wali, Tehsil & Distt Fazilka
(M-9463834700)

Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o ADC (G) Fazilka

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Bathinda Development Authority,
Bathinda

Respondents

COMPLAINT CASE NO.301 of 2025

Present :- None for the parties.

ORDER

The RTI application is dated 10.06.2025 whereby the information-seeker has sought information as mentioned in his RTI application. He filed complaint in the Commission on 10.11.2025 under Section 18 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act).

2. Notice was issued to the parties for hearing for 29.04.2026 in the Commission.

3. Today neither the complainant nor the respondent is present. An email has been received from the respondent dated 24.04.2026 that the *point-wise* reply has already been sent to the Complainant.

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).



COMPLAINT CASE NO. 301 of 2025

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.

5. 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.

6. The instant matter is now remanded back to the First Appellate Authority. The commission hereby directs the FAA to treat the copy of the complaint (copy enclosed) as the first appeal and decide the matter in accordance with the provisions of the RTI Act after giving all concerned parties an opportunity to be heard. He is directed to give an early date to hear the complainant and decide the matter.

7. 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.

8. 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.** **Sd/-**

Dated :29.04.2026

(Dr. Bhupinder S Batth)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

Remanded back to
First Appellate Authority
o/o Bathinda Development Authority
Bathinda

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864120



Email: psic25@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: www.infocommpunjab.com

Sh. Jasbir Singh, S/o Sh. Harbans Singh

Jalal Khera PO Sular,
Distt. Patiala

Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Incharge Sahara Hospital Raghomajra
Patiala

Respondents

COMPLAINT CASE NO.270 of 2025

Present :- None for the parties

ORDER

The RTI application is dated 01.08.2025 whereby the information-seeker has sought information as mentioned in his RTI application. He filed complaint in the Commission on 24.09.2025 under Section 18 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act).

2. Notice was issued to the parties for hearing for 29.04.2026 in the Commission.

3. Today neither the complainant nor the respondent is present. 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. 270 of 2025

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.

4. 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.

5. The instant matter is now remanded back to the First Appellate Authority. The commission hereby directs the FAA to treat the copy of the complaint (copy enclosed) as the first appeal and decide the matter in accordance with the provisions of the RTI Act after giving all concerned parties an opportunity to be heard. He is directed to give an early date to hear the complainant and decide the matter.

6. 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.

7. 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.** **Sd/-**

Dated :29.04.2026

(Dr. Bhupinder S Batth)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

Remanded back to
First Appellate Authority
o/o Civil Surgeon, Patiala



Email: psic25@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: www.infocommpunjab.com

Sh. Ashok Kumar, S/o Sh.
Charanji Lal, R/o Suraj Vihar, Ferozepur

Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Divisional Forest Officer
Ferozepur

Respondents

COMPLAINT CASE NO.263 of 2025

Present :- None for the parties.

ORDER

The RTI application is dated 04.02.2025 whereby the information-seeker has sought information as mentioned in his RTI application. He filed complaint in the Commission on 18.09.2025 under Section 18 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act).

2. Notice was issued to the parties for hearing for 29.04.2026 in the Commission.

3. Today neither the complainant nor the respondent is present. An email has been received from the complainant dated 28.04.2026 requesting that his case may be Remanded Back to the concerned First Appellant Authority.

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).



COMPLAINT CASE NO. 263 of 2025

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.

5. 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.

6. The instant matter is now remanded back to the First Appellate Authority. The commission hereby directs the FAA to treat the copy of the complaint (copy enclosed) as the first appeal and decide the matter in accordance with the provisions of the RTI Act after giving all concerned parties an opportunity to be heard. He is directed to give an early date to hear the complainant and decide the matter.

7. 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.

8. 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.** **Sd/-**

Dated :29.04.2026

(Dr. Bhupinder S Batth)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

Remanded back to
First Appellate Authority
o/o Divisional Forest Officer, Ferozpur

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864120



Email: psic25@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: www.infocommpunjab.com

Sh. Harnek Singh, VPO Chaklan,
Tehsil Morinda, Distt. Ropar (M-9872590758)

Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o SDO,PWD B&R, Morinda

First Appellate Authority
XEN,PWD B&R,SAS Nagar

Respondents

COMPLAINT CASE NO.273 of 2025

Present :- (i) Sh. Harnek Singh, Complainant
(ii) For the respondent: Sh Baljit Singh,JE (97791-40157)

ORDER

The RTI application is dated nil whereby the information-seeker has sought information as mentioned in his RTI application. He filed complaint in the Commission on 23.09.2025 under Section 18 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act).

2. Notice was issued to the parties for hearing for 29.04.2026 in the Commission.
3. The respondent states that the information has been provided to the complainant.
4. The complainant states that incomplete information has been provided to him.
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.273 of 2025

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.

6. 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.

7 The instant matter is now remanded back to the First Appellate Authority. The commission hereby directs the FAA to treat the copy of the complaint (copy enclosed) as the first appeal and decide the matter in accordance with the provisions of the RTI Act after giving all concerned parties an opportunity to be heard. He is directed to give an early date to hear the complainant and decide the matter.

8. 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.

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

Sd/-

(Dr. Bhupinder S Batth)

State Information Commissioner

Punjab

Date :28.04.2026

Remanded back to

First Appellate Authority

O/o SDO,PWD B&R, Morinda

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864120



Email: psic25@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: www.infocommpunjab.com

Sh Sanjay, S/o Sh Ashok,
House no 148, Ward No. 21,
Sunder Nagar, PO,
Tehsil & Distt Pathankot-145001

..... Appellant

.Vs

Public Information Officer,
O/o Director, Youth Services, Pb
Sector 42A, Chandigarh

First Appellate Authority
O/o Director, Youth Services, Pb
Sector 42A, Chandigarh

.....Respondent

APPEAL CASE NO. 4322 OF 2025

Present :- (i) None for the appellant
(ii) For the respondent- Ms Monika Rani, clerk and Ms Punam, Stenotypist

ORDER

This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 03.02.2026 vide which the copy of the reply was sent to the appellant along with the orders, with directions to file his response/rejoinder regarding the same. Accordingly, the case was adjourned to be heard on 25.03.2026. However, on 25.03.2026 the case could not be heard and hence, was postponed to be heard on 29.04.2026, i.e. today.

2. The appellant is not present today.
3. The respondent states that the appellant has not filed any rejoinder.
4. The perusal of the case file shows that the appellant is not present today. He was not present on the previous date of hearing also. He has not even informed the Commission about his absence. Even the last orders dated 03.02.2026 sent to him has not been returned undelivered which makes it clear that the same has been duly received by him. As directed, he has not filed any rejoinder/response regarding the reply of the respondent. As the Appellant is absent for second consecutive hearing and nothing has been heard from him regarding the receipt of information. Hence, it is presumed that he is satisfied with the

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864120

Email: psic25@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: www.infocommpunjab.com



APPEAL CASE NO. 4322 OF 2025

reply of the respondent. Hence, no further cause of action is left. With this the appeal case filed by the appellant is **disposed of and closed**. Copy of the orders be sent to the parties.

sd/-

(Dr. Bhupinder S Batth)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

Date :29.04.2026

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864120



Email: psic25@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: www.infocommpunjab.com

Sh Satnam Singh, (M-9855581804)
S/o ShNachattar Singh,
Village Bela, Tehsil Chamkaur Sahib,
DisttRoopnagar- 140111

..... Appellant

.Vs

Public Information Officer,
O/o Director, Youth Services, Pb
Sector 42A, Chandigarh

First Appellate Authority
O/o Director, Youth Services, Pb
Sector 42A, Chandigarh

..... Respondent

APPEAL CASE NO. 4267 OF 2025

Present :- (i) None for the appellant
(ii) For the respondent- Ms Monika Rani, clerk and Ms Punam, Stenotypist

ORDER

This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 03.02.2026 vide which the copy of the reply was sent to the appellant along with the orders, with directions to file his response/rejoinder regarding the same. Accordingly, the case was adjourned to be heard on 25.03.2026. However, on 25.03.2026 the case could not be heard and hence, was postponed to be heard on 29.04.2026, ie. today.

2. The appellant is not present today.
3. The respondent states that the appellant has not filed any rejoinder.
4. The perusal of the case file shows that the appellant is not present today. He was not present on the previous date of hearing also. He has not even informed the Commission about his absence. Even the last orders dated 03.02.2026 sent to him has not been returned undelivered which makes it clear that the same has been duly received by him. As directed, he has not filed any rejoinder/response regarding the reply of the respondent. As the Appellant is absent for second consecutive hearing and nothing has been heard from him regarding the receipt of information. Hence, it is presumed that he is satisfied with the

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,

Sector 16, Chandigarh.

Ph: 0172-2864120

Email: psic25@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: www.infocommpunjab.com



APPEAL CASE NO. 4267 OF 2025

reply of the respondent. Hence, no further cause of action is left. With this the appeal case filed by the appellant is **disposed of and closed**. Copy of the orders be sent to the parties.

sd/-

Date :29.04.2026

(Dr. Bhupinder S Batth)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864120



Email: psic25@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: www.infocommpunjab.com

Sh. Anoop Singh, S/o Late Sh.Jot Singh
R/o Ward No. 3, Badesha Road, Khamanoo
Distt.Fategarh Sahib

Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Divisional Forest Officer
Mohali

Respondents

COMPLAINT CASE NO.325 of 2025

Present :- (i) Sh. Anoop Singh, complainant along with ShRanjit Singh
(ii) For the respondent: ShRavinder Singh, Block Forest Officer

ORDER

The RTI application is dated 07.05.2024 whereby the information-seeker has sought information as mentioned in his RTI application. He filed complaint in the Commission on 21.11.2025 under Section 18 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act).

2. Notice was issued to the parties for hearing for 29.04.2026 in the Commission.
3. The complainant states that the information has not been provided to him.
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.325 of 2025

4. 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.

5. The instant matter is now remanded back to the First Appellate Authority. The commission hereby directs the FAA to treat the copy of the complaint (copy enclosed) as the first appeal and decide the matter in accordance with the provisions of the RTI Act after giving all concerned parties an opportunity to be heard. He is directed to give an early date to hear the complainant and decide the matter.

6. 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.

7. 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.** Sd/-

Date :28.04.2026

(Dr. Bhupinder S Batth)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

Remanded back to

First Appellate Authority
O/o Divisional Forest Officer
Mohali

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864120



Email: psic25@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: www.infocommpunjab.com

Sh Deepak Goyal, S/o Sh Ashok Kumar,
R/o Bank Street, New Basti,
Nabha, Distt Patiala (M-9878812888)

..... Appellant

.Vs

Public Information Officer,
O/o MARKFED, Punjab,
Sector 35, Chandigarh

First Appellate Authority
O/o MARKFED, Punjab,
Sector 35, Chandigarh

..... Respondent

APPEAL CASE NO. 2727 OF 2023

Present :- (i) Sh Shivam Goyal, on behalf of the appellant
(ii) For the respondent- PIO- Sh Pawan Narang, CIA (98153-28463)
Sh Subhash Kumar, Supdt. (98158-64848) Sh Shiv Kumar, SrAsstt. (98786-34594)
and Sh Baldev Krishan, S/M (99152-45207)

ORDER

This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 18.12.2026 vide which PIO's o/o Markfed, Chandigarh and O/o Markfed, Sangrur were directed to be present on the next date of hearing. Accordingly, the case was adjourned to be heard on 22.04.2026. Further, on the request of the appellant the case was pre-poned to be heard on 25.03.2026. However, on 25.03.2026 the case could not be heard and hence, was postponed to be heard on 29.04.2026, ie. today.

2. Sh Shivam Goyal- representative for the appellant states that the information pertaining to point no. 2 has not been provided to him. He adds that the information pertaining to point no. 2 is lying with the O/o Markfed, Chandigarh only.

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864120



Email: psic25@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: www.infocommpunjab.com

APPEAL CASE NO. 2727 OF 2023

3. The respondent-PIO states that he has brought the complete record, pertaining to point no. 2. Copy of the same is handed over to the appellant. The appellant has perused the same and states that he is satisfied with it.

4. Since the information stands provided therefore, no further cause of action is left. Therefore, the appeal case filed by the appellant is **disposed of and closed**. Copy of the orders be sent to the parties.

Sd/-

Date :29.04.2026

(Dr. Bhupinder S Batth)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab