

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Madhya Marg, Sector 16, Chandigarh.

Ph: 0172-2864111, Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com,
Email: psic21@punjabmail.gov.in



FINAL ORDER

Suresh Sood,
S/o Sh. Dev Dutt Sood,
H. No. 329-330, Sood Street, Mohalla Sodra,
Moga.

Versus

Public Information Officer,
o/o Municipal Engineer, Jalandhar.
Public Information Officer,
o/o Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation, Moga.
First Appellate Authority,
Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation, Moga.

Appeal Case No. 1599 of 2022

PRESENT:


(Appellant) Absent

Sukhwinder Singh, XEN (for the Respondent) 98882-01787

ORDER:

(To be read in continuity with earlier orders on **21.9.2022, 10.11.2022, and 12.12.2022**)

1. The RTI application is dated **17.12.2021** vide which the appellant has sought information:



PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Madhya Marg, Sector 16, Chandigarh.

Ph: 0172-2864111, Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com,
Email: psic21@punjabmail.gov.in



Appeal Case No. 1599 of 2022

as enumerated in his RTI application. First Appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (FAA) on **18.1.2022** and Second Appeal was filed in the Commission on **1.4.2022** under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005. The case was last heard on **12.12.2022**.

2. The appellant is absent but has informed the Commission of his inability to attend this hearing. At the last hearing on 12.12.2022, the PIO-cum-Municipal Engineer, incumbent on the date of submission of this RTI application, Sh. Sukhwinder Singh was issued a Show Cause Notice to which he has submitted a written reply Dated 11.1.2023. At the last hearing on 12.12.2022, the respondent PIO's representatives Sh. Simarjeet Singh, SDO and Sh. Akshay Jindal, Building Inspector, had submitted a copy of reply sent to the appellant vide Letter No. 425/C Dated 27.10.2022, wherein the appellant was provided information for point no. 1 and 2 of the RTI application and remaining information was withheld since it was "voluminous" and accordingly the appellant was invited for inspection of the record. As per the respondent, the appellant did not come for inspection. It is notable here, that the appellant had informed the Commission that he is not prepared to undertake any physical inspection of records in the office of MC Moga.

3. In view of the above and Sh. Sukhinder Singh's reply cited above, this Appeal Case is **Disposed of**.

Sd/-
(ASIT JOLLY)
State Information Commissioner, Punjab.

Chandigarh
11.1.2023