



(Regd. Post) **Sh. Sukhjinder Singh (9464579553)** Appellant
S/o Sh. Major Singh,
R/o Village Puhla Patti,
Tehsil Nathana, District Bathinda.

Versus

(Regd. Post) **Public Information Officer**
O/o Executive Officer,
Nagar Panchayat & Block Development,
Nathana, District Bathinda.

(Regd. Post) **First Appellate Authority**
O/o Executive Officer,
Nagar Panchayat & Block Development,
Nathana, District Bathinda. Respondent

Appeal Case No.: 4734 of 2021
Through CISCO WEBEX

Present: Appellant – Sh. Sukhjinder Singh
Respondent: absent.

ORDER:

1. This case may be read with the reference to the previous order dated 01.03.2023 respondent PIO was absent and he was directed to supply an affidavit as per RTI application to the appellant within ten days after receipt of order with a copy to the Commission. He was also directed to appear in person on next date of hearing i.e. today.
2. In today's hearing, appellant is present and states that affidavit is pending as per previous order of the Commission dated 01.03.2023.
3. Respondent PIO is absent forth time without any intimation to the Commission. He was also absent on previous hearings held on 26.10.2022, 25.01.2023 and 01.03.2023 in spite of registered post notices and orders issued to him by the Commission time and again, which means he is not serious towards his duties as a public servant, which indeed a serious matter.
4. On hearing held on 25.01.2023, show cause notice was issued to him by the Commission but he did not bother to submit a reply to the notice till today.
5. From the material on record, it transpires that there has been unnecessary delay in conveying the correct State of affairs to the appellant in respect to his request for information. No explanation for delay has been given by him. Rather, his failure to even respond to the directions issued to him by the Commission reinforces the fact that he has been without any reasonable cause guilty of remissness in the discharge of his duties, therefore, deserves to be penalized.
6. In view of the defying attitude of the concerned respondent PIO, EO, Nagar Panchayat & Block Development Nathana, District Bathinda neither attending the court nor submitting any explanation for the directions issued to him within the time schedule as prescribed under the RTI Act 2005, the court comes to a logical conclusion that it is a fit case for the **imposition of penalty amounting to Rs. 10000/- (Rupees Ten thousand only) upon the concerned respondent PIO. However, taking a lenient view, I impose a penalty of Rs. 10,000/- (Rs. Ten thousand only) on the respondent PIO.** The Drawing and Disbursing Officer of the office of EO, Nagar Panchayat & Block Development Nathana, District Bathinda is directed to deduct the amount of penalty of Rs. 10000/- from the salary of the concerned respondent PIO and be deposited in the State Treasury in the following Head of Account and to report its compliance to the Commission:-

"0070-Other Administrative Services
60 other Services
800-Other Receipts
86-Fee under the RTI Act, 2005

Appeal Case No.: 4734 of 2021

Through CISCO WEBEX

7. Respondent PIO is directed to supply an affidavit in original as per RTI application duly attested by the competent authority to the appellant within ten days after receipt of this order with a copy to the Commission as per previous order of the Commission dated 01.03.2023.
8. To come up on **07.06.2023 at 11:00 AM for further proceedings in the Commission.**
Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Dated: 12.04.2023

**(Anumit Singh Sodhi)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab**