

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
RED CROSS BUILDING, NEAR ROSE GARDEN,
SECTOR 16, CHANDIGARH.**

Ph: 0172-2864116, Email: - psic26@punjabmail.gov.in

Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com, Cisco Webex Code:15857-23975

Helpline No.0172-2864100(From 10.00 AM to 04.00 PM on working days)



Shri Ankit Grover,
Opp. Govt. School, Village Jandwala,
Bhimeshah, Fazilka.

.....Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer
O/o Director,
Local Govt., Punjab, Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority
O/o Director,
Local Govt., Punjab, Chandigarh.

....Respondents

AC No. 4982 of 2022

Present: i) **Shri Ankit Grover, appellant in person.**
ii) **Shri Kuldip Singh, Superintendent/PIO, and Smt. Sarabjit Kaur, Sr. Assistant, General Branch, O/o Director, Local Govt., Punjab, Chandigarh-in person.**

ORDER:

1. The RTI application is dated 18.07.2022 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter FAA) on 24.08.2022 and the second appeal was filed in the Commission on 28.10.2022 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act).
2. The notice of hearing was issued to the parties for 20.12.2022. Accordingly, the case has been heard today. Shri Ankit Grover, appellant comes present to attend the hearing in person before the Bench and states that he has not received information.
3. Shri Kuldip Singh, Superintendent, and Smt. Sarabjit Kaur, Senior Assistant, General Branch, O/o Director, Local Govt., Punjab, Chandigarh come present in person before the Bench. The PIO states that point-wise information has been supplied to the appellant vide letter dated 16.12.2022, with a copy to the Commission.
4. The appellant denies the receipt of information. He is handed over a copy of the same in the court itself. Then on the asking of the Bench, Smt. Sarabjit Kaur explains reply to each point and states that out of eight points, some of the points relate to Municipal Council, Fazilka and some of these relate to Legal Branch in the office of Director, Local Government, Punjab who have separate PIOs.
5. The Bench, on perusal of reply of the PIO and as per version of the respondents, the Bench observes there are more than one PIO involved in the present appeal case.

6. The Bench observes that the PIO has made efforts to collect, collate and for compilation of information. The Bench, however, is of the view that the appellant cannot seek information in single RTI application from multiple public authorities. A Full Bench of State Information Commission, Punjab has in Complaint Case No.2903 of 2011 decided on 13.01.2012, ruled as under:-

“We hold that under Section (3) of the Act *ibid*, the legal obligation of a PIO who receives a request for information under Section 6(1) of the Act is limited to transfer this request to only one public authority that hold the information. This obligation does not extend to transfer the request to multiple authorities.

7. The Bench further observes that the information asked for by the appellant has to be collected, collated and compiled, thereby resulting in wastage of time of multiple PIOs involved. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in matter of CBSE vs. Aditya Bandopadhyay, (2011) 8 SCC 497, held as under:-

“67. Indiscriminate and impractical demands or directions under the RTI Act for disclosure of all and sundry information (unrelated to transparency and accountability in the functioning of public authorities and eradication of corruption) would be counterproductive as it will adversely affect the efficiency of the administration and result in the executive getting bogged down with the non-productive work of collecting and furnishing information. The Act should not be allowed to be misused or abused, to become a tool to obstruct the national development and integration, or to destroy the peace, tranquility and harmony among its citizens. Nor should it be converted into a tool of oppression or intimidation of honest officials striving to do their duty. The nation does not want a scenario where 75% of the staff of public authorities spends 75% of their time in collecting and furnishing information to applicants instead of discharging their regular duties. The threat of penalties under the RTI Act and the pressure of the authorities under the RTI Act should not lead to employees of a public authorities prioritizing “information furnishing”, at the cost of their normal and regular duties.

8. In view of the above, it does not seem to be appropriate for the appellant to seek information which may entail engaging 75% of the employees of a public authority to collect and compile the information for furnishing the same to the appellant. The Bench advises the appellant to go for seeking information by filing separate RTI application before a specific public authority who has its separate PIO.

9. With the aforesaid discussions, **the instant appeal case is disposed off and closed.**

Copies of the order be sent to the concerned parties.

**Chandigarh
20.12.2022**

**Sd/-
(Lt Gen Ajae Kumar Sharma(Retd))
State Information Commission, Punjab**