

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,  
Sector 16, Chandigarh.**

**Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100**

**Email: - [psic22@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in)**

**Visit us: - [www.infocompunjab.com](http://www.infocompunjab.com)**

**Sh. Sanjeev Goyal(9814197689)**

(Regd. Post) S/o Sh. Ashok Kumar,  
RTI Activist/Secy Grahak Jago)  
# 148, Model Town, Phase-I,  
Bathinda 151001.

Complainant

Versus

(Regd. Post) **Public Information Officer**  
O/o Improvement Trust, Bathinda

**Remanded Back**

(Regd. Post) **First Appellate Authority**  
O/o Improvement Trust, Bathinda

Encl. RTI application

Respondent

**Complaint Case No.: 4 of 2023**  
**Through CISCO WEBEX**

**Present:** Appellant: absent  
Respondent: Ms. Neeru Bala

**ORDER**

1. The RTI application is dated 30.06.2022 whereby the information-seeker has sought information as mentioned in his RTI application. He filed complaint in the Commission on 19.12.2022 under Section 18 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act).
2. Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for 04.05.2023 through hearing in the Commission but heard through CISCO Webex application.
3. In today's hearing, respondent, Ms. Neeru Bala states that information was sent to the complainant on 10.08.2022
4. Complainant, Sh. Sanjeev Goyal is not present for today's hearing in spite of registered post notice issued to him and no communication is received from him after filing this instant complaint case in the Commission.
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.: 4 of 2023**  
**Through CISCO WEBEX**

6. 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.
7. 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.
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**. Copies of this decision be sent to the parties **through registered post**.

**Dated: 04.05.2023**

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