



**Sh. Jagroop Singh, (9779263988)**

S/o Sh. Baldev Singh,  
Village Mahila Jai Singh, Tehsil Patti, Distt. Tarn Taran.

**Versus**

.....Appellant/Complainant

**Public Information Officer**

O/o The Joint Development Commissioner,  
Rural Development and Panchayats, Punjab,  
Social Audit Unit, MGNREGA, Sector 62, Mohali.

.....Respondent

**First Appellate Authority**

O/o The Joint Development Commissioner,  
Rural Development and Panchayats, Punjab,  
Social Audit Unit, MGNREGA, Sector 62, Mohali.

**Appeal Case No. 327, 336 and 337 of 2022**

Present: Appellant: Sh. Baldev Singh on behalf of Sh. Jagroop Singh

Respondent: Sh. Jaswitnder Singh (Panchayat Secretary)

**ORDER (Second Hearing):**

1. This order may be read with the reference of previous order of the Commission dated 06.06.2022 which was by Ld. SIC Sh. Sanjiv Garg . As both the parties are same in above mentioned cases therefore a single speaking order is being passed.
2. Both the parties are present for hearing today. Respondent, Sh. Jaswitnder Singh stated that sought information cannot be provided to the appellant as it is a third party information.
3. Keeping in view the facts of the case and with regard to information sought relating to copies of educational qualification of Ms. Mandeep Kaur, Sh. Sukhbir Singh and Harbinder Singh , the Commission referred to the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Girish Ramchandra Deshpande vs. Central Information Commission & ors. SLP(C) No. 27734 of 2012 dated 03/10/2012 wherein it was held as under:

*"13.....The performance of an employee/officer in an organization is primarily a matter between the employee and the employer and normally those aspects are governed by the service rules which fall under the expression "personal information", the disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or public interest. On the other hand, the disclosure of which would cause unwarranted invasion of privacy of that individual. Of course, in a given case, if the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer of*

**Appeal Case No. 327, 336 and 337 of 2022**

*the Appellate Authority is satisfied that the larger public interest justifies the disclosure of such information, appropriate orders could be passed but the petitioner cannot claim those details as a matter of right."*

4. The disclosure of such information is not in the public interest as the appellant has asked for the information for promotion of his personal interest. Therefore, the PIO is justified in denying the information sought, u/s 8(1)(j) of the Act.

Accordingly the above mentioned cases are **disposed of and closed.**

Chandigarh  
17.10.2022

Sd/-  
(Maninder Singh Patti)  
State Information Commissioner, Punjab