



Sh Sukhdev Singh, (M-887227782)  
Flat No 903/B, Green Lotus Avenue,  
Near Singhpura Chowk, Zirakpur

.....Appellant

**..Vs**

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o EO, Nagar Council, Lalru

**First Appellate Authority**  
O/o Principal Secretary,  
Local Govt, Pb,  
Sector-35,Chd

.....Respondent

**AC No.3953 of 2022**

Present: (i) Sh Vinay Kumar, advocate on behalf of the appellant  
(ii) for the respondent : Sh. Ashok Pathria, EO (99880-16700)

**ORDER**

This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 27.10.2022 vide which the Respondent-PIO was directed to provide information pertaining to point no's 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8.

2. Today, the Respondent states that, as directed in the previous hearing, they have provided the information pertaining to point no's 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8 to the Appellant.

3. Sh Vinay Kumar, Advocate is appearing on behalf of the Appellant today without any authority letter or Vakalatnama. He states that they have received the information however, he demands that the information pertaining to other points of the RTI be also provided to him.

4. After hearing both the parties and perusing the case file, it is ascertained that information relating to point no's 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8 has been provided to the Appellant. Regarding remaining information, the respondent states that the information cannot be provided to the appellant, as the same is third party information. This objection of the respondent is upheld. I relied upon the decision dated 13.11.2019 of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Civil Appeal No. 10044 of 2010 titled in Central Public Information Officer,

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,  
Sector 16, Chandigarh.  
Ph: 0172-2864115, Email: - [psic25@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic25@punjabmail.gov.in)  
Visit us: - [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)  
Helpline No. 0172-2864100



**AC No.3953 of 2022**

Supreme Court of India Vs. Subhash Chandra Aggarwal, regarding Right to Information Act, 2005 in which in para no. 59 of the above referred case had defined 'Personal Information' under the Right to Information Act 2005, the relevant part of the judgment is reproduced below:-

*"Reading of the aforesaid judicial precedents, in our opinion , would indicate that personal records, including name, address , Physical, mental and psychological status, marks obtained, grades and answer sheets, are all treated as personal information. Similarly, professional records, including qualification , performance , evaluation reports, ACRs, disciplinary proceedings, etc. Are all personal information. Medical records, treatment, choice of medicine, list of hospitals and doctors visited, findings recorded. Including that of the family members, information, relating to assets, liabilities, Income tax returns, details of the investments, lending and borrowing etc. are personal information. Such personal information is entitled to protection from unwarranted invasion of privacy and conditional access is available when stipulation of larger public interest is satisfied. This list is indicative and not exhaustive.*

5. Hence, the information seeks personal information of Rajesh Kumar, which cannot be provided to him as per above said law/directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. Therefore the present appeal filed by the applicant stands **disposed of and closed**. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Sd/-

**Chandigarh**  
**21.11.2022**

**(Amrit Partap Singh Sekhon)**  
**State Information Commissioner**  
**Punjab**