



Sh Rajinder Kumar, S/o Sh. Mehar Chand,  
Ward No-2, Supreme Enclave,  
Near vishvkarma Bhawan,  
Link Road, Mansa.

...Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o Director, Local Govt,  
Sector-35, Chandigarh.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o Director, Local Govt, Pb  
Sector-35, Chandigarh.

.....Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 2128 of 2020**

**PRESENT:** Sh.Rajinder Kumar as the Appellant  
Sh.Jang Bahadar, Sr.Assistant O/o Local Govt.(Gen Branch) for the Respondent

**ORDER:**

The appellant through RTI application dated 13.05.2020 has sought information regarding decision taken vide resolution No.365 to 382 of general meeting dated 17.01.2020 of NC Mansa alongwith noting – resolution no.364 dated 29.11.2019 and other information concerning the office of Director , Local Govt. Punjab, Chandigarh. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 15.06.2020 which took no decision on the appeal. After filing first appeal, the PIO sent reply to the appellant vide letter dated 25.06.2020 stating that the matter is under consideration. On being not satisfied with the reply, the appellant filed 2<sup>nd</sup> appeal in the Commission on 10.08.2020.

The case was first heard on 02.12.2020. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information.

The respondent was absent. Having gone through the file, the Commission observed that the copy of the RTI application with the commission was not legible. The appellant was directed to send a legible copy of RTI application to the Commission.

The PIO was directed to relook at the RTI application and provide the information to the appellant as per the RTI application.

Sh.Jang Bahadur Singh, Sr.Assistant O/o Local Govt.(General Branch) appeared late and brought the information. A copy of the information was sent to the appellant with the order and the appellant was directed to point out the discrepancies, if any, in writing to the PIO and the PIO was directed to remove the same.

**Hearing dated 01.02.2021:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Mansa. As per last order, the appellant has pointed out the discrepancies. The respondent present informed that the information has already been sent to the appellant as per the RTI application and no further information is available in their record.

**Appeal Case No. 2128 of 2020**

Hearing both the parties, the PIO is directed to send a covering letter to the appellant mentioning point-wise details of information that has been provided as discussed during the hearing.

Secondly, If no other information is available on the matter, the PIO must give in writing on an affidavit that the information that has been provided is true, complete and no other information is available in the record.

To come up for further hearing on **12.05.2021 at 11.00 AM** through a video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Mansa. The PIO to appear at Chandigarh.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated 01.02.2021**

**Sd/-**  
**(KhushwantSingh)**  
**State Information Commissioner**

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden, Sector 16, Chandigarh.  
Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - [psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in)  
Visit us: - [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)



Sh Rajinder Kumar, S/o Sh. Mehar Chand,  
Ward No-2, Supreme Enclave,  
Near vishvkarma Bhawan,  
Link Road, Mansa.

...Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o Director, Local Govt, Pb  
Sector-35, Chandigarh.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o Director, Local Govt, Pb  
Sector-35,  
Chandigarh.

Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 2219 of 2020**

**PRESENT: Sh.Rajinder Kumar as the Appellant  
Sh.Jang Bahadar, Sr. Assistant O/o Local Govt.(Gen Branch) for the  
Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant through RTI application dated 11.05.2020 has sought information on 12 points regarding letter of the Director Local Govt No.17896 dated 28.04.2020 regarding meeting dated 17.01.2020 – letter No.149-50 dated 20.01.2020 - report of EO vide letter dated 24.01.2020 and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of Director , Local Govt. Punjab, Chandigarh. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 15.06.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case was first heard on 02.12.2020. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent was absent. Having gone through the file, the Commission observed that the copy of the RTI application that is with the commission was not legible. The appellant was directed to send a legible copy of RTI application to the Commission.

The PIO was directed to relook at the RTI application and provide the information to the appellant as per the RTI application.

Sh.Jang Bahadur Singh, Sr.Assistant O/o Local Govt.(General Branch) appeared late and brought the information. A copy of the information was sent to the appellant with the order and the appellant was directed to point out the discrepancies, if any, in writing to the PIO and the PIO was directed to remove the same.

**Hearing dated 01.02.2021:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Mansa. The appellant claims that the PIO has not provided the complete information on points-9,10,11 & 12. The respondent present informed that the information has already been sent to the appellant as per the RTI application and no further information is available in their record.

**Appeal Case No. 2219 of 2020**

The PIO is directed to give in writing on an affidavit that the information that has been provided is true, complete and no other information is available in the record.

To come up for compliance on **12.05.2021 at 11.00 AM** through a video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Mansa. The PIO to appear at Chandigarh.

**Chandigarh  
Dated 01.02.2021**

**Sd/-  
(Khushwant Singh)  
State Information Commissioner**



Sh Rajinder Kumar, S/o Sh. Mehar  
Chand, Ward No-2, Supreme Enclave,  
Near vishvkarma Bhawan,  
LinkRoad,Mansa.

...Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o Director, Local Govt, Pb  
Sector-35, Chandigarh.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o Director, Local Govt, Pb,  
Sector-35, Chandigarh.

Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 2220 of 2020**

**PRESENT:** Sh.Rajinder Kumar as the Appellant  
Sh.Satwinder Singh, Superintendent (LG-3) for the Respondent

**ORDER:**

The case was first heard on 02.12.2020. .The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information . The appellant further informed that his First Appeal dated 13.07.2020 had been returned back to him with the remarks of the postal authority “Refused by Under Secretary”.

The Commission observed that the Under Secretary, Local Govt. Punjab had refused to accept the first appeal in the present case and the trend has been observed in the previous cases.

Taking a strict view on the gross violation of an act of parliament, the Commission directed the Secretary, Local Govt. Department, Punjab to enquire into the matter that why RTI applications/appeals are being refused by the Under Secretary. To submit an enquiry report to the Commission on the matter before the next date of hearing.

A copy of the RTI application was sent to the authority with the direction to reply as per the RTI application as the appellant has shown dissatisfaction over the reply that has been sent. The matter be taken seriously and enquiry report be sent why appeals are being refused from receipt.

In the meantime, the appellant was directed to send a legible copy of the RTI application to the Commission.

**Hearing dated 01.02.2021:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Mansa. As per last order, the appellant has submitted a legible copy of RTI application.

I have relooked the RTI application and a copy of the same has been provided to the respondent. The PIO is directed to provide the information to the appellant within 15 days as per the RTI application and send a compliance report to the Commission.

**Appeal Case No. 2220 of 2020**

Regarding the refusal of RTI application and First appeal by the Under Secretary, Local Govt., the PIO has submitted a clarification which has been taken on the file of the Commission.

To come up for further hearing on **12.05.2021 at 11.00 AM** through a video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Mansa. The PIO to appear at Chandigarh.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated 01.02.2021**

**Sd/-**  
**(Khushwant Singh)**  
**State Information Commissioner**

**CC to :Secretary, Local Govt.Pb, Chandigarh**



Sh.Rakesh Parkash s/o Sh.Jagan Nath,  
R/o New Road, Kesar Vakilwali Gali,  
Mansa.

....Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o District Treasury Officer,  
Mansa.

...Respondent

**Complaint case No.473 of 2020**

**PRESENT: Sh.Rakesh Parkash as the Complainant  
Sh.Jagtar Singh, District Treasury Officer, Mansa for the Respondent**

**ORDER:** The complainant through RTI application dated 12.05.2020 has sought information regarding copies of Bills dated 26.02.2019, 12.07.2019, 25.04.2019, 22.10.2019, 6.11.2019, 8.05.2019, 21.06.2019, 20.09.2019 alongwith amount released from treasury against these bills –account number in which the amount was deposited, name of account holder– name of official responsible for deposit of amount in the account of account holder - and other information concerning the office of District Treasury Officer, Mansa. The complainant was not satisfied with the reply of the PIO dated 09.06.2020 after which the complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 27.07.2020.

On the date of last hearing on 02.12.2020, the respondent present informed that since the case is pending with Commissioner Cyber Crime Branch for enquiry, the information cannot be provided and the reply has already been sent to the complainant on 09.06.2020.

The complainant claimed that when the RTI application was filed, the record was available with the District Treasury office.

Having gone through the RTI application, reply of the PIO and hearing both the parties, it was settled that the PIO to provide whatever information is in his custody.

**Hearing dated 01.02.2021:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Mansa. The respondent pleaded that the bills that are being sought through the RTI application, after processing, are sent to the office of AG Punjab for payment, and the asked information is available with the office of AG Punjab.

Given the above, The PIO- AG Punjab is impleaded in the case and directed to look at the RTI application and file a suitable reply.

A copy of the RTI application is being sent alongwith the order to the PIO-AG Punjab.

To come up for further hearing on **12.05.2021 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Mansa. PIO-AG Punjab to appear at Chandigarh.

Chandigarh  
Dated:01.02.2021

Sd/-  
(KhushwantSingh)  
State Information Commissioner

CC to:PIO-O/o AG, Punjab,  
Sector 17, Chandigarh.



Sh. Rajinder Singh,  
H. No.463/3-A, Sector-53,  
Mohali.

.....Appellant

**Vs**

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o GMADA,  
Mohali.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o GMADA,  
Mohali.

.....Respondent

**Appeal case No.50 of 2020**

**PRESENT: Sh.Rajinder Sofat as the Appellant**  
**None for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant through RTI application dated 30.08.2019 has sought information regarding extension fee being charged after implementation of collector rates for residential plots in sector 69 Mohali – procedure for charging extension fee before implementation of collector rates – copy of decision taken in VidhanSabha – procedure for charging extension fee on commercial plots and other information concerning the office of GMADA Mohali. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 21.10.2019 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case was first heard on 16.09.2020. The respondent present pleaded that information has been supplied to the appellant vide letter dated 23.03.2020 with a copy submitted to the Commission. The Commission had received a copy of reply on 27.05.2020.

The appellant was absent nor has communicated any discrepancies. The appellant was directed to point out the discrepancies if any to the PIO with a copy to the Commission and the PIO was directed to relook at the RTI application and remove the discrepancies.

On the date of last hearing on 24.11.2020, the respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant informed that he has received the information but with a delay of more than one year.

The respondent claims that the RTI application was not received in their branch and once they received the notice of the Commission dated 20.02.2020 alongwith the RTI application, the information was supplied to the appellant vide letter dated 23.03.2020. The respondent was directed to provide an affidavit stating the above said statement i.e that their office did not receive this particular RTI application, reason for which it could not be tended to.

The PIO was also directed to investigate if the RTI application was received by the office, and how it failed to land on the desk of the concerned PIO. To file a detailed reply.



**Appeal case No.50 of 2020**

**Hearing dated 01.02.2021:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Mohali. The respondent is absent and vide email has sought exemption stating that the maximum staff of GMADA is on election duty. The PIO has also sent a list of persons on election duty which has been taken on the file of the Commission.

Earlier order stands. The case is adjourned.

To come up for further hearing on **12.05.2021 at 11.00 AM through video conference** facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Mohali.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated:01.02.2021**

**Sd/-**  
**(Khushwant Singh)**  
**State Information Commissioner**

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden, Sector 16, Chandigarh.**  
Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - [psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in) Visit us: -  
[www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)



Sh. Sohan Singh, s/o  
Sh. Sucha Singh,  
R/o Village Bara, P.O Pathreri Jattan,  
Tehsil & Distt. Roopnagar.

...Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o SDO, Sub Division,  
PSPCL, Sukhrampur,  
Distt. Ropar

.....Respondent

**Complaint case No. 1003 of 2019**

**PRESENT: Sh.Sohan Singh as the Complainant**  
**None for the Respondent**

**ORDER: Facts of the case:-**

That the complainant through RTI application dated 05.06.2019 has sought information regarding copy of entry register containing the tubewell connections provided in village Pathreri and village Pathreri Jattan and other information concerning the office of SDO Sub Division, PSPCL Sukhrampur. The complainant was not provided the information after which the complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 22.11.2019.

That the case first came up for hearing first on 12.03.2020. The complainant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent was absent. The PIO was directed to provide the information within 15 days and send a compliance report to the Commission.

Sh.Bawa Singh, respondent appeared late and informed that the appellant was asked vide letter dated 03.07.2019 to specify the period for which the information is required, but the appellant had not clarified. The respondent was directed to get the clarification from the appellant by contacting him on his phone No.9464869183 and provide the information as per the RTI application.

That on the date of hearing on **04.08.2020**, the appellant informed that the information provided by the PIO was not legible. The complainant also brought to the notice of the Commission that the record might be available in the computer.

The respondent was absent. The PIO was directed to provide a computer printout of the record to the complainant. The information to be provided within 15 days of the receipt of the order.

That on the date of hearing on **16.09.2020**, the complainant informed that the PIO has supplied information of 115 meters as against the electric meters of 148 installed in the village.

That the respondent was absent. The complainant was directed to inspect the record by fixing a mutually convenient date and time with the PIO and get the relevant information. The PIO was directed to allow inspection of the record to the complainant and provide the relevant information.

**Complaint Case No. 1003 of 2019**

That on the date of last hearing on 24.11.2020, the PIO was absent on 4<sup>th</sup> consecutive hearing nor had provided the information. Having gone through the record, the Commission observed that there has been an enormous delay in providing the information and gross violation of various orders of the Commission as well as the PIO has not appeared on 4<sup>th</sup> consecutive hearing.

Taking a serious view on this, the PIO was issued a **show cause notice under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 for not providing the information within the statutorily prescribed period of time and directed to file a reply on an affidavit.** If there are other persons responsible for the delay in providing the information, the PIO was directed to inform such persons of the show cause and direct them to appear before the Commission along with the written replies.

That the case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Mohali. The appellant claims that the PIO has not provided the complete information. The PIO is again absent, nor has replied to the show cause notice.

Keeping the above-mentioned facts of the case, it is clear that the PIO-SDO, Sub Division, PSPCL-Sukhrampur is flouting the spirit of the RTI Act continuously. The PIO has not only shown utter disregard for the Commission's repeated orders to provide the information but has shown willful stubbornness in not replying to the Show Cause and not appearing before the commission despite various orders of the Commission.

To secure an erring PIO's presence before the commission the Information Commission is empowered to issue warrants to Under Section 18(3) of the RTI Act. A bailable Warrant of the **PIO-SDO, Sub Division, PSPCL-Sukhrampur** is hereby issued through Senior Superintendent of Police, Rupnagar for his presence before the Commission on **15.03.2021**.

To come up for further hearing on **15.03.2021 at 11.00 AM**.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated:01.02.2021**

**Sd/-**  
**(Khushwant Singh)**  
**State Information Commissioner**

**BAILABLE WARRANT OF PRODUCTION  
BEFORE SHRI KHUSHWANT SINGH  
STATE INFORMATION COMMISSIONER, PUNJAB  
AT CHANDIGARH**

**In case: Sohan Singh V/s Public Information Officer-cum-SDO-  
Sub-Division, PSPCL, Sukhrampur, District Rupnagar**

**APPEAL CASE NO.1003 of 2019**

**UNDER SECTION 18 OF THE RIGHT TO INFORMATION ACT, 2005**

**Next Date of Hearing 15.03.2021**

To

**The Senior Superintendent of Police,  
Rupnagar**

Whereas PIO-cum-SDO-PSPCL, Sub-Division, Sukhrampur, District Rupnagar has failed to appear before the State Information Commissioner, Punjab despite the issuance of notice/summon in the above mentioned appeal case. Therefore, you are hereby directed to serve this bailable warrant to the PIO-cum-SDO-PSPCL, Sub-Division, Sukhrampur, District Rupnagar to appear before the undersigned at Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden, Sector 16, Chandigarh on **15.03.2021 at 11.00 A.M.**

**Chandigarh  
Dated:01.02.2021**

**(Khushwant Singh)  
State Information Commissioner**

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden, Sector 16, Chandigarh**  
**Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in**  
**Visit us: - [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)**



Sh.Harpal Singh, S/o Late Sh.Bawa Singh  
AliasBaru S/o Sh.Jetha,  
R/o Village Kumbra,  
Tehsil & Dist. Mohali

..... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o EO, GMADA,  
Mohali.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o EO. GMADA,  
Mohali.

Respondent

**Appeal case No.410 of 2020**

**PRESENT:       None for the Appellant**  
**Sh.Gagandeep Singh, clerk O/o-GMADA for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant through RTI application dated 05.09.2019 has sought information regarding providing of plots in lieu of land acquired Khasra No.429/2 relating to Sh.Bawa s/o Jethu – letter No.29620 dated 09.08.2018, letter No.26871 dated 18.07.2018, letter No.26919 dated 18.07.2018, letter no.29620 dated 09.08.2018, letter no.41308 dated 15.11.2018 etc. and other information concerning the office of EO-GMADA Mohali. The appellant was not satisfied with the information provided by the PIO vide letter dated 18.10.2018 after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 11.12.2019 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case was first heard on 16.09.2020. The respondent present pleaded that information has been supplied to the appellant vide letter dated 18.10.2019 with a copy submitted to the Commission.

The appellant stated that the information was not clear. The respondent informed that the information relates to the Estate Officer, GMADA.

The appellant was directed to point out the discrepancies in writing to the PIO with a copy to the Commission and the respondent was directed to remove the same. If the information is not in the custody of EO-GMADA, the respondent was directed to procure it from the concerned PIO and provide to the appellant.

On the date of last hearing on 24.1.2020, the appellant was absent and the vide letter received in the Commission on 23.11.2020 informed that the PIO has not provided the information.

As per respondent, the appellant had pointed out the discrepancies on 20.11.2020. The respondent assured to remove the discrepancies within 15 days. The PIO was directed to remove the discrepancies within 15 days and send a compliance report to the Commission.

**Appeal case No.410 of 2020**

**Hearing dated 01.02.2021:**

**The case** has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Mohali. The respondent pleaded that as per the facts of the case a reply has been sent to the appellant.

The appellant is absent. The case is adjourned.

To come up for further hearing on **12.05.2021 at 11.00 AM through a video conference** facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Mohali.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated:01.02.2021**

**Sd/-**  
**(KhushwantSingh)**  
**State InformationCommissioner**



Sh.Rajeshwar Sharma.  
Kothi No-584, Phase-4,  
Mohali.

...Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o GMADA,  
Mohali.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o GMADA,  
Mohali.

..... Respondent

**Appeal case No.3040 of 2019**

**PRESENT: Sh.Rajeshwar Sharma as the Appellant**  
**None for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant through RTI application dated 15.05.2019 has sought information regarding action taken on his request No.9880 dated 18.03.2019 and other information concerning the office of GMADA Mohali. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed a first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 20.06.2019 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case was first heard on 18.12.2019. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the complainant. The appellant was not satisfied and pleaded that he has sought action taken report on his application. The PIO was directed to relook at the RTI application and provide any document that is available on the action taken on the request of appellant.

The case was again heard on **24.02.2020**. Both the parties were absent. The case was adjourned.

On the date of hearing on **16.09.2020**, the respondent present pleaded that the information has already been provided to the appellant. The appellant was absent and vide email pointed out the discrepancies, a copy of which was sent to the PIO and the PIO was directed to remove the discrepancies.

On the date of last hearing on 24.11.2020, the respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant. As per appellant, the reply was not as per the RTI application.

Hearing both the parties, the PIO was directed to provide all notings/documents that have been created to arrive at the decision that has been supplied to the appellant. The appellant was directed to visit the office of the PIO by fixing a mutually convenient time and resolve the matter.

**Appeal case No.3040 of 2019**

**Hearing dated 01.02.2021:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Mohali. The respondent is absent and vide email has sought exemption stating that the maximum staff of GMADA is on election duty. The PIO has also sent a list of persons on election duty which has been taken on the file of the Commission.

Earlier order stands. The case is adjourned. The PIO is directed to bring the complete file concerning this particular RTI application at the next date of hearing.

To come up for further hearing on **12.05.2021 at 11.00 AM** through a video conference facility available in the office of **Deputy Commissioner, Mohali**.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated 01.02.2021**

**Sd/-**  
**(KhushwantSingh)**  
**State Information Commissioner**



**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden, Sector 16, Chandigarh.**  
**Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in Visit**  
**us: - [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)**



Sh. Kesar Singh Sekhon,  
Flat No-104/B-5, Pb Premium Apartment,  
Sector-88, Mohali.

...Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o GMADA,  
Mohali.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o GMADA,  
Mohali

.....Respondent

**Appeal Case No.3671 of 2019**

**PRESENT: None for the Appellant**  
**Sh.Gulshan Kumar, the then PIO-GMADA for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The case was first heard on 28.01.2020. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant was not satisfied and stated that the PIO has not provided the information as per the RTI application.

Having gone through the RTI application and the information that has been provided, the Commission observed that the appellant had asked whether the amenities which were mentioned in the brochure of 2011 were actually being provided and operational. The PIO had however, not applied his mind while supplying the information and correct information was not supplied. The PIO was directed to relook at the RTI application and provide the information as per the RTI application within ten days.

The case was last heard on **03.03.2020**. As per appellant, the information was not provided. The respondent was absent. Due to delay in providing the information, the PIO was issued a **show cause notice under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 and directed to file a reply on an affidavit**. The PIO was again directed to provide information within 15 days of the receipt of the order.

On the date of last hearing on **16.09.2020**, the respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information that was sought in the RTI application.

Hearing both the parties, the Commission observed that the appellant had basically asked for amenities to be provided as per brochure. The PIO was directed to relook at the RTI application and provide complete information. The PIO however, did not file any reply to the show cause notice issued on 03.03.2020. The PIO was given one last opportunity to file reply to the show cause notice.

On the date of last hearing on 24.11.2020, Sh.Gulshan Kumar, the then PIO was present and informed that he has sent a reply to the show cause notice on an affidavit.

## Appeal Case No.3671 of 2019

The Commission had received an affidavit regarding reply to the show cause notice which has been taken on the file of the Commission. In the said affidavit, the PIO stated that the delay was on the part of concerned Superintendent-cum-APIO Smt.Kanwaljit Kaur and DE(PH-2) Sh.Varun Garg of Engineering Wing.

The appellant was absent. The PIO was directed to give a detailed reply to the show cause notice issued for delay in providing the information. The PIO was also directed to ensure that the information has been provided to the appellant as per last order of the Commission.

### **Hearing dated 01.02.2021:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Mohali. Sh.Gulshan Kumar, the then PIO-GMADA informed that the delay was on the part of Superintendent-cum-APIO as he had transferred the RTI application to the APIO u/s 5(4) of the RTI Act on 13.05.2019. The respondent further informed that the information has already been provided to the appellant.

The appellant is absent on 2<sup>nd</sup> consecutive hearing. The case is adjourned.

To come up for further hearing on **12.05.2021 at 11.00 AM** through a video conference facility available in the office of **Deputy Commissioner, Mohali**.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated:01.02.2021**

**Sd/-**  
**(Khushwant Singh)**  
**State Information Commissioner**