



Sh. Harjit Singh Dhillon,
S/o Late Sh. Gurbax Singh,
R/o 4072/3, Gobind Colony,
Jamalpur, Distt. Ludhiana.

Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Municipal Corporation,
Zone-B, Ludhiana.

Respondent

Complaint Case Nos.128 &129 of 2019

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA	Date of Second Appeal/ Complaint
24.12.2018	Nil	Nil	Nil	29.01.2019 & 30.01.2019

Present:

Complainant- None.

Respondents- Sh.Jagroop Singh, SDO.

ORDER

The following order was made by the bench on 20.08.2019.

“As the appellant and the respondents are the same and the information sought essentially is identical, the single order shall dispose both the appeals.

The Commission had made following observations on 04.07.2019:

04.07.2019

The case has come up today. The respondents are absent. The Commission takes strong exception to the indifference shown by the respondents.

The PIO in the office of the respondents is hereby issued show cause notice to explain as to why a penalty @ Rs.250/- per day of delay subject to maximum of Rs.25,000/- till the complete information is furnished, be not imposed under Section 20(1) of RTI Act, 2005 on him for causing willful delay / denial of the information to the RTI applicant and why the compensation be not awarded to the Appellant under Section 19 (8) (b) of the Act for the detriment suffered by him.

Contd...pg...2



-2-

Complaint Case No.128&129/2019

In addition to the written reply, the respondents are also given an opportunity under Section 20 (1) proviso thereto, for a personal hearing before the imposition of such penalty on the next date of hearing. He may take note that in case he does not file his written reply and does not avail himself of the opportunity of personal hearing on the date fixed, it will be presumed that he has nothing to say and the Commission shall proceed to take further proceedings against him ex parte.

The case has again come up today. The appellant submits that he was present on the last hearing, however, he has been shown absent in the orders issued. The office admits that same has happened inadvertently and marks him present.

It is strange and intriguing that respondent has not bothered to file a reply much less appearing in person. A final opportunity is afforded to the respondent to apprise the complainant of the status of the case and file a written explanation to the Commission on the show cause notice issued to it.”

The case has come up today. Sh. Jagroop Singh, SDO, is present. He has sent a reply to the appellant. A copy of it has been endorsed to the Commission as well. The respondent has submitted that the offence as pointed in his application was compounded on 2017 and his connection was regularized after charging from him the applicable fees and penalty. The Commission feels that the appellant has been informed. The respondent regrets the delay. The Commission does not find any malafide in the issue. The appeal is **disposed**.

01.10.2019

**Sd/-
(Yashvir Mahajan)
State Information Commissioner**



Sh. Balwinder Singh,
S/o Sh. Hari Ram,
R/o House No.-42/2,
Sector-41-A, Chandigarh.

Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Director,
Rural Development and Panchayat Department,
Vikas Bhawan, Sector-62, SAS Nagar.

Respondent

Complaint Case No.298/2019

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA	Date of Second Appeal/ Complaint
07.02.2019	Nil	Nil	Nil	20.03.2019

Present: Complainant- Sh. Balwinder Singh.
Respondent- Smt. Nirmal Kaur, Superintendent.

ORDER:

The following order was made by the Commission on 20.08.2019:

18.07.2019:

"The respondents have endorsed a copy of the memo 23.05.2019 to this Commission originally sent to the complainant, enclosing therewith the certified copies of documents. They have sought adjournment of the hearing. The complainant says that the documents sent to him do not relate to his requisition. The Complainant is advised to convey as to what is the discrepancy, in writing, to which the respondents are desired to respond.

20.08.2019

The matter has come up today. The respondent is absent. The complainant asserts that the information pertaining to his representation dated 18.12.2018 has not been provided till date. The Commission takes an exception to the non-chalant and callous conduct of the respondents and directs them to file a satisfying response commensurate with the application of the complainant. Simultaneously, the PIO will explain the delay in providing the information."

The case has come up today. The respondents are present. They say that



-2-

Complaint Case No.298/2019

the information has since been provided to the appellant. The Commission has gone through the file. It seems that the complaint is motivated by some personal grudge and has nothing to do with public interest. Moreover regular enquiries by the department have already been held and he is making use of some proxies to settle his personal score. The complaint at its face seems vexatious and is directed to be filed.

Disposed.

01.10.2019

**Sd/-
(Yashvir Mahajan)
State Information Commissioner**