



Sh.Yogesh Mahajan,  
Opposite Water Tank, Municipal Market,  
Mission Road, Pathankot.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o XEN, Water Supply and Sanitation Division,  
Fatehgarh Sahib.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o SE, Water supply and Sanitation Division,  
Patiala.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 576 of 2020**

**PRESENT:   None for the Appellant**  
**Sh.Gopal Rai, SDO O/o Water Supply & Sanitation Div for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant through RTI application dated 01.11.2019 has sought information regarding Grants received and utilized by the divisions from 01.10.2018 to 01.11.2019 –work order booked, other work for which no tender called and other information concerning the office of XEN, Water Supply and Sanitation Division, Fatehgarh Sahib. . The appellant was asked by the PIO vide letter dated 18.11.2019 to deposit requisite fee of Rs.2350/- after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 10.12.2019 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case came up for hearing first on 08.07.2020 through video conferencing at DAC Fatehgarh Sahib. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 01.07.2020. The appellant was absent and vide email informed that he has not received the information.

There might be postal delay and the information might not have been received by the appellant. Once the information is received, the appellant was directed to point out the discrepancies to the PIO with a copy to the Commission and the PIO was directed to remove the discrepancies.

**Hearing dated 02.09.2020:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Fatehgarh Sahib.

The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant vide email has informed that he has received the information till date.

Since the information has been provided, no further course of action is required. The case is **disposed off and closed**.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated 02.09.2020**

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



Sh.Yogesh Mahajan,  
Opposite Water Tank, Municipal Market,  
Mission Road, Pathankot.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o XEN, Water Supply and Sanitation Division,  
Fatehgarh Sahib.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o SE, Water supply and Sanitation Division,  
Patiala

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 582 of 2020**

**PRESENT:   None for the Appellant**  
**Sh.Gopal Rai SDO, O/o Water Supply & Sanitation Div for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant through RTI application dated 01.11.2019 has sought information regarding Grants received and utilized by the divisions from 01.10.2018 to 01.11.2019 and other information concerning the office of XEN, Water Supply and Sanitation Division, Fatehgarh Sahib. . The appellant was asked by the PIO vide letter dated 18.11.2019 to deposit requisite fee of Rs.2350/- after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 10.12.2019 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case came up for hearing first on 08.07.2020 through video conferencing at DAC Fatehgarh Sahib. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 01.07.2020. The appellant was absent and vide email informed that he has not received the information.

There might be postal delay and the information might not have been received by the appellant. Once the information is received, the appellant was directed to point out the discrepancies to the PIO with a copy to the Commission and the PIO was directed to remove the discrepancies.

**Hearing dated 02.09.2020:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Fatehgarh Sahib.

The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant vide email has informed that he has received the information till date.

Since the information has been provided, no further course of action is required. The case is **disposed off and closed**.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated 02.09.2020**

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



Sh. Jatinder Pal Singh, S/o Sh. Nidhan Singh,  
VPO New Sullar, # 105,  
Tehsil & Distt Patiala.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o XEN, PSPCL,  
East Division, Patiala.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o XEN, PSPCL,  
East Division, Patiala.

... Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 2356 of 2019**

**PRESENT: Sh. Jatinder Pal Singh as the Appellant**  
**Sh. Amandeep Singh, Sr. Xen for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The case was first heard on 04.11.2019. The appellant pleaded that the PIO has not provided the complete information. The respondent was absent. Having gone through the RTI application and the information provided by the PIO vide letter dated 12.04.2019, the following was concluded:

- |                |  |
|----------------|--|
| - Points-1 & 2 | - Sufficiently replied and information provided  |
| - Point-3      | - Incomplete reply. The PIO to relook and provide Information                            |
| - Point-4      | - If there is any department enquiry which has been conducted, to provide enquiry report |
| - Point-5      | - The information is not covered under the ambit of the information as per the RTI Act.  |

The case was again heard on **14.01.2020**. Both the parties were absent. The PIO was given one more opportunity to comply with the earlier order of the Commission and directed to provide the complete information to the appellant.

On the date of hearing on **03.03.2020**, the appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information as per order of the Commission. The respondent was absent on 3<sup>rd</sup> consecutive hearing nor had complied with the order of the Commission. The PIO was issued a **show cause notice under Section 20 of the RTI Act and directed to file reply on an affidavit.**

**On the last date of hearing on 05.08.2020 which was held** through video conferencing at DAC Patiala, the respondent pleaded that the information on points 3 & 4 has been provided. The appellant was not satisfied with the reply on point-3. Hearing both the parties, the PIO was directed to give an affidavit regarding point-3 that the information that has been provided is true, complete and no other information is available.

The reply to the show cause notice was not received. The PIO was directed to submit reply to the show cause notice on an affidavit.

The Commission also observed that the appellant had to suffer undue inconvenience to get the information and directed the PIO to pay an amount of **Rs.3000/-** via demand draft drawn through Govt. Treasury as compensation to the appellant for the loss and detriment suffered by him of having to file the appeals and not getting information in time. The PIO was directed to duly inform the Commission of the compliance of the order and submit proof of having compensated the appellant.

**Hearing dated 02.09.2020:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. The respondent present pleaded that in compliance with the order of the Commission, complete information has been provided to the appellant and compensation amount of Rs.3000/- has also been paid to the appellant vide demand draft No.606981 dated 18.08.2019. The respondent has also sent an acknowledgement of the appellant having received the information and compensation amount on 19.08.2020. In the said acknowledgement letter, the appellant has stated that he has received the information and demand draft of Rs.3000/- and does not want to pursue his case further.

The commission has also received reply to the show cause notice from the PIO on 19.08.2020 which has been taken on the file of the Commission.

I have gone through the reply and accepts the plea of the PIO. The show cause is dropped.

Information stands provided. Compensation has been paid. No further course of action is required.

The case is **disposed off and closed.**

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated:02.09.2020**

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

**CC to 1.Sr.Xen, Distribution Division,**  
**Model Town, Patiala**

**2. Asstt.Engineer, East Technical Sub-Div,**  
**PSPCL, Patiala.**



Sh. Jarnail Singh, S/o Sh Thakur Singh,  
R/o 23/14, Anand Nagar-B,  
Tipri, Patiala

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o SDO, Distribution Sub Division,  
Kalyan, PSPCL, Patiala.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o East Division, PSPCL,  
Patiala.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 199 of 2020**

**PRESENT:** Sh.Jarnail Singh as the Appellant  
Sh.Ajaib Singh, SDO Operation PSPCL Kalyan for the Respondent

**ORDER:**

The appellant through RTI application dated 20.08.2019 has sought information regarding application of Karamjit Kaur alongwith other documents – proof of ownership of land, submitted for electric connection installed in her name in front of Govt. School Patiala and other information concerning the office of SDO Distribution Sub Division, Kalyan. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 14.11.2019 which took no decision on the appeal. After filing appeal, the PIO sent reply to the appellant vide letter dated 25.11.2019 stating that the information being 3<sup>rd</sup> party, it cannot be provided.

The case first came up for hearing on 08.07.2020 through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. The respondent present pleaded that the information is 3<sup>rd</sup> party and cannot be provided. The respondent however, had not issued notice to the 3<sup>rd</sup> party for calling its consent.

The appellant had asked for information regarding electric connection installed in the name of Karamjit Kaur alleging that the tubewell connection granted to Karamjit Kaur is on his land and he is seeking the information to check the record. The 3<sup>rd</sup> party Mrs.Karamjit Kaur was impleaded in the case and directed to appear before the Commission on the next date of hearing and plead its case.

**Hearing dated 02.09.2020:**

The respondent present pleaded that since the information is 3<sup>rd</sup> party, it cannot be provided.

At the last hearing, the 3<sup>rd</sup> party Mrs. Karamjit Kaur was impleaded and directed to appear before the Commission to plead her case. The 3<sup>rd</sup> party is absent.

Having gone through the file, the Commission observes that since the documents that have been sought by the appellant is a public record and these documents were submitted by the applicant to the public authority for getting electric connection, the PIO is directed to provide both the documents to the appellant within 15 days and send a compliance report to the Commission.

With the above order, the case is **disposed off and closed.**

**Sd/-**

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated 02.09.2020**

**(Khushwant Singh)**  
**State Information Commissioner**



Sh. Shangara Singh, S/o Sh Tulsa Singh,  
R/o HO-66-C, Urban Estate,  
Phase-3, Patiala.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o PDA,  
Patiala.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o Chief Administrator,  
PDA, Patiala.

... Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 3926 of 2019**

**PRESENT:   None for the Appellant**  
**Ms. Jaspal Kaur, Superintendent-PDA Patiala for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**       The appellant through RTI application dated 27.05.2019 has sought information regarding unauthorized gates constructed in Urban Estate Phase-1 to 3, notices issued to the allottees for removal of unauthorized gates, action taken for not following the rules from the office of PIO-PDA Patiala. The appellant was not satisfied with the information provided by the PIO vide letter dated 22.07.2019 after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 08.08.2019 which disposed off the appeal on 29.08.2019.

On the date of first hearing on 19.02.2020, the respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant on 22.07.2019 and again on 29.08.2019 and a copy of the same submitted to the Commission. The appellant was not satisfied with the information regarding point-1. The respondent stated that since no survey was conducted for demolition of the gates, there is no record available.

Having gone through the RTI application, information provided by the PIO and hearing both the parties, the PIO was directed to reconsider point-1. And if there is any information and if any survey was conducted for unauthorized gates, it be provided. If no record is available and no such survey has been conducted, the same be provided on an affidavit.

The case was last heard on **08.07.2020**. The respondent present pleaded that the record was traced out and the information (13 pages) regarding unauthorized gate has been sent to the appellant on 02.07.2020. The respondent further informed that they have spoken the appellant on telephone and the appellant stated that he has received the information and will communicate the discrepancy if any. The appellant was directed to communicate the discrepancies in the information if any in writing.

**Hearing dated 02.09.2020:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. The respondent present informed that the information has been provided to the appellant and the appellant has not communicated any discrepancies.

The appellant is absent. It is presumed that the appellant has received the information and is satisfied.

Since the information has been provided, no further course of action is required. The case is **disposed off and closed**.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated 02.09.2020**

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

Sh Azad Kumar, S/o Sh B.N Sharma,  
# 49-B, Partap Nagar, Patiala.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o Deputy Chief Engineer/ HR & Admin,  
The Mall, Opp Kali Devi Mandir,  
Shakti Sadan, PSTCL, Patiala.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o Chief Engineer/TS. PSTCL,  
Patiala.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 1070 of 2019**

**PRESENT:   None for the Appellant**  
**Sh.H.S.Bindra, SE(Communication), PSTCL-Ludhiana )   for the**  
**Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant through RTI application dated 30.07.2018 has sought information on 9 points regarding action taken on the legal advice of the legal advisor PSEB dated 06.12.1990 as well as action taken on application dated 02.04.2018 addressed to CMD who marked on 05.04.2018 with the remarks "Put up with file" – action taken on order dated 17.07.2017 – copy of speaking order – order of appointment as work charge – office order of appointment as work charge telephone – interview conducted for telephone mechanic – copy of memo dated 02.08.2006 – copy of memo dated 15.03.1993 – copy of office order No.101/CE/TS from the office of Deputy Chief Engineer/ HR & Admin, The Mall, PSTCL, Patiala.. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed a first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 14.09.2018, which took no decision on the appeal.

The case was first heard on 27.06.2019. Since the appellant was not satisfied with the information provided by the PIO, hearing both the parties, following was concluded:

- Regarding point-1 & 4, the respondent pleaded that the information is not available since the record is not traceable. However, the Commission will not consider the record missing or destroyed until an enquiry is conducted which establishes that the record is missing or destroyed. The respondent to conduct an enquiry and submit complete enquiry report on an affidavit.
- The information on points 2 & 3 stands provided to the best possible extent.
- Regarding points 5 to 8, the appellant to inspect the record on the date fixed i.e. on 16.07.2019 at 11.00 AM. The PIO to allow the inspection and provided the information.
- Regarding point-9, the PIO to provide the information.

On the next date of hearing on **27.08.2019**, the respondent present pleaded as per correspondence done with the concerned officer, the record is not traceable. However, the available information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant was not satisfied. The Commission also received a letter diary No.15729 on 19.08.2019 of the PIO whereby the PIO had given point-wise reply which was taken on the file of the Commission. The case was adjourned.

The case was again heard on **02.12.2019**. The respondent present pleaded that the available information has been provided to the appellant and no other document is available in their record since the file is not traceable. As per appellant, the information might lie in the file bearing No.CE/TS/ME-137 and in the custody of Superintending Engineer, Personnel, PSTCL Patiala.

The Superintending Engineer, Personnel, PSTCL Patiala was impleaded in the case and directed to make this file available at the next date of hearing in the Commission. If the file is not traceable as suggested in the earlier communication, appropriate reply be given to the Commission as to the reasons for not traceable of this file.

On the next date of hearing on **04.03.2020**, the respondents present pleaded that the file is not traceable and they are trying to locate the same. Both the respondents sought some more time to trace the file. The plea was accepted and the case was adjourned. The Commission however, made clear that if the file is not traced, the Commission will be constrained to order a full-fledged enquiry to trace the record.

The case was last heard on **08.07.2020**. The respondent present pleaded that the file has been traced and the available information has been provided to the appellant. The respondent further pleaded that if the appellant is not satisfied, he can inspect the file and get the relevant information.

The appellant was directed to contact Sh.Manpreet Singh Kang, SDO in the office of PSPCL Patiala on 15.07.2020 at 11.00 AM and inspect the record and get the relevant information. The PIO was directed to allow inspection of the record and provide relevant information as per RTI Act.

**Hearing dated 02.09.2020:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC, Patiala. The respondent present pleaded that the appellant had inspected the record on 17.07.2020 and as per order of the Commission, the relevant information that were specified by the appellant after inspecting the record, has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 22.07.2020. The appellant has also acknowledged having received the information.

The appellant is absent nor has communicated any discrepancies. If any discrepancy is found, the appellant is directed to point out to the PIO and the PIO is directed to remove the same.

With the above order, the case is **disposed off and closed**.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated 02.09.2020**

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

CC to : 1. Superintending Engineer, Personnel,  
PSPCL Patiala.

2. Superintending Engineer, Communication,  
PSTCL,Ludhiana.