



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, Faterhgarh 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

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



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 3rd 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 Raj Singh, S/o Shlshar Singh,
R/o Village Todarwal, P.O Babarpur,
Tehsil Nabha, Distt Patiala

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o SSP,
Patiala.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o IGP, Patiala Range,
Patiala.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1635 of 2019

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
Sh.Hakam Singh, ASI for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on 14.11.2019. The respondent present pleaded that the enquiry in both the cases has been completed and the reports alongwith complete files have been submitted in the courts of Sh.Randeep Kumar, Judicial Magistrate (1st Class)Patiala. The reply has been sent to the appellant. The respondent further informed that the appellant is satisfied with the reply and has agreed to get the information from the concerned court. The appellant had however, asked for supply of copy of FIR only which they will send to the appellant through registered post. The appellant was absent and telephonically had asked for adjournment.

The case was again heard on **23.01.2020**. The respondent pleaded that the appellant be asked to inspect the record and get the relevant information. The appellant had agreed for the same. The appellant was directed to inspect the record by fixing a mutually convenient date and time and get the relevant information. The PIO was directed to allow inspection and provide the information as per the RTI Act before the next date of hearing.

The case was again heard on **17.02.2020**. The appellant informed that despite visiting the office of PIO for three times, the PIO had not provided the record for inspection. The respondent present pleaded that since the enquiry has been completed and the report alongwith complete record has been presented in the court, the information cannot be provided. The copy of FIR was provided to the appellant during the hearing. The respondent was directed to send appropriate reply to the appellant that why information on other points is being denied. The reply to be sent within a week.

On the next date of hearing on **02.03.2020**, the respondent present pleaded that as per report of SHO, Police Station Tripti Patiala, the enquiry in both the FIR cases has been completed and final report has been filed in the court. The reply has been sent to the appellant.

The appellant was absent. The case was adjourned.

Appeal Case No. 1635 of 2019

On the last date of hearing on **05.08.2020 which was** held through video conferencing at DAC Patiala, the appellant informed that as per the claim of the police, he had sought documents from the concerned court where the said challan had been presented. The appellant claimed that the court had provided some documents, but denied the remaining documents on the grounds that the remaining documents are not part of the judicial file.

Henceforth, The PIO was directed to provide the remaining documents, which are in the custody of the police. It was also made clear that if the PIO is unable to provide the information that has been sought, the Commission will be constrained to conduct an enquiry as to where the rest of the documents are-since the police is claiming that they are now part of the judicial file, whereas the court has replied that it has only some documents on the file which have been sought .

Hearing dated 02.09.2020:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. The respondent present pleaded that point-wise reply has been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 27.07.2020 with a copy to the Commission. As per respondent, following reply has been sent to the appellant:

- Point-1 : Copy of FIR provided in the court on 17.02.2020
- Point-2 : No enquiry was conducted
- Point-3 : No statement available in the record
- Point-4 : Information cannot be provided
- Point-5 : Presented in the court
- Point-6 : Cannot be provided
- Point-7 : Provided
- Point-8 : Cannot be provided
- Point-9 : Cannot be provided

I have gone through the reply of the PIO and find that the RTI application has been sufficiently addressed. However, the PIO has simply denied the information on points 4,6 8 & 9 and has not given any reasons and under which section has he denied the information. The PIO is directed to explain specific reasons for denial of information on points, and under which section the information has been denied. If the information on any point is not available in the record, the PIO is give in writing on an affidavit.

To come up for further hearing on **26.10.2020 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Patiala.

Chandigarh
Dated: 02.09.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh. Ajay Nand / Ajay Kumar Mehta,
C-118, East Mohan Nagar,
Chamrang Road, Amritsar.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Managing Director, PSPCL,
Patiala.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Chairman-cum-Managing Director,
PSPCL, Patiala.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 190 of 2020

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
Sh.Ravi Kathuria, Addl.SE , PSPCL for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on 08.07.2020 through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. The respondent present pleaded that the information has already been supplied to the appellant vide letter dated 20.09.2019, 25.09.2019 & 01.10.2019. The appellant was not satisfied and pleaded that the information is incomplete.

Hearing both the parties, following was discussed and concluded:

- Point-1 & 2 - The respondent stated that the information is available online. The appellant pleaded that the information be provided to him in physical form. The bench made clear that once the information has been declared suo-moto by the public authority and is available on the website in electronic form, the information is no longer held up by the authority. The appellant was advised to download the information from the website of the public authority.
- Point-3 - The respondent stated that the information has been sent to the appellant. The respondent is directed to send the information once again to appellant. The information be sent via registered post.
- Point-4 - The respondent pleaded that the information sought under point 4 is in a very vague form and since there are numerous agreements that the PSPCL has entered to procure electricity. The respondent pleaded that the appellant be directed to ask for specific agreements as otherwise it would become very tedious to put together information, which in turn will divert the human resources of the department.

The respondent is directed to send a list of all the agreements that have been made to the appellant. The appellant on receiving such a list may ask for ten agreement copies of his choice. They are to be provided free of cost.

- Point-5 - The respondent replied that the information was procured from the concerned department and provided to the appellant. The appellant has expressed his satisfaction so no further course of action is required.

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 information on point-3 has been sent to the appellant. A list of all the agreements regarding point-4 has also been sent to the appellant but the appellant has not specified the copies of the ten agreements.

The appellant is absent and vide letter received in the Commission on 27.08.2020 has sent his observations which is taken on the file of the Commission. Having gone through the RTI application, the Commission observes that the information that the appellant wants through point-3 is that in what proportion (commercial or domestic) does PSPCL use the electricity it produces on its own and the one that it purchases privately. The respondent informed that there is no such formula because once the electricity is sent to the grid, it is simply distributed.

However, as discussed during the hearing, the PIO is directed to provide if there is any document on record which specifies the system of distribution/supply of electricity to residential and commercial users from the self generated and privately procured electricity.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **19.10.2020 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Patiala.

Chandigarh
Dated 02.09.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



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 3rd 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 3rd party and cannot be provided. The respondent however, had not issued notice to the 3rd 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 3rd 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 3rd party, it cannot be provided.

At the last hearing, the 3rd party Mrs. Karamjit Kaur was impleaded and directed to appear before the Commission to plead her case. The 3rd 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.**

Chandigarh
Dated 02.09.2020

Sd/-
(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.

Appeal Case No. 1070 of 2019

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.

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



Sh. Ranjit Singh, S/o Sh Ram Singh,
VPO Galwati, Police Station, SadarNabha,
Tehsil Nabha, Distt Patiala.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o SSP,
Patiala.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o IGP, Patiala Range,
Patiala .

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 416 of 2020

PRESENT: Sh.Ranjit Singh as the Appellant
Sh.Hakam Singh, ASI for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 31.07.2019 has sought information regarding FIR No.129 dated 18.07.2019 PS Sadar Nabha – copy of FIR – Copy of RC of vehicle –Driving license of car driver – action taken and other information concerning the office of SSP Patiala. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 03.09.2019 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 08.07.2020 through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. The respondent present pleaded that as per report of Chief officer, Police Station Sadar Nabha dated 19.03.2020, the challan alongwith relevant record has been presented in the Court of Judicial Magistrate First Class, Nabha on 13.01.2020, the information cannot be provided.

The PIO-JMIC was impleaded in the case and directed to look at the RTI application and provide the information to the appellant as per the RTI Act. A copy of RTI application was enclosed with the order.

Hearing dated 02.09.2020:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC, Patiala. The appellant claims that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent present pleaded that as per report of Chief officer, Police Station Sadar Nabha, the challan alongwith relevant record has been presented in the Court on 13.01.2020, the information cannot be provided.

At the last hearing, the PIO-JMIC was impleaded and directed to provide the information to the appellant as per the RTI Act and a copy of RTI application was sent to the PIO. The PIO-JMIC is absent.

Appeal Case No. 416 of 2020

Having gone through the record, the Commission observes that when the RTI application was filed, the information was in the custody of the police but the information was not provided. There has been an enormous delay in providing the information, the PIO O/o SSP Patiala is directed to explain the reasons that why the information was not provided within the stipulated time and if denied under what ground and what circumstances. The PIO to bring explanation on the next date of hearing.

The respondent informed that the information was earlier in the custody of Police Station Sadar, Nabha and since the challan alongwith other documents has been presented in the court, now it is lying in the custody of the court.

The PIO-SSP Patiala is directed to procure the documents from the concerned court/police station/police file and provide to the appellent.

To come up for further hearing on **26.10.2020 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Patiala.

Chandigarh
Dated 02.09.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

CC to PIO-O/o Judicial Magistrate(Ist Class),
Nabha.