



Sh.Parminder Singh,
H No-422, Palam Enclave,
Morinda, DisttRoopnagar.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o EO, PUDA,
Mohali.

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 277 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Parminder Singh as the Complainant
Mrs.Sukhvinder Kumari, PIO-cum-EO PUDA and Sh.Sukhdeep Singh O/o
GMADA for the Respondent

ORDER: This order should be considered in continuation to the earlier order.

The case was first heard on 24.07.2019. The complainant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information even after a reminder issued to them on 23.02.2019.

The respondent was absent. The Commission observed that there has been an enormous delay 7 months in attending to the RTI application. The PIO was issued a show cause notice **under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 for not supplying the information within the statutorily prescribed period of time and directed to file reply on an affidavit.** The PIO was again directed to provide the information to the appellant within 10 days.

The case was again heard on **23.10.2019**. The Commission received a letter on 26.08.2019 from the PIO stating that the information has been sent to the complainant vide letter dated 22.07.2019. The appellant claimed that he has not received the information.

The respondent was absent nor has sent any reply to the show cause notice. The PIO was given one last opportunity to reply to the show cause notice on an affidavit and provide the information to the appellant as per earlier. The PIO was also directed to be present personally at the next date of hearing.

The case was last heard on 13.02.2020. The complainant informed that the PIO has not provided the information. The PIO was absent on 3rd consecutive hearing nor had sent any reply to the show cause notice. To secure an erring PIO's presence before the commission, a bailablw warrant of the PIO-cum-Estate Officer, PUDA was issued Under Section 18(3) of the RTI Act through Senior Superintendent of Police, Mohali for his presence before the Commission on **03.03.2020**.

Hearing dated 03.03.2020:

Mrs.Sukhvinder Kumar, EO-PUDA is present. However, she has not filed reply to the show cause notice. The PIO-EO PUDA is directed to bring written reply to the show cause notice on the next date of hearing.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **30.03.2020 at 11.00 AM**.

Chandigarh
Dated:03.03.3030

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh.Darshan Lal, S/o Sh Karan Chand,
H No-8456, Sector-125, Sunny Enclave,
Kharar, Distt Mohali.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o XEN, PSPCL,
Kharar.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o SE, PSPCL,
Roopnagar.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 522 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Darshan Lal as the Appellant
Sh.Swaranjit Singh, SDO-PSPCL, Kharar for the Respondent

ORDER: The case was first heard on **08.05.2019**. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant was not satisfied and stated that he had asked for total number of electric connections in the name of Poonam Sharma. The PIO was directed to provide total number of electric connections issued in the name of Poonam Sharma w/o Rahul Partap Singh from 01.04.2009 to 31.03.2017 and the copies of documents enclosed at the time of applying for the connection.

The case was again heard on **16.07.2019**. Both the parties were absent. In the interest of justice, one more opportunity was granted and the case was adjourned. The PIO was directed to comply with the earlier order of the Commission which still stands and be present on the next date of hearing.

The case was further heard on **28.08.2019**. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent was absent on 2nd 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 2005 and** directed to file reply on an affidavit. The PIO was again directed to provide the information to the appellant within 10 days of the receipt of this order.

Sh.Bachitter Singh, SDO-Operation Sub-Division, PSPCL City Kharar-1 appeared late and pleaded that the information will be provided to the appellant within a week.

The case was last heard on **05.12.2019**. The appellant claimed that the information which has been provided by the PIO is incomplete. The appellant also submitted objections. A copy of the objections was attached with the order for the PIO. The PIO was directed to provide, If such document exists and remove the deficiency if any.

Hearing dated 03.03.2020:

The respondent present pleaded that the earlier SDO has since retired and he has just joined as SDO-PSPCL Kharar. The respondent further pleaded that the available information has been provided to the appellant and no further information is available in their record.

The PIO is directed to give this on an affidavit that no further information is available. The affidavit to be provided within 15 days. The PIO is also directed to file reply to the show cause notice.

To come up for further hearing on **04.05.2020 at 11.00 AM.**

Chandigarh
Dated 03.03.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh Deepak Gutt,
H no-631, Sector-9,
Punchkula.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o GMADA,
Mohali.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o GMADA,
Mohali.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1244 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Deepak Gutt as the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on 31.07.2019. The Respondent pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 09.01.2019. The appellant was not satisfied and stated that the respondent has not provided information regarding role, responsibility of GMADA and an action if the developer fails to give possession of plots to public as sought in point-30. The respondent stated that they have cancelled the license of the builder.

Hearing both the parties, the Commission directed the PIO to relook at point-30 and reply accordingly as per the query raised in the RTI application.

The case was last heard on **05.12.2019**. The respondent had brought the information and handed over to the appellant. The appellant was not satisfied.

Hearing both the parties, the appellant was directed to inspect the record and get the relevant information. The PIO was directed to allow inspection to the appellant by fixing a mutually convenient date and time and provide certified copies of the information relating to this RTI application.

Hearing dated 03.03.2020:

The respondent is absent. The Commission has received a letter from the PIO on 27.01.2020 stating that the complete information has been provided to the appellant and a copy of the same submitted to the Commission. The appellant is not satisfied and informed that he has received a letter dated 19.02.2020 from the PIO regarding point-25 stating that there are so many court cases going on against Sky Rock City Welfare Society but they do not have any complied information.

Having gone through the reply, the Commission observes that point-25 has not been appropriately replied by the PIO. The PIO is directed to provide a list of all court cases filed by GMADA regarding Sky Rock City Welfare Society

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **05.05.2020 at 11.00 AM.**

Chandigarh
Dated:03.03.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh. Tejinder Singh,
R/o Village Bholapur, P.O Ramgarh,
Chandigarh Road, Ludhiana.

...Appellant.

Versus

Public Information Officer,
SDM, Licensing Authority & Registering,
Malerkotla.

First Appellate Authority,
DC,
Sangrur

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1328 of 2018

Present: None for the Appellant
Sh.Karanbir Singh, PIO-RTA for the Respondent

ORDER:

This order should be considered in continuation to the earlier order.

On the date of hearing on **01.07.2019** the appellant pleaded that though he has received the information but with a delay of one year and four months. The appellant claimed that he has been harassed a lot for not providing the information by the PIO in time and hence the PIO be penalized and he be compensated.

This was the 6th consecutive hearing that the PIO-RTA was absent despite many orders of the Commission, nor sent any reply to the show cause. Showing utter disregard for the Commission's repeated orders to provide the information as well as not replying to the show cause and not appearing before the Commission, a penalty of Rs.25000/- was imposed upon the PIO-RTA Sangrur which was to be deposited in the Govt Treasury.

The PIO-RTA Sangrur was also directed to pay an amount of Rs.2500/- via demand draft as compensation to the appellant for the loss and detriment suffered by him of having to file the appeals and not getting the 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.

Further the PIO was also rendered liable under section 20(2) of the RTI Act and it was recommended to the Disciplinary Authority to issue a charge sheet to the PIO-RTA Sangrur for violation of the provisions of the RTI Act and send a copy to the Commission.

On the date of hearing of **16.10.2019**, the PIO-RTA appeared and pleaded that the delay in providing the information had occurred at the level of the clerk who did not put up the files on time. The PIO was directed to file an affidavit in this regard on the next date of hearing.

The case was last heard on **10.12.2019**. The appellant was absent and vide email has sought exemption. The appellant in the same email informed that the PIO has not provided the compensation amount as per order of the Commission.

In compliance with the order dated 16.10.2019, the respondent submitted an affidavit which was taken on the file of the Commission. Having gone through the merits of the affidavit, the action under section 20(2) recommended to the Disciplinary Authority to issue a charge sheet to the PIO-RTA Sangrur was withdrawn. However, the action under section 20 remained the same to realize the penalty amount of Rs.25000/-. The PIO was directed to duly inform the Commission of the compliance of the order by producing a copy of the challan justifying the deposit of penalty in the Govt Treasury. The PIO was also directed to submit proof of having compensated the appellant.

Hearing dated 03.03.2020:

The appellant is absent and vide email has informed that the PIO has not provided the compensation amount as per order of the Commission.

The PIO is present and has submitted a copy of challan as a proof of having deposited the amount of penalty in the Govt Treasury on 02.03.2020 which is taken on the file of the Commission. The respondent has also brought a demand draft of Rs.2500/- bearing no.412491 dated 28.02.2020 drawn on State Bank of India to be paid to the appellant, which has been taken on the file of the Commission. The appellant is directed to come to the commission any time and collect the demand draft.

Since the PIO has deposited the amount of penalty in the Govt Treasury and has brought demand draft for the compensation amount, no further course of action is required.

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

Chandigarh
Dated: 03.03.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

CC to PIO- RTA Sangrur

2. PIO-STC, Punjab, Chandigarh

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. Sucha Singh, S/o Lt Sh Nasib Singh,
VPO Mauli Baidwan, Sector-80,
Mohali.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o E.O, GMADA,
Sector-62, Mohali.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o GMADA, Sector-62,
Mohali.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1777 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Himmat Singh for the appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on 18.09.2019. The respondent pleaded that the appellant to inspect the record and get the relevant information. The appellant was directed to visit the office of the PIO on the date fixed i.e. on 04.10.2019 at 11.00 AM and inspect the record. The PIO was directed to allow inspection of the record and provide the relevant information to the appellant.

The case was last heard on **10.12.2019**. The appellant was present and informed that he had inspected the record but the information was not provided. The respondent was absent. The case is adjourned.

Hearing dated 03.03.2020:

The appellant informed that he has inspected the record but has not been able to locate the information.

Having gone through the file, the Commission observes that the appellant has basically sought action taken on his application dated 28.06.2011 given for the allotment of plot alongwith earnest money of Rs.50000/- by way of demand draft which was accepted by GMADA vide receipt No.4156 dated 06.07.2011. The PIO is directed to provide the information or file a suitable reply on an affidavit.

To come up for further hearing on **05.05.2020 at 11.00 AM.**

Chandigarh
Dated 03.03.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh. Jatinder Pal Singh, S/o Sh Nidhan Singh,
VPO New Sullar, # 105,
T ehsil & 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
None 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 last 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.

Hearing dated 03.03.2020:

The appellant claims that the PIO has not provided the information as per order of the Commission.

The respondent is absent on 3rd consecutive hearing nor has complied with the order of the Commission. The Commission has taken a serious view of this and hereby directs the PIO **show cause why penalty be not imposed on him under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 for not supplying the information within the statutorily prescribed period of time**. He/she should file an affidavit in this regard. If there are other persons responsible for the delay in providing the information, the PIO is directed to inform such persons of the show cause and direct them to appear before the Commission along with the written replies.

To come up for further hearing on **05.05.2020 at 11.00 AM**.

Chandigarh
Dated 03.03.2020

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.

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. Sandeep Kumar, S/o Sh Om Parkash,
R/o Street No-2, Near Shani Dev Mandir,
Patel Nagar, Malout,
Distt Sri mukatsar Sahib.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o DC,
Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o DC,
Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 2391 of 2019

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 06.02.2019 has sought information regarding social welfare associations registered in District Mukatsar Sahib from 01.01.2014 to 31.01.2019 and other information concerning the office of DC, Sri Mukarsar Sahib. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 14.03.2019 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case was last heard on 11.12.2019. The respondent present pleaded that the RTI application was received by them from the office of DC on 11.02.2019 and the information regarding point-1 had been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 05.04.2019. The information relating to points 2,3 & 4 does not relate to them. The PIO-DIC was exempted.

The PIO-DC, Sri Mukatsar Sahib was directed to transfer the RTI application to the concerned PIO and ensure that the information is provided as per the RTI application.

Hearing dated 03.03.2020:

Both the parties are absent. The appellant vide email has informed that the PIO has not provided the information. The earlier order stands.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **05.05.2020 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Sri Mukatsar Sahib. Copies of order be sent to both the parties through registered post.

Chandigarh
Dated 03.03.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



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: Sh.Kesar Singh as the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was last 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 that 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.

Hearing dated 03.03.2020:

The appellant claims that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent is absent. The Commission observes that there has been an enormous delay in providing the information. The Commission has taken a serious view of this and hereby directs the PIO to **show cause why penalty be not imposed on him under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 for not supplying the information within the statutorily prescribed period of time.** He/she should file an affidavit in this regard. If there are other persons responsible for the delay in providing the information, the PIO is directed to inform such persons of the show cause and direct them to appear before the Commission along with the written replies.

The PIO is again directed to provide information within 15 days of the receipt of this order.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **29.04.2020 at 11.00 AM.**

Chandigarh
Dated 03.03.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



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. 3720 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Kesar Singh as the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 22.04.2019 has sought information regarding security of the Purab Premium Apartments sector 88 Mohali – contact for security, persons employed, amount incurred 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 14.06.2019 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case was last heard on 28.01.2020. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information even after a lapse of nine months of filing the RTI application. The respondent present submitted a letter of the PIO dated 24.07.2019 whereby the PIO had asked the appellant to get the information by visiting their office on any working day.

Due to an enormous delay of nine months in providing the information, the PIO was issued a **show cause notice under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 and directed to file reply on an affidavit.** The PIO was again directed to provide the information within 15 days.

Hearing dated 03.03.2020:

The appellant claims that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent is absent nor has filed reply to the show cause notice. The PIO is given one last opportunity to provide the information to the appellant and appear before the Commission on the next date of hearing alongwith reply to the show cause notice on an affidavit, otherwise it will be presumed that the PIO has nothing to say on the matter and the Commission will act as per provisions of section 20 of the RTI Act.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **29.04.2020 at 11.00 AM.**

Chandigarh
Dated 03.03.2020

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 Dharam Singh,
Flat No-1401/B-5,
Pb Premium Appartments, Sec-88,
Mohali.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o GMADA,
Mohali.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o GMADA,
Mohali.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3737 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Dharam Singh as the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 18.04.2019 has sought information regarding tubewells installed in Purab Premium Apartments Sector 88 Mohali and other information concerning the office of GMADA Mohali. The appellant was not satisfied with the information provided by the PIO on 24.05.2019 after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 14.06.2019 which disposed off the appeal stating that the information has already been provided to the appellant.

The case was last heard on 28.01.2020. The respondent was absent. Sh.Gagandeep Singh, clerk present in an another case informed that he did not know about this case. A copy of the RTI application was provided to him. The PIO was directed to relook at the RTI application and provide the information to the appellant within 15 days.

Hearing dated 03.03.2020:

The appellant claims that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent is absent.

Earlier order stands. The PIO is directed to comply with the earlier order of the Commission and provide the information to the appellant otherwise the Commission will be constrained to issue a show cause notice under section 20 of the RTI Act.

To come up for further hearing on **29.04.2020 at 11.00 AM.**

Chandigarh
Dated 03.03.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh Bharat Bhushan,
H No-153, Akash Nagar,
Near Greenland School,
P.O Netaji Nagar, Sale, Tabri,
Ludhiana

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Secretary, 6th Pay Commission,
Punjab, Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Chairman, 6th Pay Commission,
Punjab, Chandigarh.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3983 of 2018

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER: The case was first heard by Sh.S.S.Channy, CIC on 07.01.2019. Sh.Rajinder Singh, Section Officer appeared and informed that the information has been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 20.12.2018. The appellant was absent. The appellant was directed to go through the information and send his observations. The case was again heard on 05.02.2019. Both the parties were absent. The appellant vide letter dated 22.01.2019 sent deficiencies in the provided information and a copy of same was sent to the PIO with the direction to remove the same. The case was again heard on 13.03.2019. None was present. The appellant vide letter dated 02.03.2019 sought exemption. The respondent was also absent. Copies of both the letters dated 22.01.2019 and 02.03.2019 were sent to the PIO to supply complete information and directed to submit status report.

The case was again heard on 08.04.2019. Both the parties were absent. The appellant vide letter dated 29.03.2019 informed that the PIO has not replied/removed the discrepancies. The PIO was again directed to sort out the discrepancies before the next date of hearing.

The case was further heard on by this bench on 23.10.2020. The appellant sought exemption due to ill health. The respondent was continuously absent. The PIO was issued a **show cause notice under section 20 of the RTI Act and directed to file reply on an affidavit.** The PIO was again directed to sort out the discrepancies in the information.

The case was last heard on **13.01.2020**. The appellant vide letter received in the Commission on 07.01.2020 sought exemption and informed that the PIO has not provided the complete information. The respondent was absent. The PIO was given one last opportunity to provide the complete information to the appellant and be present on the next date of hearing alongwith written reply to the show cause notice on an affidavit.

Hearing dated 03.03.2020:

Both the parties are absent. The appellant vide email has sought exemption due to illness. The respondent is absent nor has sent reply to the show cause notice.

Earlier order stands. The case is adjourned.

To come up for further hearing on **04.05.2020 at 11.00 AM.**

Chandigarh
Dated 03.03.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh Daljit Singh, S/o Sh Bachittar Singh,
R/o 201/100, Block-J, BRS Nagar,
Ludhiana.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Chief Director,
Vigilance Bureau, Sec-68,
SAS Nagar.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Chief Director,
Vigilance Bureau, Sec-68,
SAS Nagar.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 4302 of 2018

PRESENT: Sh.Daljit Singh as the Appellant
Sh.Rajesh Kumar, Inspector O/o Director Vigilance, Pb, for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on 23.01.2019 by Sh.A.S.Chanduraian, State Information Commissioner. Sh.Avtar Singh Inspector was present. After examining the record, it was found that the PIO sent a reply to the appellant vide letter dated 17.01.2019 stating that the information cannot be supplied and is exempt u/s 8(1)(h) of the RTI Act. After hearing both the parties, the investigating officer of SSP Vigilance Bureau Pb Ludhiana was impleaded and directed to be present on the next date of hearing.

On the next date of hearing which was held on 27.02.2019. Sh.Anil Kumar, ASI O/o SSP Vigilance Bureau Ludhiana appeared. The appellant claimed that the information has not been provided by the PIO. The PIO was directed to file a fresh reply in wiring on the queries raised by the appellant. On the hearing of 20.03.2019, Sh.Jaswant Singh, ASI Vigilance Bureau Mohali and Sh.Manmohan Singh, ASI O/o SSP Vigilance Bureau, Ludhiana appeared. On examining the record, it was found that the PIO vide letter dated 13.03.2019 has sent a reply to the appellant stating that the case No.38 dated 18.05.2002 was registered on the basis of source report and the information on source report is exempt u/s 8(1)(h) of the RTI Act.

The case was further heard by this bench on 07.08.2019. The respondent present pleaded that the reply has been sent to the appellant. The appellant was not satisfied and wanted preliminary report before registration of the FIR.

The case was last heard on **10.12.2019**. The respondent present from the office of Director Vigilance pleaded that as per order of the High Court, reinvestigation is going on and is still pending. The respondent further pleaded that since the source report is confidential to the investigating agency it cannot be provided .

Hearing both the parties, The PIO was directed to appropriately address point-2 and provide relevant manual/instructions of the State Govt. to be followed before filing the FIR. The point-1 to be adjudicated on the next date of hearing.

Appeal Case No. 4302 of 2018

Hearing dated 03.03.2020:

The respondent present informed that the information on point-2 has been supplied to the appellants. The appellants are not satisfied.

The case is being sent to the Registry Branch to put up this case to the Hon'ble Chief Information Commissioner to **allot the case to the Double Bench.**

Announced in the Court, copy of the order to be sent to the parties.

Chandigarh
Dated:03.03.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

CC to:

The Deputy Registrar
(Alongwith case file)