



Sh Happy Kumar, S/o Sh. Daulat Ram,  
Chamber No. 60, New Court Complex,  
Abohar Road, Malout  
Distt Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

... Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o District Food Supply Officer,  
Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

...Respondent

**Complaint Case No. 894 of 2020**

**PRESENT: Sh.Happy Kumar as the Complainant**  
**Sh.Suresh Kumar, Inspector for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The complainant through RTI application dated 16.03.2020 has sought information regarding license number of depot holder Sh.Rakesh Kumar alongwith area covered– terms & conditions for running a ration depot – number of cardholders with the said depot – details of ration distributed since 2017 and other information as enumerated in the RTI application from the office of DFSO Sri Mukatsar Sahib. The complainant was not provided the information after which the complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 02.12.2020.

The case was last heard on 06.05.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Sri Mukatsar Sahib. As per complainant, the information had not been provided by the PIO.

Since the notice issued to the PIO was inadvertently delivered by the postal authority in the office of District Forest Officer instead of District Food Supply Officer, and was returned back from the District Forest Office, the notice was resent to District Food Supply Officer, Sri Mukatsar Sahib. A copy of earlier notice alongwith copy of RTI application was attached with the order for the PIO's perusal.

The PIO-District Food Supply Officer, Sri Mukatsar Sahib was directed to look at the RTI application and provide the information to the appellant as per the RTI Act.

**Hearing dated 03.08.2021:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Sri Mukatsar Sahib. As per respondent, the information has already been provided to the complainant.

As per complainant, the information is incomplete.

Since it is a complaint case and the complainant has come to the Commission without going to the First Appellate Authority, if there is any discrepancy in the provided information, the appellant should go to the First Appellate Authority first.

I am remanding this case back to the First Appellate Authority with the direction to consider this as an appeal case and dispose of the same within a period of 30 days.

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

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated:03.08.2021**

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



Sh. Jagmohan Singh Bhatti,  
# 919 Phase-4, Sector-59,  
Mohali.

... Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o President,  
Punjab State Consumer Redressal Commission,  
Sector-37-A, Chandigarh.

...Respondent

**Complaint Case No. 910 of 2020**

PRESENT: None for the Complainant  
Sh.Parmod Kumar, Steno for the Respondent

ORDER:

The complainant through RTI application dated 07.09.2020 has sought information regarding the appointment letter of the entire staff of Punjab State Consumer Redressal Commission for the last 5 years – detail of appointment of President of the Commission after his retirement as a High Court Judge - a copy of the order of appointment - and other information as enumerated in the RTI application from the office of President, Punjab State Consumer Redressal Commission, Pb Chandigarh. The complainant was not provided with the information after which the complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 25.11.2020.

The case last came up for hearing on 06.05.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Mohali. Both the parties were absent.

The case was adjourned.

**Hearing dated 03.08.2021:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Mohali. The respondent present pleaded that they received the RTI application on 22.09.2020 and since the appellant did not attach the ID proof with the RTI application, the complainant was asked to vide letter dated 15.10.2020 send an ID proof, which the complainant sent to their office on 20.10.2020. Thereafter, the information was sent to the complainant vide letter dated 12.11.2020.

The complainant is absent on the 2<sup>nd</sup> occasion without any legitimate reasons for the absence. Nor has the complainant been represented.

Since it is a complaint case and the RTI application has been replied to within the time prescribed under the RTI Act, I see no malafide on the part of the PIO in attending the RTI application.

Further, if the complainant is not satisfied with the information, he should go to the First Appellate Authority.

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

Chandigarh  
Dated: 03.08.2021

Sd/-  
(Khushwant Singh)  
State Information Commissioner

CC to: First Appellate Authority O/o President,  
State Consumer Redressal Commission, Pb, Chandigarh.



Smt Harpreet Kaur W/o Sh. Gurbhawan Singh  
Village Attari, P.O Badhai,  
Tehsil & Distt Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o SSP,  
Ferozepur.

First Appellate Authority,  
DIG, Ferozepur Range,  
Ferozepur.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 100 of 2021**

PRESENT: Smt.Harpreet Kaur as the Appellant  
Sh.Sukhdev Singh, ASI for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 10.09.2020 has sought information regarding a detailed report the doctor prepared and sent to Police Station Cantt. Ferozepur relating to hitting/harming Manmohan Singh, Ram Singh, Lavpreet Singh and Major Singh on 06.03.2020 against DSP Crime – copy 11 of FIR registered against the accused – a copy of challan presented in the court and other information as enumerated in the RTI application from the office of SSP Punjab Police Ferozepur. The appellant was not satisfied with the reply of the PIO dated 09.10.2020 after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 07.11.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case was last heard on 06.05.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Sri Mukatsar Sahib. As per the respondent, the information had been supplied to the appellant vide letter dated 12.12.2020 & 16.03.2021.

The appellant was absent and vide letter received in the Commission on 18.03.2021 informed that the PIO has not provided the information on point-4(3) and further the PIO had supplied the incomplete information after the issue of notice of the Commission.

Regarding point-4(3), the respondent stated that since no FIR was registered, no challan was prepared and presented in the court.

Having gone through the RTI application and the information that was provided, the commission found that the RTI application has been sufficiently replied to and no further course of action is required.

However, in the interest of justice, one more opportunity was given to the appellant to appear before the Commission on the next date of hearing and point out the discrepancies, if any.

**Appeal Case No. 100 of 2021**

**Hearing dated 03.08.2021:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Sri Mukatsar Sahib. As per the respondent, the complete information has already been provided to the appellant with a copy to the Commission.

The appellant claims that the PIO has not supplied the copy of the challan nor has taken any action on the FIR. The respondent stated that since no FIR was registered, no challan was prepared.

Having gone through the RTI application and the copy of the information that has been submitted in the Commission, I find that the RTI has been sufficiently replied to and the information has been provided to the best possible extent.

No further course of action is required. The case is **disposed of and closed.**

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 03.08.2021**

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

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,**  
**Sector 16, Chandigarh.**  
Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - [psic30@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic30@punjabmail.gov.in)  
Visit us: - [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)



Smt Chanchal Rani, W/o Lt Sh Mahinder Singh,  
R/o Village Meeranpur, Distt Patiala.

... Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o Medical Superintendent,  
Amar Hospital, Patiala.

...Respondent

**Complaint Case No. 122 of 2021**

**PRESENT: None for the Complainant**  
**Sh.Abhishek Dhiman, Advocate for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The complainant through RTI application dated 06.10.2020 has sought information regarding CCTV footage of surgical care unit, Cardiac Care Unit(CCU) & Medical Intensive Care Unit-2(MICU-2) from 10.09.2020 to 11.09.2020 along with details of doctors/nurses/staff on duty – CCTV footage of front entry/exit gate and side entry/exist gage dated 15.09.2020 from the same department. Both the complaint cases are clubbed together. The complainant was not provided the information after which the complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 19.01.2021.

The case last came up for hearing on 28.06.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. As per the complainant, the PIO had not supplied the information.

The respondent was absent nor has sent any reply. The notices issued to the respondent had been returned to the Commission with the remarks 'refused'.

The case was adjourned.

**Hearing dated 03.08.2021:**

The case has come up for hearing today. Sh.Abhishek Dhiman, Advocate is present on behalf of Amar Hospital and has submitted a reply which has been taken on the file of the Commission.

The counsel has pleaded that the respondent hospital being purely a private institution/hospital does not come under the purview of RTI Act and therefore not liable to provide any information other than medical records of the patient.

I am in agreement with the plea of the respondent hospital, and since it does not qualify as a public authority under section 2 of the RTI Act, the complaint case is closed.

The case is **closed**.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 03.08.2021**

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



Smt Chanchal Rani, W/o Lt Sh Mahinder Singh,  
R/o Village Meeranpur, Distt Patiala.

... Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o Medical Superintendent,  
Amar Hospital, Patiala.

...Respondent

**Complaint Case No. 123 of 2021**

**PRESENT: Mrs.Chanchal Rani as the Complainant  
None for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The complainant through the RTI application dated 15.10.2020 has sought information regarding the medical treatment of Mahinder Singh s/o Shingara Singh of village Bahadarpur Meerawala – CCTV footage of lifts – patient treatment chart from 08.09.2020 to 15.09.2020 as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of Medical Superintendent, Amar Hospital, Patiala. The complainant was not provided with the information after which the complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 19.01.2021.

The case last came up for hearing on 28.06.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. As per the complainant, the PIO had not supplied the information.

The respondent was absent nor has sent any reply. The notices issued to the respondent had been returned to the Commission with the remarks 'refused'.

The case was adjourned.

**Hearing dated 03.08.2021:**

The case has come up for hearing today. Sh.Abhishek Dhiman, Advocate is present on behalf of Amar Hopital and has submitted a reply which has been taken on the file of the Commission.

The counsel has pleaded that the respondent hospital being purely a private institution/hospital does not come under the purview of the RTI Act and therefore not liable to provide any information other than medical records of the patient. The counsel has submitted a copy of the medical records of the patient which has been taken on the file of the Commission.

I am in agreement with the plea of the respondent hospital, and since it does not qualify as a public authority under section 2 of the RTI Act, the complaint case is closed. A copy of the medical record of the patient submitted by the counsel, is being sent to the complainant along with the order.

The case is **closed**.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 03.08.2021**

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