



Sh.Rakesh Kumar Gupta, Advocate,  
8/237, Jagraon Road, Mandi Mullanpur,  
Distt. Ludhiana

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o Director, Local Govt. Department,  
Sector-35-A, Chandigarh.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o Director, Local Govt. Department,  
Sector-35-A, Chandigarh

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 761 of 2020**

**PRESENT: None for the Appellant**  
**None for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The case first came up for hearing on 24.08.2020. Due to a network problem, the VC could not take place. The respondents from different departments of the Local Govt. were present at Chandigarh. The respondents present from recruitment cell & Trust Service Cell pleaded that since the information relates to the third party, it cannot be provided and the reply has been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 17.07.2020 & 24.08.2020 respectively.

The respondent present from Municipal Trust Cell informed that the available information concerning them has been supplied to the appellant vide letter dated 02.07.2020. The respondent further informed that the information sought by the appellant is not specified and voluminous since the appellant had asked for information of different employees of Municipal Councils, Municipal Committees, Certified area Committees & Nagar Panchayats), Municipal Trusts and Municipal Corporation in the state of Punjab.

The respondent from LG-2 Branch also pleaded that the information sought by the appellant is not specified.

Having gone through the RTI application, reply submitted by the PIOs and discussions with the respondents, the Commission agreed that the information that has been sought by the appellant was very voluminous and not specific and involves diversion of manpower to procure the information of all employees of different departments of the Department of Local Bodies, as well as involves many PIOs in the process. The information also involves privacy issues of the employees since he has asked for educational certificates of all the employees working under the Local Govt. Department.

The appellant was directed to file a fresh application to the Commission and clearly specify the information that he seeks and also establish a larger public interest involved in revealing such voluminous and personal information.

On the date of the hearing on **22.03.2021**, the appellant was absent and vide email sent his reply which was taken on the file of the Commission.

The respondent was absent. The case was adjourned.

On the date of last hearing on **08.07.2021**, the appellant is absent.

The respondent who was present at Chandigarh, was directed to submit a complete list of posts of Class-1, Class-2 & Class-3 officers in all departments of the Local Govt.

**Hearing dated 03.11.2021:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Ludhiana. Both the parties are absent.

Having gone through the record, the Commission observes that there was an issue of privacy involved in the sought information, for which the commission had asked the appellant to put ample evidence that the information sought is in larger public interest. The appellant is continuously absent for the last four hearings and nor has been represented by anyone to pursue this case. The appellant has submitted some contentions via an email, however, I find they do not have enough meat in them to tilt the debate of privacy versus public interest in the favour of disclosure of information under larger public interest.

The case is **disposed of and closed** due to non pursuance of the case by the appellant.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated 03.11.2021**

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



Sh.Rakesh Kumar Gupta, Advocate,  
8/237, Jagraon Road, Mandi Mullanpur,  
Distt Ludhiana

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o Director, Local Govt Department,  
Sector-35-A, Chandigarh.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o Director, Local Govt Department,  
Sector-35-A, Chandigarh

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 762 of 2020**

**PRESENT: None for the Appellant**  
**None for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The case came up for hearing first on **24.08.2020**. Due to a network problem, the VC could not take place. The respondents from different departments of the Local Govt. were present at Chandigarh. The respondents present from the recruitment cell & Trust Service Cell have pleaded that since the available information concerning them has been provided to the appellant and the remaining information being third party, it cannot be provided and the reply has been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 16.07.2020 & 24.08.2020 respectively.

The respondents present from Municipal Trust Cell & LG-1, LG-2 & LG-3 Branch informed that the information sought by the appellant is not specified and voluminous since the appellant has asked for information of different employees of Municipal Councils, Municipal Committees, Certified area Committees & Nagar Panchayats), Municipal Trusts and Municipal Corporation in the state of Punjab.

Having gone through the RTI application, reply submitted by the PIOs and discussions with the respondents, the Commission agreed that the information that had been sought by the appellant is very voluminous and not specific and involves huge manpower to procure the information of all employees of different departments of the Department of Local Bodies, as well as involves many PIOs in the process. The information also involved privacy issues of the employees since he had asked for educational certificates of all the employees working under Local Govt. Department.

The appellant was directed to file a fresh application to the Commission and clearly specify the information that he seeks and also establish a larger public interest involved in revealing such voluminous and personal information.

On the date of last hearing on **22.03.2021**, the appellant was absent and vide email sent his reply which was taken on the file of the Commission.

The respondent was absent. The case was adjourned.

**Appeal Case No. 762 of 2020**

**On the date of** last hearing on **08.07.2021**, the appellant was absent.

The case was adjourned.

**Hearing dated 03.11.2021:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Ludhiana. Both the parties are absent.

Having gone through the record, the Commission observes that there was an issue of privacy involved in the sought information, for which the commission had asked the appellant to put ample evidence that the information sought is in larger public interest. The appellant is continuously absent for the last four hearings and nor has been represented by anyone to pursue this case. The appellant has submitted some contentions via an email, however, I find they do not have enough meat in them to tilt the debate of privacy versus public interest in the favour of disclosure of information under larger public interest.

The case is **disposed of and closed** due to non pursuance of the case by the appellant.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated 03.11.2021**

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



Sh.Rakesh Kumar Gupta, Advocate,  
8/237, Jagraon Road, Mandi Mullanpur,  
Distt Ludhiana

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o Director, Local Govt Department,  
Sector-35-A, Chandigarh.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o Director, Local Govt Department,  
Sector-35-A, Chandigarh

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 971 of 2020**

**PRESENT: None for the Appellant**  
**None for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The case came up for hearing first on 24.08.2020. Due to a network problem, the VC could not take place. The respondents from different departments of the Local Govt. were present at Chandigarh. The respondents present from recruitment cell & Trust Service Cell pleaded that since the available information concerning them has been provided to the appellant and remaining information being third party, it cannot be provided and the reply has been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 17.07.2020 & 24.08.2020 respectively

The respondents present from Municipal Trust Cell & LG-1, LG-2 & LG-3 Branch informed that the information sought by the appellant is not specified and voluminous since the appellant has asked for information of different employees of Municipal Councils, Municipal Committees, Certified area Committees & Nagar Panchayats), Municipal Trusts and Municipal Corporation in the state of Punjab.

Having gone through the RTI application, reply submitted by the PIOs and discussions with the respondents, the Commission agreed that the information that has been sought by the appellant is very voluminous and not specific and involves huge manpower to procure the information of all employees of different departments of the department of Local Bodies, as well as involves many PIOs in the process. The information also involves privacy issue of the employees since he has asked for educational certificates of all the employees working under Local Govt. Department.

The appellant was directed to file fresh application to the Commission and clearly specify the information that he seeks and also establish a larger public interest involved in revealing such voluminous and personal information.

On the date of hearing on **22.03.2021**, the appellant was absent and vide email sent his reply which was taken on the file of the Commission.

The respondent was absent. The case was adjourned.

**Appeal Case No. 971 of 2020**

On the date of last hearing on 08.07.2021, the appellant was absent. The case was adjourned.

**Hearing dated 03.11.2021:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Ludhiana. Both the parties are absent.

Having gone through the record, the Commission observes that there was an issue of privacy involved in the sought information, for which the commission had asked the appellant to put ample evidence that the information sought is in larger public interest. The appellant is continuously absent for the last four hearings and nor has been represented by anyone to pursue this case. The appellant has submitted some contentions via an email, however, I find they do not have enough meat in them to tilt the debate of privacy versus public interest in the favour of disclosure of information under larger public interest.

The case is **disposed of and closed** due to non pursuance of the case by the appellant.

**Chandigarh  
Dated 03.11.2021**

**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](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)**



Sh.Sukhdhir Singh, Head Teacher,  
Block-Mangat-2, Ludhiana.  
R/o H No-4, BabaNand Singh Nagar,  
Basant Avenue Dugri, Ludhiana.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o DEO (EE),  
Ludhiana.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O.o DEO (EE),  
Ludhiana.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 1162 of 2020**

**PRESENT: None for the Appellant**  
**Sh.Kuldeep Singh, Dy. DEO(EE) for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The case first came up for hearing on 24.08.2020 through video conferencing at DAC Ludhiana. Due to network problems, the VC could not take place. The appellant was present at Chandigarh and informed that the PIO has not supplied the information as per the RTI application.

Having gone through the reply, the Commission observed that the reply is incomplete. The PIO was directed to provide the complete information as per the RTI application within 15 days. If the PIO seeks any exemption, he was directed to give a speaking order.

On the date of hearing on **22.03.2021**, the respondent present pleaded that since he is the enquiry officer in the case, and the RTI application has been marked to him by the Superintendent, it was inappropriate for an enquiry officer to give an enquiry to the person against whom the enquiry was conducted.

He further added that the complete enquiry report has been sent to Director General, School Education Mohali for further action.

Director General School Education, Mohali was impleaded in the case and directed to provide information to the appellant. A copy of the RTI application was attached with the order for the PIO's perusal. The DGSE was also directed to conduct an enquiry into the factual position of handling of this RTI.

On the date of last hearing on **08.07.2021**, the PIO-Director General Education, Pb Mohali was absent. The PIO-Director General Education Pb Mohali was given one more opportunity to appear at the next date of hearing and file an appropriate reply.

**Appeal Case No. 1162 of 2020**

As per the appellant, the enquiry report was with the DEO. Sh.Kuldeep Singh, Dy.DEO was absent and vide email has sought exemption. Sh.Kuldeep Singh, Dy.DEO(EE) Ludhiana was directed to be present on the next date of hearing and submit his reply.

**Hearing dated 03.11.2021:**

**The case** has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Ludhiana. Sh.Kuldeep Singh, Dy.DEO is present and informed that the information was supplied to the appellant vide letter dated 16.01.2020 to which the appellant was not satisfied and had pointed out some discrepancies ,which were sorted out on 02.06.2020. The respondent further informed that since in this complaint, no enquiry was conducted, no enquiry report was available in the record and the reply has already been sent to the appellant. However, the available information has been provided to the appellant.

The appellant is absent nor is represented. Since the relevant information has been provided, and the appellant has not pointed out any discrepancies and has preferred to absent himself, it is presumed that the appellant has got the relevant information as sought by him.

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

**Chandigarh  
Dated 03.11.2021**

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

**CC to :Director General School Education,  
Pb Mohali**