



Smt. Rana Bir Surpal Kaur, (9872091528)

W/o Late Sh. Sarup Singh Dhillon IAS,
1528, Sector 34 D, Chandigarh - 160022

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer

.....Respondent

O/o Punjab State Cooperative Agricultural Development Bank Ltd,
Sector 17 B, Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority

O/o Punjab State Cooperative Agricultural Development Bank Ltd,
Sector 17 B, Chandigarh.

Appeal Case No.3910 of 2021

RTI application filed on	:	03-05-2021
PIO replied on	:	06-05-2021
First appeal filed on	:	17-05-2021
First Appellate Authority order	:	-

Present: Appellant: Absent

Respondent: Ms. Seena (Law Officer), 9592114173

ORDER:

1. This order may be read with the reference of previous order dated 17.11.2021.

Information Sought:

Please supply me certified copies of documents in record or extract to make me informed of the following information completely and relevantly as on date of supply of information unless otherwise stated anywhere specifically in this application in to following reference. Information is required by registered post.

If this information in full or part, relates to any other public authority, the same please be transferred to that PA as per section 6(3) of the RTI Act. This information is not made available by your Public Authority under voluntary disclosure.

As per Section 2(f) of the Right to Information Act 2005, the "information" means - any material in any form, including records, documents, memos, e-mails, opinions, advices, press releases, circulars, orders, logbooks, contracts, reports, papers, samples, models, data material held in any electronic form and information relating to any private body which can be accessed by a public authority under any other law for the time being in force;

So please access the following information under any other law for the time being in force; and arrange to supply me the same. The applicable fee is attached as IPO No. 53F 464815 Dated 24/04/2021. Please note that this information relates to my husband who has availed loan facility. Since all liability has to be met by me. Hence information can not be denied by PIO by using provision of Section 8,

2. During the hearing, the Respondent gave a reference of earlier decision taken by the undersigned bench on this similar matter in CC: 1087/2021 dated 29.11.2021 case titled Kuldeep singh vs Primary Co operative Agricultural development bank ldt, Srihind, it has specifically held as under:

Appeal Case No.3910 of 2021

4.” In view of the observations noted above, the instant case is remanded to the concerned First Appellate Authority and directed/advised that present complaint case be kept abeyance so as to await the outcome of the decision of Hon’rable High court in said CWP-841-2010 and then deal the case accordingly”. ...

Decision:

Keeping in view the facts of the case and the submissions made by the respondent authority the Commission concurs with the detailed order passed by the FAA of the Respondent and we also confirm our earlier order passed on this same issue where it was categorically held by the undersigned bench that: the instant case is remanded to the concerned First Appellate Authority and directed/advised that present appeal case be kept abeyance so as to await the outcome of the decision of Hon’rable High court in said CWP-841-2010 and then deal the case accordingly.

The case is disposed of accordingly.

Sd/-

Chandigarh
Dated: 04.04.2022

(Maninder Singh Patti)
State Information Commissioner, Pb.

Appeal Case No.1259,1276,2637,2790,3100,5328,5330,5457,5458,5459 of 2021

Sh. Manjit Singh, (9914200995)

S/o Sh. Sant Singh,
House No. 10330, Narang Colony, Street No. 3,
Near Gurmukh Dholi, Sri Muktsar Sahib - 152026

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer

.....Respondent

O/o XEN, Construction Division (B&R), Sri Muktsar Sahib.

Public Information Officer

O/o XEN, Construction Division (B&R), Sri Muktsar Sahib.

Public Information Officer

O/o XEN, Construction Division (B&R), Mohali.

Public Information Officer

O/o XEN, Construction Division (B&R), Moga.

Public Information Officer

O/o XEN, Construction Central Works Division No 2 (B&R), Amritsar.

Public Information Officer

O/o XEN, Construction Division (B&R), Ferozepur.

Public Information Officer

O/o XEN, Construction Division (B&R), Barnala.

Public Information Officer

O/o XEN, Construction Division B&R, Mansa.

Public Information Officer

O/o XEN, Construction Division (B&R),
Sri Muktsar Sahib.

Public Information Officer

O/o Superintending Engineer, Construction Circle (B&R) Circle,
Faridkot.

First Appellate Authority

O/o Superintending Engineer, PWD (B&R), Faridkot.

First Appellate Authority

O/o Superintending Engineer, Construction Circle B&R, Faridkot.

First Appellate Authority

O/o Superintending Engineer, PWD B&R, Punjab, Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority

O/o Superintending Engineer, PWD B&R, Construction Circle, Faridkot.

First Appellate Authority

O/o Superintending Engineer, Construction Division (B&R) Circle, Amritsar.

First Appellate Authority

O/o Superintending Engineer, Construction Division, B&R, Ferozepur.

First Appellate Authority

O/o Superintending Engineer, Construction Division (B&R Circle), Sangrur.

First Appellate Authority

O/o Superintending Engineer, Construction Circle (B&R), Bathinda.

First Appellate Authority

O/o Superintending Engineer, Construction Circle B&R, Faridkot.

First Appellate Authority

O/o Chief Engineer, PWD B&R, Patiala.

Facts: The appellant Sh. Manjit Singh vide RTI applications sought certain information in all the above mentioned cases. Aggrieved with the non-supply of the desired information from the respondent authorities i.e. PIO/FAA, the appellant filed a second appeal under the provision of Section 19 of the RTI Act before the state Information Commission.

Grounds for Second Appeal The PIO did not provide the desired information.

Present: Appellant: Sh. Manjit Singh (**Heard over phone**)

Respondent: Sh. Kulwinder Singh Sandhu (XEN), 9872725177,
Sh. Harjinder Singh (SDO), 9515216103, (On telephone call),
Sh. Navroop Singh (SDO), 9779901080, (On telephone call),
Sh. Sukhchain Singh (Clerk), 9878552569

ORDER:

1. A single speaking order is being passed in the above mentioned cases.
2. **Written Submission From appellant:** An email dated 31.03.2022 is received by the undersigned bench the relevant portion of which is reproduced below:

ਵਸਾ,,, ਮਿਤੀ,,4,4,2022, ਨੂੰ ਸੋਕੋਂਡ ਅਪੀਲ ਕੇਸ ਦੀ ਸੁਣਵਾਈ ਨਾ ਕਰਵਾਉਣ ਲਈ,,,
ਸ੍ਰੀ ਮਾਨ ਜੀ ਮੈਂ ਮਨਜੀਤ ਸਿੰਘ ਵਾਸੀ ਸ੍ਰੀ ਮੁਕਤਸਰ ਸਾਹਿਬ ਨੇ ਵੱਖ-ਵੱਖ ਸਰਕਾਰੀ ਵਿਭਾਗਾਂ ਤੋਂ ਆਰ ਟੀ ਆਈ
ਰਾਹੀਂ ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਨਾ ਮਿਲਣ ਕਰਕੇ ਆਪ ਜੀ ਪਾਸ ਅਪੀਲ ਕੀਤੀ ਸੀ, ਇਹਨਾਂ ਕੇਸਾਂ ਦੀ ਸੁਣਵਾਈ ਮਿਤੀ,4,4,2022,
ਨੂੰ ਹੈ ਮੈਂ ਇਹਨਾਂ ਕੇਸਾਂ ਦੀ,,1259,1276,2637,2790,3100,3528,5330,5457,5459/2021,, ਨੰਬਰ ਦੀ
ਸੁਣਵਾਈ ਆਪ ਜੀ ਪਾਸੋਂ ਨਹੀਂ ਕਰਵਾਉਣਾ ਚਾਹੁੰਦਾ ਹਾਂ, ਕਿਰਪਾ ਕਰਕੇ ਇਹ ਸਭ ਕੇਸ ਕਿਸੇ ਹੋਰ ਕਮਿਸ਼ਨਰ ਸਾਹਿਬ
ਨੂੰ ਟਰਾਂਸਫਰ ਕੀਤੇ ਜਾਣ ਆਪ ਜੀ ਦੀ ਬੜੀ ਮਿਹਰਬਾਨੀ ਹੋਵੇਗੀ,,,

3. During the hearing:

{The appellant was not present in person in the Commission though earlier he requested the Commission to fix all his cases on personal hearings only, accordingly all the above mentioned cases were fixed for personal hearing at PSIC Chandigarh. Further, to utilize the time and recourses of the commission and the respondent authorities who appeared for the hearing, the appellant was heard over telephone call.}

The appellant abused Right to Information and also used insinuate and defamatory language against the State Information Commissioner repeatedly and to transfer all his case to some another bench.

It is pertinent to mention here that

In P. Jayasankar vs.Chief Secretary to Government of Tamilnadu and Gunaseelan, I.P. S. decided by MadrasHigh Court on 18.2.2013, it was held that

“no information seeker can be allowed to insinuate or defame the Commissioners in the guise of prosecuting their cases”

Under such circumstances, when specific power is vested on the Commissioner and the Commission had proceeded against the information seeker, who had abused the Information Commissioner in the course of his proceedings; it will be open to the said authority to disqualify a particular information seeker by passing a speaking order. Commission, preferred to admonish him.

- 4. Having heard the parties present in all the above mentioned cases and on perusal of the available records and also taking note from the written submission of the appellant to transfer his all the cases to some another bench, this Court is view that; it is a clear cut case of forum shopping. Such practice is against the judicial discipline. The act of bench-hunting or bench shopping or bench-avoiding is not permissible under the law. No litigant can play hide and seek with the courts or adopt pick and choose.**

DECISION:

- 5. Thus in view of the discussion contained in the forgoing paragraphs of this Judgment the Commission cautions the appellant Sh. Manjit Singh is to refrain from such acts in future otherwise he will be blacklisted/barred from seeking information next time.**
- 6. Moreover, the Commission is in the view that the RTI application in these instances had been adequately addressed. No further intervention of the Commission is required in the matter. The appeal stands disposed accordingly.**

Chandigarh
Dated: 04.04.2022

Sd/-
(Maninder Singh Patti)
State Information Commissioner, Pb.



Sh. Varinder Kalia, (9417405543)

S/o Sh. Kewal Krishan Kalia,
House No. 31, near Improvement Tust Colony,
Jail Road, Gurdaspur.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o Chief Manager (HRD), Punjab Gramin Bank,
Jalandhar.

.....Respondent

First Appellate Authority

O/o General Manager (HRD), Punjab Gramin Bank,
Jalandhar.

Appeal Case No.3388 of 2021

RTI application filed on	:	14-12-2020
PIO replied on	:	07-01-2021
First appeal filed on	:	11-01-2021
First Appellate Authority order	:	27-01-2021

Present: Appellant: Sh. Varinder Kalia

Respondent: Sh. Dinesh Sharma, (CPIO), 8283823500

Sh. Mayank Mehta (CAPIO), 9988431543

ORDER (Second Hearing):

1. This order may be read with the reference of previous order dated 09.03.2022.

Information sought:

The period to which the information relates : 01-04-2014 to 31-01-2018.

Specific details of information required :

- 1) Copy of NOC dated 28/07/2016 and 14/09/2016 (original)
- 2) Copy of ATM issue form signed by customer.
- 3) Copy of inspection report dated 08/09/2017 and November/ December 2017
- 4) Copy of concurrent inspection January' 2017 to December' 2017

Observation :

2. Both the parties were present and heard.
3. The primary contention of the Appellant is that the Punjab Gramin Bank is deemed to be covered under the jurisdiction of State information Commission and hence the respondent bank should provide the sought information pertaining to his RTI application. The Commission finds no merit in such contention raised by the appellant. On the other hand, the Commission do find that there is substance in the contention of the Respondent.

Appeal Case No.3388 of 2021

The Commission concurs with the detailed order passed by the FAA of the Respondent and we also confirm our earlier order (supra) passed on this same issue where it was categorically held by one of the Learned Information Commissioners that: Complaint Case No. 648/20211 dated 04.04.2011, it had specifically held as under:

1.....“Punjab Gramin Bank is a Statutory Body incorporated under Regional Rural Act,1976 by a Gazette Notification dated 12.09.2005 of Govt. of India. As such, Punjab Gramin Bank is a Public Authority under Govt. of India and not under Govt. of Punjab. This has already been held in an earlier case of the complainant/appellant by State Information Commission, Punjab in its Order dated 20.05.2008 passed in CC No. 687 of 2008 titled Shri Manjit Singh, 41-Rishi Vihar, Majitha Road, Amritsar Vs. PIO, Punjab Gramin Bank, Kapurthala. Therefore, the complaint/Appeal is preferable before Central Information Commission, New Delhi.

2. Accordingly, the Complainant is directed to file a complaint/appeal with the Central Information Commission, B Wing, Second Floor, August Kranti Bhawan, Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi -110066, for seeking information.

Decision:

4. After hearing the parties and on perusal of the relevant documents on file, the Commission found no reason to disagree with the replies of the respondents. The replies of respondents upheld. The matter is disposed of accordingly at Commission's end.

Chandigarh
Dated: 04.04.2022

Sd/-
(Maninder Singh Patti)
State Information Commissioner, Pb.



Sh. Ravinder Kataria, (9463133590)

64, New Sant Fateh Singh Nagar,
Dugri Road, Ludhiana - 141002

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer

.....Respondent

O/o Sub Divisional Magistrate cum licensing Authority,
Khadoor Sahib, Distt. Tarn Taran.

First Appellate Authority

O/o Sub Divisional Magistrate cum licensing Authority,
Khadoor Sahib, Distt. Tarn Taran.

Appeal Case No.3744 of 2021

RTI application filed on	:	01-02-2021
PIO replied on	:	18-02-2021
First appeal filed on	:	09-04-2021
First Appellate Authority order	:	-

Present: Appellant: Sh. Ravinder Kataria
Respondent: Absent

ORDER:

1. This order may be read with the reference of previous order of the Commission dated 16.03.2022.

Information Sought:

1- मैं भारत का नागरिक हूँ। कृपया मुझे सूचना का अधिकार अधिनियम 2005 के तहत आप के कार्यालय के रिकॉर्ड के अनुसार नीचे लिखे दस्तावेजों की दिनांक 01-07-2020 से 31-12-2020 तक की प्रमाणित प्रतियां मेरे पंजीकृत पते पर प्रदान करें।

(क) उपरोक्त अवधि के दौरान आपके कार्यालय के क्षेत्राधिकार में पंजीकृत दोपहिया एवं चार पहिया अवाणिज्यिक(प्राइवेट) वाहनों की 15 वर्ष की अवधि समाप्ति के उपरांत ऐसे समस्त वाहनों का नवीनीकरण करते समय वाहन स्वामी से लिए गए फार्म संख्या 25 (वांछित सूचना का विवरण)

(ख) उपरोक्त अवधि के दौरान आपके कार्यालय में बाहरी राज्यों से आए वाहनों को वाहन स्वामी द्वारा पुनः पंजीकृत करवाते समय प्रस्तुत किए गए समस्त दस्तावेज (वांछित सूचना का विवरण)

(ग) उपरोक्त अवधि के दौरान कार्यालय में कार्यरत अनुभाग अधिकारी द्वारा पुनः पंजीकृत वाहनों का मूल्यांकन निर्धारित करते समय अपनाई गई प्रक्रिया के संपूर्ण दस्तावेज (वांछित सूचना का विवरण)

(घ) उपरोक्त अवधि के दौरान उपरोक्त वाहनों को पुनः पंजीकृत करने की प्रक्रिया में संलिप्त समस्त अधिकारियों एवं कर्मचारी के नाम एवं पद की जानकारी देते समस्त दस्तावेज (वांछित सूचना का विवरण)

2. **Written submission from respondent:** A email dated 04.04.2022 is received by the undersigned bench which is in affidavit form, wherein it is mentioned sought information/reply pertaining to the RTI application has already been supplied to the appellant and no any other information pertaining to this RTI application is available in the office record . This email is taken on record..

Observation :

3. The allegations made by the information seeker, in this case **Sh. Ravinder Kataria**, in the presence of staff of the Commission , that the Commission was biased towards respondents, are irresponsible, defamatory and baseless. His conduct during hearing was not appropriate. The legal and factual position need to be discussed and the respondent authority's submission had to be considered. If that was viewed and suspected as bias and pro Respondent Authority, it will be highly objectionable. His conduct in representing information seeker was irritating; he was intemperate and quite disturbing besides hurling several insinuations against all including this Commissioner. At a time it was impossible for the Commission to go ahead with the performance of duty. He had exhibited no remorse and continued spoiling peace, dignity and decorum of the Commissions' court room.

The Commission issues a strict warning to the appellant for his reckless and defamatory remarks during hearing and advises him not to repeat the same and any repetition of such conduct would invite the disqualification as held by the Madras High Court in below referred case.

In P. Jayasankar vs.Chief Secretary to Government of Tamilnadu and Gunaseelan, I.P. S. decided by MadrasHigh Court on 18.2.2013, it was held that

“no information seeker can be allowed to insinuate or defame the Commissioners in the guise of prosecuting their cases”....

Under such circumstances, when specific power is vested on the Commissioner and the Commission had proceeded against the information seeker, who had abused the Information Commissioner in the course of his proceedings; it will be open to the said authority to disqualify a particular information seeker by passing a speaking order. Commission preferred to admonish him.

Decision:

4. Thus in view of the discussion contained in the forgoing paragraphs of this Judgment and legal position, the Commission concludes that the information sought has been given as per the record of the Public authority and the appeal is dismissed.

Sd/-

**(Maninder Singh Patti)
State Information Commissioner, Pb.**

Dated: 04.04.2022



Sh. Ravinder Kataria, (9463133590)

64, New Sant Fateh Singh Nagar,
Dugri Road, Ludhiana - 141002

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer

.....Respondent

O/o Sub Divisional Magistrate cum licensing Authority,
Distt. Tarn Taran.

First Appellate Authority

O/o Sub Divisional Magistrate cum licensing Authority,
Distt. Tarn Taran.

Appeal Case No.3747 of 2021

RTI application filed on	:	01-02-2021
PIO replied on	:	18-02-2021
First appeal filed on	:	09-04-2021
First Appellate Authority order	:	-

Present: Appellant: Sh. Ravinder Kataria
Respondent: Absent

ORDER:

1. This order may be read with the reference of previous order dated 16.03.2022.

1- मैं भारत का नागरिक हूँ। कृपया मुझे सूचना का अधिकार अधिनियम 2005 के तहत आप के कार्यालय के रिकॉर्ड के अनुसार नीचे लिखे दस्तावेजों की दिनांक 01-07-2020 से 31- 12-2020 तक की प्रमाणित प्रतियां मेरे पंजीकृत पते पर प्रदान करें।

(क) उपरोक्त अवधि के दौरान आपके कार्यालय के क्षेत्राधिकार में पंजीकृत दोपहिया एवं चार पहिया अवाणिज्यिक(प्राइवेट) वाहनों की 15 वर्ष की अवधि समाप्ति के उपरांत ऐसे समस्त वाहनों का नवीनीकरण करते समय वाहन स्वामी से लिए गए फार्म संख्या 25 (वांछित सूचना का विवरण)

(ख) उपरोक्त अवधि के दौरान आपके कार्यालय में बाहरी राज्यों से आए वाहनों को वाहन स्वामी द्वारा पुनः पंजीकृत करवाते समय प्रस्तुत किए गए समस्त दस्तावेज (वांछित सूचना का विवरण)

(ग) उपरोक्त अवधि के दौरान कार्यालय में कार्यरत अनुभाग अधिकारी द्वारा पुनः पंजीकृत वाहनों का मूल्यांकन निर्धारित करते समय अपनाई गई प्रक्रिया के संपूर्ण दस्तावेज (वांछित सूचना का विवरण)

(घ) उपरोक्त अवधि के दौरान उपरोक्त वाहनों को पुनः पंजीकृत करने की प्रक्रिया में संलिप्त समस्त अधिकारियों एवं कर्मचारों के नाम एवं पद की जानकारी देते समस्त दस्तावेज (वांछित सूचना का विवरण)

2. **Written submission from respondent:** A email dated 04.04.2022 is received by the undersigned bench which is in affidavit form, wherein it is mentioned sought information/reply pertaining to the RTI application has already been supplied to the appellant and no any other information pertaining to this RTI application is available in the office record . This email is taken on record.

Observation :

5. The allegations made by the information seeker, in this case **Sh. Ravinder Kataria**, in the presence of staff of the Commission , that the Commission was biased towards respondents, are irresponsible, defamatory and baseless. His conduct during hearing was not appropriate. The legal and factual position need to be discussed and the respondent authority's submission had to be considered. If that was viewed and suspected as bias and pro Respondent Authority, it will be highly objectionable. His conduct in representing information seeker was irritating; he was intemperate and quite disturbing besides hurling several insinuations against all including this Commissioner. At a time it was impossible for the Commission to go ahead with the performance of duty. He had exhibited no remorse and continued spoiling peace, dignity and decorum of the Commissions' court room.

The Commission issues a strict warning to the appellant for his reckless and defamatory remarks during hearing and advises him not to repeat the same and any repetition of such conduct would invite the disqualification as held by the Madras High Court in below referred case.

In P. Jayasankar vs.Chief Secretary to Government of Tamilnadu and Gunaseelan, I.P. S. decided by MadrasHigh Court on 18.2.2013, it was held that

“no information seeker can be allowed to insinuate or defame the Commissioners in the guise of prosecuting their cases”....

Under such circumstances, when specific power is vested on the Commissioner and the Commission had proceeded against the information seeker, who had abused the Information Commissioner in the course of his proceedings; it will be open to the said authority to disqualify a particular information seeker by passing a speaking order. Commission preferred to admonish him.

Decision:

6. Thus in view of the discussion contained in the forgoing paragraphs of this Judgment and legal position, the Commission concludes that the information sought has been given as per the record of the Public authority and the appeal is dismissed.

Sd/-

Dated: 04.04.2022

**(Maninder Singh Patti)
State Information Commissioner, Pb.**

Sh. Rajinder Kumar, (9646380671)

S/o Sh. Mehar Chand,

R/o Ward No. 2, Supreme Enclave, near Vishkarma Bhawan,

Link Road, Mansa – 151505

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer

.....Respondent

O/o Chief Director cum ADGP, Vigilance Bureau, Punjab,

Sector 68, Mohali.

First Appellate Authority

O/o Director, Vigilance Bureau, Punjab,

Sector 68, Mohali.

Appeal Case No.5212 of 2021

Present: Appellant: Absent

Respondent: Ms. Amandeep Kaur (Inspector cum APIO / Vigilance), 8054940526

ORDER:

1. This order may be read with the reference of previous order of the Commission
22.03.2022.

2. Information sought:

ਕੁਰਮਾ ਕੇ ਕੋਈਗੀਤ
ਮਿਸਟਰਿ ਮਿਸਟਰਿ 25-12-20 ਦੇ ਕਮਿਸ਼ਨ ਕਰਮਚਾਰੀ ਦੀ ਸਿਰਫ਼
ਵਾਨੀ ਨਾਮਕ ਨਿਵਾਰ 2 ਨਾਮਕ ਤੇ ਇਸ ਨਿਵਾਰ ਨਿਵਾਰ
ਮਹਾਰਾਜ ਕੀਤੀਗਤ ਹੈ ਕਮਿਸ਼ਨਰਿਟਿ ਇਸ ਕੀ ਕਾਨੀ
ਕਮਿਸ਼ਨਰਿਟਿ ਨਿਵਾਰਿਟਿ ਨਿਵਾਰਿਟਿ ਨਿਵਾਰਿਟਿ 25 P 6A
2 - 15 P ਮਾਮਲਾ 2 V. 6 ਦੇ ਕੀ ਕੋਲੀ ਮੀ 1
8054940526 ਦੇ ਨਿਵਾਰਿਟਿ No. 63 ਨਿਵਾਰਿਟਿ 02-04-2022
ਕੀ ਕੋਲੀ ਮੀ ਕਮਿਸ਼ਨਰਿਟਿ ਕੀ ਕਮਿਸ਼ਨਰਿਟਿ
① ਮਿਸਟਰਿ ਮਿਸਟਰਿ ਕੀਤੀ ਕਮਿਸ਼ਨਰਿਟਿ ਕਮਿਸ਼ਨਰਿਟਿ
- ਕੀ ਕਮਿਸ਼ਨਰਿਟਿ ਕਮਿਸ਼ਨਰਿਟਿ ਕਮਿਸ਼ਨਰਿਟਿ
- ਕਮਿਸ਼ਨਰਿਟਿ ਕਮਿਸ਼ਨਰਿਟਿ ਕਮਿਸ਼ਨਰਿਟਿ
- ਕਮਿਸ਼ਨਰਿਟਿ ਕਮਿਸ਼ਨਰਿਟਿ ਕਮਿਸ਼ਨਰਿਟਿ

3. Respondent, Ms. Amandeep Kaur pleaded that the sought information has already been provided to the appellant and a copy of the same has been submitted in the commission for ready reference.

4. After hearing the respondent and records placed in the case file the Commission observed that the RTI application in this instance had been adequately addressed. There is no further cause for action and this appeal case is herewith CLOSED.

Sd/-

Chandigarh
Dated: 04.04.2022

(Maninder Singh Patti)
State Information Commissioner, Pb.

Appeal Case No.5302 of 2021

5. After hearing the respondent and records placed in the case file the Commission observed that the RTI application in this instance had been adequately addressed. There is no further cause for action and this appeal case is herewith CLOSED.

Sd/-

Chandigarh
Dated: 04.04.2022

(Maninder Singh Patti)
State Information Commissioner, Pb.



Sh. Karamjit, (9988152559, 9915451481)

S/o Sh. Malkit Ram,

R/o Dhanoa, Tehsil Mukerian, Distt Hoshiarpur.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o XEN, PWD, Mukherian,

Distt Hoshiarpur.

.....Respondent

First Appellate Authority

O/o Sr. Superintending Engineer, PWD,

Hoshiarpur.

Appeal Case No.3369 of 2021

RTI application filed on	:	16-03-2021
PIO replied on	:	-
First appeal filed on	:	06-05-2021
First Appellate Authority order	:	-

Present: Appellant: Advocate Varun Walia on behalf of applicant (9465763954)

Respondent: Sh. Davinder Kumar (SDE), 9646067766

ORDER:

1. This order may be read with the reference of previous order of the Commission dated 30.03.2022
2. Both the parties are present for hearing.
3. Respondent Sh. Davinder Kumar assured the Commission to provide an updated reply/information pertaining to the information sought by the appellant, within a week.
4. Accordingly, on the assurance of respondent authority this instant appeal case is **Disposed of** with the directions to respondent PIO, to file a reply / supply information within the said period. Failing to which action under section 20(1) of RTI act will be initiated, submit the compliance report in the Commission within 15 days from issue of this order. However, the liberty is granted to the appellant to approach the Commission within one month in case any submission regarding the receiving of information.

NOTE: All documents / information supplied to appellants / complainants must mandatorily be attested as :Information supplied under the RTI Act, 2005, Signature of the PIO, Name of the PIO, Name of the Public Authority, Date.

Sd/-

Chandigarh

Dated: 04.04.2022

**(Maninder Singh Patti)
State Information Commissioner, Pb.**