



Sh. Pankaj Kumar (9988241285)

s/o Sh. Nabh Singh,
MCB Zone, Gali No.1-B,
Surkhpeer Road,
Bathinda – 151001.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o M.C., Bathinda

First Appellate Authority

O/o M.C., Bathinda

Respondent

Appeal Case No.: 2853 of 2021
Through CISCO WEBEX

Present:

- (i) Sh. Sanjeev Goyal on behalf of the appellant
(ii) For the respondent PIOs: 1. Sh. Davinder Jaura, XEN
2. Sh. Pargat Singh, PIO
3. Sh. Sandip Kataria
4. Sh. Deepak Mittal

ORDER

1. The RTI application is dated 1.4.2021 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter FAA) on 5.4.2021 and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 21.6.2021 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act). Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for hearing for 4.5.2022 through CISCO WEBEX application.
2. In today's hearing, representative of the appellant, Sh. Sanjeev Goyal states that information with regard to point No.1 & 2 has been received. Information with regard to point No.6 has been provided but without certified by the PIO. He further pleads that information on affidavit may be provided duly signed by the PIO. The information with regard to point No.7 may be highlighted and be given.
3. Respondents' state that information relates with their branch had already been supplied to the appellant in connection with points concerned with their branch. Nothing is left to be supplied.
4. After hearing both the parties and examining case file, the court advises to the appellant to visit office of the respondent PIOs tomorrow at for inspection 5.5.2022 at 2.00 p.m. All the PIOs are advised to be present on the given date & time for showing official record with regard to the RTI application as per today's hearing.
5. The Bench, as per observations made above, is of the view that the appellant cannot seek information on single RTI application from multiple public authorities. A Full Bench of State Information Commission, Punjab in Complaint Case No.2903 of 2011 has decided on 13.01.2012, ruled as under:-

"We hold that under Section (3) of the Act *ibid*, the legal obligation of a PIO who receives a request for information under Section 6(1) of the Act is limited to transfer this request to only one public authority that holds the information. This obligation does not extend to transfer the request to multiple authorities.
6. The Bench further observes that the PIO O/o MC, Bathinda has made efforts to supply information to the appellant by forwarding RTI application to different PIOs of but the information asked for by the appellant has to be collected, collated and compiled, thereby resulting in wastage of time of multiple PIOs involved.

Appeal Case No.: 2853 of 2021
Through CISCO WEBEX

The Hon'ble Supreme Court in matter of CBSE vs. Aditya Bandopadhyay, (2011) 8 SCC 497, held as under:-

"67. Indiscriminate and impractical demands or directions under the RTI Act for disclosure of all and sundry information (unrelated to transparency and accountability in the functioning of public authorities and eradication of corruption) would be counterproductive as it will adversely affect the efficiency of the administration and result in the executive getting bogged down with the non-productive work of collecting and furnishing information. The Act should not be allowed to be misused or abused, to become a tool to obstruct the national development and integration, or to destroy the peace, tranquility and harmony among its citizens. Nor should it be converted into a tool of oppression or intimidation of honest officials striving to do their duty. The nation does not want a scenario where 75% of the staff of public authorities spends 75% of their time in collecting and furnishing information to applicants instead of discharging their regular duties. The threat of penalties under the RTI Act and the pressure of the authorities under the RTI Act should not lead to employees of a public authorities prioritizing "information furnishing", at the cost of their normal and regular duties.

In view of the above, it does not seem to be appropriate for the appellant to seek information which may entail engaging 75% of the employees of a public authority to collect and compile the information for furnishing the same to the appellant. The Bench advises the appellant to go for seeking information by filing separate RTI application before a specific public authority who has its separate PIO near future.

Despite of that four PIOs are present here and supplying information to the appellant. It is also observed that respondent sent a letter (no. 1305/40 dated 02.05.2022) to the appellant and representative of the appellant stating that he is not satisfied with the supplied information and wastage of precious time of all; as cases are fixed for different dates. In that letter respondent PIO also requested the appellant/representative of the appellant to contact the Chief Sanitary Inspector on his mobile no. 9876010022 to mutually cooperate for inspection of the official record in all the cases (Appeal case numbers: 1182/21, 1183/21, 405/21, 904/21, 1938/21, 1939/21, 2718/21, 2796/21, 2799/21, 2834/21, 2835/21, 2851/21, 2836/21, 2850/21, 3751/21, 2853/21, 2857/21, 2859/21 and 2860/21), which was received by the representative of the appellant, Sh. Sanjeev Goyal on 02.05.2022. This letter is received by the undersigned Bench via an email dated 03.05.2022 and taken on record.

7. **Appellant, Sh. Pankaj Kumar is advised to be present in person on the next date of hearing positively along with his representative.**

8. To come up on **06.09.2022 at 11:00 A.M. through CISCO-Webex** (Video Conferencing application). Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Steps to use CISCO WEBEX: Install CISCO Webex->Click on Join Meeting->Enter Meeting Number 1582933632.

Dated: 04.05.2022

(Anumit Singh Sodhi)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.

Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100

Email: - psic22@punjabmail.gov.in

Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Sh. Sanjeev Goyal (9814197689)

s/o Sh. Ashok Kumar,
148, Model Town,
Bathinda – 151001.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o M.C., Bathinda

First Appellate Authority

O/o M.C., Bathinda

Respondent

Appeal Case No.: 2854 of 2021
Through CISCO WEBEX

Present:

(i) Sh. Sanjeev Goyal, the appellant

(ii) For the respondent PIOs: Sh. Davinder Jaura, XEN

ORDER

1. The RTI application is dated 24.2.2021 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter FAA) on 9.4.2021 and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 21.6.2021 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act). Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for hearing for 4.5.2022 through CISCO WEBEX application.
2. In today's hearing, respondent, Sh. Davinder Jaura, XEN states that information has already been supplied to the appellant on 17.03.2022 but appellant expresses his dissatisfaction and pleads the court for an intervention in the matter for suitable directions to the PIO.
3. In view of the above, the court advises the appellant to visit office of the respondent PIOs tomorrow at for inspection 5.5.2022 at 2.00 p.m. All the PIOs are advised to be present on the given date & time for showing official record with regard to the RTI application. They are also advised to provide the identified information to the appellant under intimation to the Commission.
4. The Bench, as per observations made above, is of the view that the appellant cannot seek information on single RTI application from multiple public authorities. A Full Bench of State Information Commission, Punjab in Complaint Case No.2903 of 2011 has decided on 13.01.2012, ruled as under:-

"We hold that under Section (3) of the Act *ibid*, the legal obligation of a PIO who receives a request for information under Section 6(1) of the Act is limited to transfer this request to only one public authority that holds the information. This obligation does not extend to transfer the request to multiple authorities.
5. The Bench further observes that the PIO O/o MC, Bathinda has made efforts to supply information to the appellant by forwarding RTI application to different PIOs of but the information asked for by the appellant has to be collected, collated and compiled, thereby resulting in wastage of time of multiple PIOs involved.

Appeal Case No.: 2854 of 2021
Through CISCO WEBEX

The Hon'ble Supreme Court in matter of CBSE vs. Aditya Bandopadhyay, (2011) 8 SCC 497, held as under:-

"67. Indiscriminate and impractical demands or directions under the RTI Act for disclosure of all and sundry information (unrelated to transparency and accountability in the functioning of public authorities and eradication of corruption) would be counterproductive as it will adversely affect the efficiency of the administration and result in the executive getting bogged down with the non-productive work of collecting and furnishing information. The Act should not be allowed to be misused or abused, to become a tool to obstruct the national development and integration, or to destroy the peace, tranquility and harmony among its citizens. Nor should it be converted into a tool of oppression or intimidation of honest officials striving to do their duty. The nation does not want a scenario where 75% of the staff of public authorities spends 75% of their time in collecting and furnishing information to applicants instead of discharging their regular duties. The threat of penalties under the RTI Act and the pressure of the authorities under the RTI Act should not lead to employees of a public authorities prioritizing "information furnishing", at the cost of their normal and regular duties.

In view of the above, it does not seem to be appropriate for the appellant to seek information which may entail engaging 75% of the employees of a public authority to collect and compile the information for furnishing the same to the appellant. The Bench advises the appellant to go for seeking information by filing separate RTI application before a specific public authority who has its separate PIO near future.

It is also observed that respondent sent a letter (no. 1305/40 dated 02.05.2022) to the appellant and representative of the appellant stating that he is not satisfied with the supplied information and wastage of precious time of all; as cases are fixed for different dates. In that letter respondent PIO also requested the appellant/representative of the appellant to contact the Chief Sanitary Inspector on his mobile no. 9876010022 to mutually cooperate for inspection of the official record in all the cases (Appeal case numbers: 1182/21, 1183/21, 405/21, 904/21, 1938/21, 1939/21, 2718/21, 2796/21, 2799/21, 2834/21, 2835/21, 2851/21, 2836/21, 2850/21, 3751/21, 2853/21, 2857/21, 2859/21 and 2860/21), which was received by the representative of the appellant, Sh. Sanjeev Goyal on 02.05.2022. This letter is received by the undersigned Bench via an email dated 03.05.2022 and taken on record.

6. To come up on **06.09.2022 at 11:00 A.M. through CISCO-Webex** (Video Conferencing application). Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Steps to use CISCO WEBEX: Install CISCO Webex->Click on Join Meeting->Enter Meeting Number 1582933632.

Dated: 04.05.2022

(Anumit Singh Sodhi)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.**

Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100

Email: - psic22@punjabmail.gov.in

Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Sh. Sanjeev Goyal (9814197689)

s/o Sh. Ashok Kumar,
148, Model Town,
Bathinda – 151001.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer (By Name)

(Regd. Post) O/o ADC(D), Bathinda

First Appellate Authority

O/o ADC(D), Bathinda

Respondent

Appeal Case No.: 2855 of 2021

Through CISCO WEBEX

Present:

(i) Sh. Sanjeev Goyal, the appellant

(ii) Nobody on behalf of the respondent PIO

ORDER

1. The RTI application is dated 17.2.2021 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter FAA) on 25.3.2021 and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 11.6.2021 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act). Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for hearing for 4.5.2022 through CISCO WEBEX application.
2. In today's hearing the appellant Sh. Sanjeev Goyal states that requisite information is still pending and respondent is absent despite being aware about the date of hearing, his casual approach towards Notice of the Commission that affects disposal of the case. Today is the first hearing, so one more opportunity is awarded to the respondent PIO to appear in person on the next date of hearing along with directions to supply the point-wise reply/information to the appellant within ten days after receipt of this order.
3. Appellant is also advised to point out specifically deficiency, in writing to the respondent PIO with a copy to the Commission, once he receives the information within seven days.
4. Both the parties are advised to represent this case in person on the next date of hearing, failing to which, appropriate order in their absence shall be passed.
5. To come up on **07.09.2022 at 11:00 A.M. through CISCO-Webex** (Video Conferencing application). Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Steps to use CISCO WEBEX: Install CISCO Webex->Click on Join Meeting->Enter Meeting Number 1582933632.

Dated: 04.05.2022

**(Anumit Singh Sodhi)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab**



Sh. Sanjeev Goyal (9814197689)

s/o Sh. Ashok Kumar,
148, Model Town,
Bathinda – 151001.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o M.C., Bathinda

First Appellate Authority

O/o M.C., Bathinda

Respondent

Appeal Case No.: 2857 of 2021
Through CISCO WEBEX

Present:

- (i) Sh. Sanjeev Goyal, the appellant
(ii) For the respondent PIO: Sh. Davinder Jaura, XEN
Sh. Sandip Kataria,
Sh. Gurkirat Singh, SDM office. (8558866533)
Sh. Neeraj Garg

ORDER

1. The RTI application is dated 26.3.2021 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter FAA) on 30.3.2021 and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 21.6.2021 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act). Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for hearing for 4.5.2022 through CISCO WEBEX application.
2. In today's hearing, both the parties are present.
3. Sh. Sanjeev Goyal states that information sought for as per RTI application is still pending and pleads the court for an intervention in the matter for suitable directions to the PIOs.
4. Respondents' state that whatever information relates with their branches had already been supplied to the appellant and nothing is left to be supplied but appellant expresses his dissatisfaction on the same.
5. In view of the above, the court advises the appellant to visit office of the respondent PIOs tomorrow at for inspection 5.5.2022 at 2.00 p.m. All the PIOs are advised to be present on the given date & time for showing official record with regard to the RTI application. They are also advised to provide the identified information to the appellant under intimation to the Commission.
6. The Bench, as per observations made above, is of the view that the appellant cannot seek information on single RTI application from multiple public authorities. A Full Bench of State Information Commission, Punjab in Complaint Case No.2903 of 2011 has decided on 13.01.2012, ruled as under:-

"We hold that under Section (3) of the Act *ibid*, the legal obligation of a PIO who receives a request for information under Section 6(1) of the Act is limited to transfer this request to only one public authority that holds the information. This obligation does not extend to transfer the request to multiple authorities.
7. The Bench further observes that the PIO O/o MC, Bathinda has made efforts to supply information to the appellant by forwarding RTI application to different PIOs of but the information asked for by the appellant has to be collected, collated and compiled, thereby resulting in wastage of time of multiple PIOs involved.

Appeal Case No.: 2857 of 2021
Through CISCO WEBEX

The Hon'ble Supreme Court in matter of CBSE vs. Aditya Bandopadhyay, (2011) 8 SCC 497, held as under:-

"67. Indiscriminate and impractical demands or directions under the RTI Act for disclosure of all and sundry information (unrelated to transparency and accountability in the functioning of public authorities and eradication of corruption) would be counterproductive as it will adversely affect the efficiency of the administration and result in the executive getting bogged down with the non-productive work of collecting and furnishing information. The Act should not be allowed to be misused or abused, to become a tool to obstruct the national development and integration, or to destroy the peace, tranquility and harmony among its citizens. Nor should it be converted into a tool of oppression or intimidation of honest officials striving to do their duty. The nation does not want a scenario where 75% of the staff of public authorities spends 75% of their time in collecting and furnishing information to applicants instead of discharging their regular duties. The threat of penalties under the RTI Act and the pressure of the authorities under the RTI Act should not lead to employees of a public authorities prioritizing "information furnishing", at the cost of their normal and regular duties.

In view of the above, it does not seem to be appropriate for the appellant to seek information which may entail engaging 75% of the employees of a public authority to collect and compile the information for furnishing the same to the appellant. The Bench advises the appellant to go for seeking information by filing separate RTI application before a specific public authority who has its separate PIO near future.

Despite of that four PIOs are present here and supplying information to the appellant. It is also observed that respondent sent a letter (no. 1305/40 dated 02.05.2022) to the appellant and representative of the appellant stating that he is not satisfied with the supplied information and wastage of precious time of all; as cases are fixed for different dates. In that letter respondent PIO also requested the appellant/representative of the appellant to contact the Chief Sanitary Inspector on his mobile no. 9876010022 to mutually cooperate for inspection of the official record in all the cases (Appeal case numbers: 1182/21, 1183/21, 405/21, 904/21, 1938/21, 1939/21, 2718/21, 2796/21, 2799/21, 2834/21, 2835/21, 2851/21, 2836/21, 2850/21, 3751/21, 2853/21, 2857/21, 2859/21 and 2860/21), which was received by the representative of the appellant, Sh. Sanjeev Goyal on 02.05.2022. This letter is received by the undersigned Bench via an email dated 03.05.2022 and taken on record.

8. To come up on **06.09.2022 at 11:00 A.M. through CISCO-Webex** (Video Conferencing application). Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Steps to use CISCO WEBEX: Install CISCO Webex->Click on Join Meeting->Enter Meeting Number 1582933632.

Dated: 04.05.2022

(Anumit Singh Sodhi)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.**

Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100

Email: - psic22@punjabmail.gov.in

Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Sh. Sanjeev Goyal (9814197689)

s/o Sh. Ashok Kumar,
148, Model Town,
Bathinda – 151001.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer (By Name)

(Regd. Post) O/o Improvement Trust, Bathinda

First Appellate Authority

O/o Improvement Trust, Bathinda

Respondent

Appeal Case No.: 2858 of 2021

Through CISCO WEBEX

Present: (i) Sh. Sanjeev Goyal on behalf of the appellant
(ii) Nobody on behalf of the respondent PIO.

ORDER

1. The RTI application is dated 4.3.2021 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter FAA) on 5.4.2021 and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 21.6.2021 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act). Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for hearing for 4.5.2022 through CISCO WEBEX application.
2. In today's hearing, appellant states that information is still pending from the respondent PIO.
3. Respondent PIO is absent without any intimation to the Commission.
4. After hearing both the parties and examining the documents placed on record, it is observed that RTI application is vague in nature as time period is not mentioned in the RTI application for which information sought for. It is also observed that requisite information has already been supplied to the appellant through letter no. 644 dated 07.04.2021, this letter is in the case file and taken on record but appellant expresses his dissatisfaction on the supplied information. **A copy of this order be sent to the respondent PIO through registered post for his ready reference.**
5. To come up on **07.09.2022 at 11:00 A.M. through CISCO-Webex** (Video Conferencing application). Copy of the order be sent to the parties.
Steps to use CISCO WEBEX: Install CISCO Webex->Click on Join Meeting->Enter Meeting Number 1582933632.

Dated: 04.05.2022

**(Anumit Singh Sodhi)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab**

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,

Sector 16, Chandigarh.

Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100

Email: - psic22@punjabmail.gov.in

Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Sh. Sanjeev Goyal (9814197689)

s/o Sh. Ashok Kumar,
148, Model Town,
Bathinda – 151001.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o M.C., Bathinda

First Appellate Authority

O/o M.C., Bathinda

Respondent

Appeal Case No.: 2859 of 2021

Through CISCO WEBEX

Present:

(i) Sh. Sanjeev Goyal on behalf of the appellant

(ii) For the respondent PIO: Sh. Sandip Kataria along with Sh. Mintoo Kumar (9256488900)

ORDER

1. The RTI application is dated 12.3.2021 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter FAA) on 12.04.2021 and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 21.6.2021 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act). Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for hearing for 4.5.2022 through CISCO WEBEX application.
2. In today's hearing, both the parties are present.
3. Sh. Sanjeev Goyal states that information sought for as per RTI application is still pending and pleads the court for an intervention in the matter for suitable directions to the PIOs.
4. Respondents' state that whatever information relates with their branches had already been supplied to the appellant and nothing is left to be supplied but appellant expresses his dissatisfaction on the same.
5. In view of the above, the court advises the appellant to visit office of the respondent PIOs tomorrow at for inspection 5.5.2022 at 2.00 p.m. All the PIOs are advised to be present on the given date & time for showing official record with regard to the RTI application. They are also advised to provide the identified information to the appellant under intimation to the Commission.
6. The Bench, as per observations made above, is of the view that the appellant cannot seek information on single RTI application from multiple public authorities. A Full Bench of State Information Commission, Punjab in Complaint Case No.2903 of 2011 has decided on 13.01.2012, ruled as under:-

"We hold that under Section (3) of the Act *ibid*, the legal obligation of a PIO who receives a request for information under Section 6(1) of the Act is limited to transfer this request to only one public authority that holds the information. This obligation does not extend to transfer the request to multiple authorities.
7. The Bench further observes that the PIO O/o MC, Bathinda has made efforts to supply information to the appellant by forwarding RTI application to different PIOs of but the information asked for by the appellant has to be collected, collated and compiled, thereby resulting in wastage of time of multiple PIOs involved.

Appeal Case No.: 2859 of 2021
Through CISCO WEBEX

The Hon'ble Supreme Court in matter of CBSE vs. Aditya Bandopadhyay, (2011) 8 SCC 497, held as under:-

"67. Indiscriminate and impractical demands or directions under the RTI Act for disclosure of all and sundry information (unrelated to transparency and accountability in the functioning of public authorities and eradication of corruption) would be counterproductive as it will adversely affect the efficiency of the administration and result in the executive getting bogged down with the non-productive work of collecting and furnishing information. The Act should not be allowed to be misused or abused, to become a tool to obstruct the national development and integration, or to destroy the peace, tranquility and harmony among its citizens. Nor should it be converted into a tool of oppression or intimidation of honest officials striving to do their duty. The nation does not want a scenario where 75% of the staff of public authorities spends 75% of their time in collecting and furnishing information to applicants instead of discharging their regular duties. The threat of penalties under the RTI Act and the pressure of the authorities under the RTI Act should not lead to employees of a public authorities prioritizing "information furnishing", at the cost of their normal and regular duties.

In view of the above, it does not seem to be appropriate for the appellant to seek information which may entail engaging 75% of the employees of a public authority to collect and compile the information for furnishing the same to the appellant. The Bench advises the appellant to go for seeking information by filing separate RTI application before a specific public authority who has its separate PIO near future.

Despite of that two PIOs are present here and supplying information to the appellant. It is also observed that respondent sent a letter (no. 1305/40 dated 02.05.2022) to the appellant and representative of the appellant stating that he is not satisfied with the supplied information and wastage of precious time of all; as cases are fixed for different dates. In that letter respondent PIO also requested the appellant/representative of the appellant to contact the Chief Sanitary Inspector on his mobile no. 9876010022 to mutually cooperate for inspection of the official record in all the cases (Appeal case numbers: 1182/21, 1183/21, 405/21, 904/21, 1938/21, 1939/21, 2718/21, 2796/21, 2799/21, 2834/21, 2835/21, 2851/21, 2836/21, 2850/21, 3751/21, 2853/21, 2857/21, 2859/21 and 2860/21), which was received by the representative of the appellant, Sh. Sanjeev Goyal on 02.05.2022. This letter is received by the undersigned Bench via an email dated 03.05.2022 and taken on record.

8. To come up on **06.09.2022 at 11:00 A.M. through CISCO-Webex** (Video Conferencing application). Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Steps to use CISCO WEBEX: Install CISCO Webex->Click on Join Meeting->Enter Meeting Number 1582933632.

Dated: 04.05.2022

(Anumit Singh Sodhi)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100
Email: - psic22@punjabmail.gov.in
Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Sh. Sanjeev Goyal (9814197689)

s/o Sh. Ashok Kumar,
148, Model Town,
Bathinda – 151001.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o M.C., Bathinda

First Appellate Authority

O/o M.C., Bathinda

Respondent

Appeal Case No.: 2860 of 2021
Through CISCO WEBEX

Present: (i) Sh. Sanjeev Goyal, the appellant
(ii) For the respondent PIO: Sh. Sandip Kataria,

ORDER

1. The RTI application is dated 05.3.2021 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter FAA) on 12.04.2021 and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 21.6.2021 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act). Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for hearing for 4.5.2022 through CISCO WEBEX application.
2. In today's hearing, both the parties are present.
3. Sh. Sanjeev Goyal states that information sought for as per RTI application is still pending and pleads the court for an intervention in the matter for suitable directions to the PIOs.
4. Respondent, Sh. Sandip Kataria states that whatever information relates with his branch had already been supplied to the appellant and nothing is left to be supplied but appellant expresses his dissatisfaction on the same.
5. In view of the above, the court advises the appellant to visit office of the respondent PIOs tomorrow at for inspection 5.5.2022 at 2.00 p.m. All the PIOs are advised to be present on the given date & time for showing official record with regard to the RTI application. They are also advised to provide the identified information to the appellant under intimation to the Commission.
6. The Bench, as per observations made above, is of the view that the appellant cannot seek information on single RTI application from multiple public authorities. A Full Bench of State Information Commission, Punjab in Complaint Case No.2903 of 2011 has decided on 13.01.2012, ruled as under:-

"We hold that under Section (3) of the Act *ibid*, the legal obligation of a PIO who receives a request for information under Section 6(1) of the Act is limited to transfer this request to only one public authority that holds the information. This obligation does not extend to transfer the request to multiple authorities.
7. The Bench further observes that the PIO O/o MC, Bathinda has made efforts to supply information to the appellant by forwarding RTI application to different PIOs of but the information asked for by the appellant has to be collected, collated and compiled, thereby resulting in wastage of time of multiple PIOs involved.

Appeal Case No.: 2860 of 2021
Through CISCO WEBEX

The Hon'ble Supreme Court in matter of CBSE vs. Aditya Bandopadhyay, (2011) 8 SCC 497, held as under:-

"67. Indiscriminate and impractical demands or directions under the RTI Act for disclosure of all and sundry information (unrelated to transparency and accountability in the functioning of public authorities and eradication of corruption) would be counterproductive as it will adversely affect the efficiency of the administration and result in the executive getting bogged down with the non-productive work of collecting and furnishing information. The Act should not be allowed to be misused or abused, to become a tool to obstruct the national development and integration, or to destroy the peace, tranquility and harmony among its citizens. Nor should it be converted into a tool of oppression or intimidation of honest officials striving to do their duty. The nation does not want a scenario where 75% of the staff of public authorities spends 75% of their time in collecting and furnishing information to applicants instead of discharging their regular duties. The threat of penalties under the RTI Act and the pressure of the authorities under the RTI Act should not lead to employees of a public authorities prioritizing "information furnishing", at the cost of their normal and regular duties.

In view of the above, it does not seem to be appropriate for the appellant to seek information which may entail engaging 75% of the employees of a public authority to collect and compile the information for furnishing the same to the appellant. The Bench advises the appellant to go for seeking information by filing separate RTI application before a specific public authority who has its separate PIO near future.

It is also observed that respondent sent a letter (no. 1305/40 dated 02.05.2022) to the appellant and representative of the appellant stating that he is not satisfied with the supplied information and wastage of precious time of all; as cases are fixed for different dates. In that letter respondent PIO also requested the appellant/representative of the appellant to contact the Chief Sanitary Inspector on his mobile no. 9876010022 to mutually cooperate for inspection of the official record in all the cases (Appeal case numbers: 1182/21, 1183/21, 405/21, 904/21, 1938/21, 1939/21, 2718/21, 2796/21, 2799/21, 2834/21, 2835/21, 2851/21, 2836/21, 2850/21, 3751/21, 2853/21, 2857/21, 2859/21 and 2860/21), which was received by the representative of the appellant, Sh. Sanjeev Goyal on 02.05.2022. This letter is received by the undersigned Bench via an email dated 03.05.2022 and taken on record.

8. To come up on **06.09.2022 at 11:00 A.M. through CISCO-Webex** (Video Conferencing application). Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Steps to use CISCO WEBEX: Install CISCO Webex->Click on Join Meeting->Enter Meeting Number 1582933632.

Dated: 04.05.2022

(Anumit Singh Sodhi)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.**

Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100

Email: - psic22@punjabmail.gov.in

Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Sh. Jasbir Singh (9888296107)

Guru Nanak Nagar,
Village Bolapur, Jhabawal,
Post Office, Ramgarh,
District Ludhiana-141123

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o State Transport Commissioner Punjab,
Sector-17, Chandigarh

First Appellate Authority

O/o State Transport Commissioner Punjab,
Sector-17, Chandigarh

Respondent

Appeal Case No.: 2471 of 2021
Through CISCO WEBEX

Present: (i) Appellant – Sh. Jasbir Singh at PSIC Office.
(ii) For the respondent PIO: Sh. Gurbax Singh, PIO

ORDER

1. This order may be read with the earlier orders of the Commission dated: 10.11.2021 vide which respondent PIO was directed to supply the information once again to the appellant and appellant was advised to point out deficiency, if any. The case was adjourned for further hearing for 4.5.2022.
2. In today's hearing, respondent, Sh. Gurbax Singh states that their department as per last orders dated: 10.11.2021, the information was sent to the appellant on 25.04.2022.
3. Appellant, Sh. Jasbir Singh appeared before the undersigned Bench after the hearing was over of this case and he intimates the Commission that he is not satisfied with the supplied reply because respondent PIO denied information on the plea that information could be collected from Architecture Deptt. by the appellant.
4. Both the parties are advised to represent this case in person or through their representative(s), who is well aware about the case on the next date of hearing positively, failing which appropriate orders will be passed in their absence.
5. To come up on **17.05.2022 at 11:00 A.M. through CISCO-Webex** (Video Conferencing application). Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Steps to use CISCO WEBEX: Install CISCO Webex->Click on Join Meeting->Enter Meeting Number 1582933632.

Dated: 04.05.2022

(Anumit Singh Sodhi)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.**

Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100

Email: - psic22@punjabmail.gov.in

Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Sh. Gurpreet Singh (7814044919)

H.No.163, Sector-45-A,
Chandigarh.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o Deptt. Of Technical Education
& Industrial Training(Indl. Training Wing), Pb,
Sector 36, Chandigarh

First Appellate Authority

O/o Deptt. Of Technical Education
& Industrial Training(Indl. Training Wing), Pb,
Sector 36, Chandigarh

Respondent

Appeal Case No.: 2492 of 2021
Through CISCO WEBEX

Present: (i) Appellant – Sh. Gurpreet Singh
(ii) For the respondent : Sh. Sanjiv Kumar, SA.

ORDER

1. Reference earlier orders dated: 10.11.2021. The case was adjourned for further hearing for 4.5.2022.
2. In today's hearing the appellant and respondent both are present.
3. The appellant states that as per last order of the Commission dated: 10.10.2021 the information was to be supplied within seven days from the date of order. He further pleads that the information sought for is not 3rd party information. It is to inform that the information sought for is about an appointment letter which was issued with forged signatures that is why the department does not want to give.
4. The respondent states that the matter is under investigation by the Vigilance Department, the Vigilance department has denied to supply the information.
5. After hearing both the parties in details, I am of the considered view that information can be supplied because appointment letter is not a confidential matter/personal. So, it is directed that the same be got provided to the appellant. It is also directed that letter received from Vigilance Department may also be forwarded to the appellant within seven days failing which penal action shall be initiated against the department.
6. To come up on **18.5.2022 at 11:00 A.M.** through **CISCO-Webex** (Video Conferencing application). Copy of the order be sent to the parties. **Steps to use CISCO WEBEX: Install CISCO Webex->Click on Join Meeting->Enter Meeting Number 1584674319.**

Dated: 04.05.2022

(Anumit Singh Sodhi)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.

Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100

Email: - psic22@punjabmail.gov.in

Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Sh. Tejinder Singh, Advocate (9041004313)

Civil Courts, Tehsil Complex,
Backside Sanjh Kender,
Pillaur 144410

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/O Addl. Secy., Transport Commissioner, Pb.,
Chandigarh

First Appellate Authority

O/O Addl. Secy., Transport Commissioner, Pb.,
Chandigarh

Respondent

Appeal Case No.: 1556 of 2021

Through CISCO WEBEX

Present: (i) Sh. Tejinder Singh, the appellant
(ii) For the respondent: Sh. Gurbax Singh (APIO)

ORDER

1. Refer earlier order dated 22.3.2022 where it had been stated by Ms. Jaswinder Kaur, Steno that the concerned PIO/APIO are unable to attend the meeting and requested for an adjournment. The respondent PIO was advised to appear in the Commission on the next date of hearing. The case was adjourned to 4.5.2022 i.e. today.
2. In today's hearing, both the parties are present. Appellant intimates the Commission that the sought information is still awaited.
3. The respondent states that information has been supplied to the appellant on 2.5.2022.
4. In view of above, the PIO concerned is directed to visit office of the Commission along with record file on the next date of hearing and the matter is adjourned for further hearing on **17.5.2022 at 11:00 A.M. through CISCO WEBEX application**
5. Appellant is also advised to represent this case in person on the next date of hearing, failing which appropriate orders will be passed in their absence. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

(Steps to use CISCO WEBEX: Install CISCO Webex->Click on Join Meeting->Enter Meeting Number 1582933632).

Dated: 04.05.2022

(Anumit Singh Sodhi)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,

Sector 16, Chandigarh.

Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100

Email: - psic22@punjabmail.gov.in

Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Sh. Ravinder Kataria (8544841830/9463133590)

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

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o SDM, Mansa

First Appellate Authority

O/o SDM, Mansa

Respondent

Appeal Case No.: 2587 of 2021

Heard through CISCO WEBEX

Present: (i) Sh. Ravinder Kataria- appellant (On phone)

(ii) For the respondent: Sh. Neeraj Garg

ORDER

1. The above mentioned case was earlier heard on 30.03.2022 vide which respondent PIO was directed to supply the pending information (point no. 2) within weeks' time under intimation to the Commission. The case was adjourned to 4.5.2022 i.e. today.
2. In today's hearing, respondent, Sh. Neeraj Garg states that information in connection with point No.2 has been sent to the appellant on 28.4.2022 comprising 59 pages.
3. On this, appellant, Sh. Ravinder Kataria states that he was away and he has not gone through the supplied information and seeks adjournment.
4. Request of the appellant is granted; matter is fixed for further hearing on **12.07.2022 at 11:00 A.M. through CISCO WEBEX** along with advice to go through the information and point out specifically deficiency, if any in writing to the respondent PIO with a copy to the Commission.
(Steps to use CISCO WEBEX: Install CISCO Webex->Click on Join Meeting->Enter Meeting Number 1582933632).

Dated: 04.05.2022

**(Anumit Singh Sodhi)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab**

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100
Email: - psic22@punjabmail.gov.in
Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Appellant

Sh. Amarjit Bansal (9855600073)

President, Mubarikpur Crushers Association(Regd.)
H.O. Saket Stone Crusher, Mubarikpur,
Tehsil Dera Bassi, Distt. Mohali.

Versus

Show-Cause

Public Information Officer (By Name)
(Regd. Post) O/o XEN-Cum-Mining Officer,
SAS Nagar(Mohali).

First Appellate Authority

O/o Chief Engineer, Water Resources & Mining,
Sector 18, Chandigarh

Respondent

Appeal case No.: 3834 of 2021
Through CISCO WEBEX

Present: (i) Sh. Subhash Sharma, Advocate (988892733) on behalf of the appellant.
(ii) For the respondent: absent

ORDER

1. The above mentioned case was earlier heard on 23.11.2021 wherein respondent PIO was absent and he was directed to appear in person on the next date of hearing. Matter was adjourned for further hearing on 31.01.2022.

The above mentioned case was allocated to the undersigned Bench on 03.01.2022 but matter was not heard on the fixed date 31.01.2022 and fixed for today i.e. 04.05.2022.

2. In today's hearing, representative of the appellant, Sh. Subhash Sharma intimates the Commission that information from M to S point has not been received from the respondent PIO.
3. Respondent PIO is absent in spite of registered notice. He was also absent on the previous hearing held on 23.11.2021.
4. In view of the foregoing, **respondent PIO, O/o XEN-cum-Mining Officer, SAS Nagar (Mohali) is directed to show cause** in writing or through affidavit under Section 20(1) of the RTI Act, as to why penalty be not imposed upon him for willful delay/ denial of the information to the RTI applicant and why the compensation be not awarded to the complainant under Section 19 (8)(b) of the Act for detriment suffered.

In addition to his submission, the PIO is also hereby given an opportunity under Section 20(1) proviso, thereto, for a personal hearing before the imposition of such penalty on the next date of hearing. He may note that in case he does not file his submission and does not avail himself of the opportunity of personal hearing on the next date fixed, it will be presumed that he has nothing to say and the Commission shall proceed to take further proceedings against him ex-parte.

5. To come up on **27.07.2022 at 11:00 A.M. through CISCO-Webex** (Video Conferencing application). Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

(Steps to use CISCO WEBEX: Install CISCO Webex->Click on Join Meeting->Enter Meeting Number 1582933632).

Dated: 04.05.2022

(Anumit Singh Sodhi)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100
Email: - psic22@punjabmail.gov.in
Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Sh. Ashok Kumar (9417295387)

s/o Sh. Roshan Lal,
R/o F7/250, Aarewali Street, Kashmir Avenue,
Amritsar.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o Municipal Corporation, Amritsar.

First Appellate Authority

O/o Commissioner, MC, Amritsar

Respondent

Appeal case No.: 3702 of 2021
Through CISCO WEBEX

Present: (i) Appellant - present
(ii) For the respondent: absent

Order

1. Refer earlier order dated 15.3.2022 vide which the appellant was advised to demand specific information within 10 days as per orders of the Commission dated 17.11.2021. The respondent was also advised to supply the specific information as pointed out by the appellant. The case was adjourned to 4.5.2022 i.e. today.
2. In today's hearing the respondent PIO is again absent in spite of registered notice and Order passed by the Commission dated 15.03.2022 in the present case.
3. The appellant states that as per directions of the Commission a letter has been written to the respondent department for specific information on 24.03.2022 but till date he has not received the specific information.
4. In view of the above discussion, the court directs to the respondent department to supply the specific information to the appellant immediately without fail, failing which a penal action will be taken against the department.
5. To come up on **26.5.2022 at 11:00 A.M. through CISCO-Webex** (Video Conferencing application). Copy of the order be sent to the parties.
(Steps to use CISCO WEBEX: Install CISCO Webex->Click on Join Meeting->Enter Meeting Number 1582933632).

Dated: 04.05.2022

(Anumit Singh Sodhi)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

Note: After the court a call from Ms. Raj, Inspector(9417606226) is received stating that due to technical issue she could not attend the hearing. She was apprised with proceedings of this hearing.

Dated: 04.05.2022

(Anumit Singh Sodhi)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab