

Appellant

Sh. Ravinder Singh Gill # 986, Near Dev Hotel, Main Bazaar, Moga 142002.

Versus

Public Information Officer O/o DGP, Pb., Chandigarh

First Appellate Authority O/o DGP, Pb., Chandigarh

Appeal Case No.: 338 of 2022 Through CISCO WEBEX Respondent

# Present:

t: Appellant- absent Respondent: Sh. Parshotam, ASI

- ORDER
  - The RTI application is dated 5.7.2021 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 14.9.2021 and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 10.1.2022 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act). Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for hearing through CISCO WEBEX on 4.8.2022 i.e. today.
  - **2.** In today's hearing the appellant is absent but a reply dated 23.07.2022 is received from the appellant in the Commission vide diary no. 16677 dated 27.07.2022, which is taken on record.
  - **3.** The respondent states that the case was transferred to BOI, Punjab stating therein that the information sought is voluminous in nature and efforts of 75% will be involved in this exercise, so the information cannot be supplied. The similar kind of appeal case No.4733 of 2021 has been disposed of/closed by the bench of Hon'ble SIC, Sh. Amrit Partap Singh Sekhon on 17.06.2022.
  - **4.** As a similar appeal case is disposed of & closed by the Commission. Therefore, no further cause of action is required. Hence, this instant appeal case is **disposed of closed**. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Dated: 04.08.2022



Sh. Ravinder Kataria (8544841830/9463133590)

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

Versus

Public Information Officer O/o SDM, Mansa

**First Appellate Authority** 

O/o SDM, Mansa

#### Appeal Case No.: 2587 of 2021 Through CISCO WEBEX

Respondent

Present: Appellant: absent Respondent: Ms. Shakuntla Rani, PIO, SDM, Mansa(8126564201)

ORDER:

- 1. Refer to earlier order dated: 30.3.2022. The case was adjourned for 4.8.2022.
- 2. In today's hearing the respondent states that the department had sent reply/information dated 28.4.2022 along with 59 pages, to the appellant, copy of the same is on our record.
- 3. Appellant is absent despite being aware about the date of hearing.
- 4. On enquiring by the undersigned Bench, respondent intimates the Commission that no deficiency has been pointed out by the appellant till date and no correspondence is received by the Commission after the previous hearing held on 30.03.2022.
- 5. In wake of above, it is presumed that the appellant is satisfied with the supplied information and he has nothing to say in this regard. Therefore, no further cause of action is required. Hence, the instant appeal case is **disposed of/closed**. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Dated: 04.08.2022



Appellant

**Sh. Rajinder Kumar (9646380671)** s/o Sh. Mehar Chand, Ward No.2, Supreme Enclave, Near Vishavkarma Bhawan, Link Road, Mansa 151505.

Versus

Public Information Officer O/o Secy., Regional Transport Authority, Bathinda First Appellate Authority O/o Distt. Transport Officer-cum-SDM, Mansa

Respondent

#### Appeal Case No.: 5207 of 2021 Through CISCO Webex

Appellant: Sh. Rajinder Kumar

Respondent: Sh. Mukesh Bhatia, SO on behalf of the department

## ORDER

Present:

- The RTI application is dated 10.11.2020 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 29.1.2021 and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 17.11.2021 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act). Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for hearing through CISCO WEBEX on 4.8.2022 i.e. today
- 2. In today's hearing, appellant states that information has not been supplied to him by the respondent PIO.
- The respondent states that information with has been provided in the written form vide letter no. 1310 dated 18.07.2022. A copy of the same is also sent to the Commission via an email 18.07.2022, which is received and taken on record.
- 4. After hearing both the parties and examining the case file, I am of the considered view that supplied reply is sufficient which fulfills all the aspects of the RTI application. Therefore, no further cause of action is required. Hence, this instant appeal case is **disposed of closed**. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Dated: 04.08.2022



Complainant

**Sh. Ajit Singh Chadha(9815100065)** s/o Sh. Makhan Singh Chadha House No. 55A/2, Model Town, Patiala

Versus

Public Information Officer O/o Commissioner, M.C, Patiala

#### Complaint case No.: 1286 of 2021 Through CISCO WEBEX

Respondent

Present: None present.

## ORDER

- The RTI application is dated 5.10.2021 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. Complaint was filed in the Commission on 17.11.2021 under Section 18 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act). Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for hearing through CISCO WEBEX on 4.8.2022 i.e. today
- 2. In today's hearing, both the parties are absent. Notice which was issued to the complainant is returned to the Commission vide dairy no. 1112 dated 19.01.2022 with remarks 'insufficient address' but address of the complainant is correct as per the case file. A call was made to the appellant by the undersigned Bench, to inform today's hearing but till date no correspondence from him after filing the case in the Commission.
- 3. The attention of the Complainant is drawn to the decision of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India rendered on 12.12.2011 in Civil Appeal Nos. Nos.10787 10788 of 2011 (arising out of SLP © No.32768-32769/2010)- Chief Information Commissioner and another Vs. State of Manipur and another, in Para 31 whereof, it has been held that while entertaining a complaint case under Section 18 of the RTI Act, 2005, the Commissioners have no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for an access to the information which is as under:-

(31. We uphold the said contention and do not find any error in the impugned judgment of the High Court whereby it has been held that the Commissioner while entertaining a complaint under Section 18 of the said Act has no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for access to the information).

4. In wake of above, no further cause of action is required. Therefore, this instant complaint case is **disposed of & closed.** Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Dated: 04.08.2022