



Smt.Bakshish Kaur, W/o Late Sh.Sukhdev Singh
Village Susana, P.O Sus,
Tehsil & Distt.Hoshiarpur.

...Complainant

Vs

Public Information Officer,
O/o Chief Engineer, North,
PSPCL, Shakti Sadan, Jalandhar.

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 47 of 2020

PRESENT: Smt.Bakshish Kaur as the Complainant
Sh.Amrik Ram, Sr.Xen Bhogpur for the Respondent

ORDER:

The complainant through RTI application dated 23.10.2019 has sought information regarding revision of pension file No.S-11360 ID No.261312 & PP No.14545/08-09 dated 18.02.2009 from 01.01.2006 and other information concerning the office of Chief Engineer, North, PSPCL Jalandhar. The complainant was not provided the information after which the complainant filed complaint in the Commission on 07.01.2020.

The case first came up for hearing on 14.09.2020 through video conferencing at DAC Jalandhar. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 24.08.2020 and a copy of the same submitted to the Commission. As per respondent, the complainant was satisfied.

Having gone through the record, the Commission observed that even though the respondent had supplied the information, yet there was a delay in attending to the RTI application. The respondent further pleaded that since Sh.Sukhdev Singh was working in Kartarpur Division, the pension case of the deceased employee was to be processed by Kartarpur Division. The Kartarpur Division was asked to process the pension case of the deceased employee vide letter dated 26.06.2016 followed by reminders dated 29.07.2019 & 30.08.2019. Thereafter, the Kartarpur Division processed the case and sent pension arrears and PPO No.121224/19-20 to this office on 24.12.2019. The revised pension alongwith amount of arrear had been provided to the complainant alongwith the pension for the month of Jan.2020. The respondent also apologized for delay in attending to the RTI application.

The complainant was absent nor had communicated any discrepancies. The complainant was asked to file objection if any on the next date of hearing.

Hearing dated 04.11.2020:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Jalandhar. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been supplied to the complainant. The complainant has received the information and is satisfied.

Since the information has been provided, no further course of action is required. The case is **disposed off and closed**.

Chandigarh
Dated 04.11.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh.Subhash Chander,
Gali No-2 , New Luxmi Nagar,
Kapurthala.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o XEN,
Punjab Water Supply and
Sewerage, Division No-2,
Jalandhar.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o SE, Water Supply and Sewerage Board,
Model Town Road, Near Manbro Chowk,
Jalandhar

.....Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1427of 2020

PRESENT: Sh.Subhash Chander as the Appellant
Sh.Rajesh Gulati, DFO for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 31.12.2019 has sought information regarding permission letter obtained from forest department while laying sewerage line on the protected forest area to provide sewerage connections to AGI Flats or other building on 66 ft road near urban estate phase-ii and other information concerning the office of Suptd. Water Supply & Sewerage Board Jalandhar. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 04.03.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case was first heard on 22.09.2020 through video conferencing at DAC Jalandhar. The appellant informed that he had received a letter from the office of the PIO-SE-Punjab Water Supply and Sewerage Circle Jalandhar that the information does not relate to them. The Commission also received a copy of said letter from the office of SE- Punjab Water Supply and Sewerage Circle Jalandhar on 11.09.2020 stating that the area for which the information has been sought by the appellant does not come under the purview of Punjab Water Supply & Sewerage Board and the reply has already been sent to the appellant by the Xen-Punjab Water Supply & Sewerage Division No.1 Jalandhar vide letter dated 09.07.2020.

The respondent was absent. Having gone through the RTI application, the Commission impleaded the PIO-Department of Forests, Punjab Circle Jalandhar and directed it to provide information, if any such permission has been granted for laying the mentioned sewerage line. A copy of the RTI application was enclosed with the order for the PIO-Forest Department, Jalandhar.

A copy of the RTI was also forwarded to the SE, Punjab Water Supply and Sewerage, Circle Jalandhar to look into the RTI and get it implemented in accordance with the provisions of the RTI Act. To send a compliance report to the commission.

Hearing dated 04.11.2020:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Jalandhar. The respondent, the Forest Department has clarified that no permission was sought by the Water Supply and Sewerage Department for laying the mentioned sewerage line, thus no permission was granted. The appellant has received the information during the hearing and has shown satisfaction.

Since the information has been provided, no further course of action is required. The case is **disposed off and closed**.

Sd/-

**Chandigarh
Dated 04.11.2020**

**(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner**

**CC to PIO-Department of Forests,
Punjab Maqsuda Chowk,
G.T.Road, Jalandhar.**



Sh.Nand Kishore, S/o Sh.Sardari Lal,
716, Hargobind Nagar, Phagwara.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o PUDA,
Jalandhar.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Regional Deputy Director,
Department Local Bodies,
Jalandhar

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3512 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Nand Kishore as the Appellant
Sh.Sanjeev Sharma PIO for the Respondent

ORDER: The appellant through RTI application dated 21.05.2019 has sought information regarding land acquired by PUDA under Acquisition Act and objection raised by land owners, award given to land owners and other information concerning the office of PUDA Jalandhar. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 26.06.2019 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case was first heard on 22.01.2020. The respondent present pleaded that the information sought by the appellant was not specific and the RTI application was also not legible. The appellant had also not filed first appeal before the appropriate authority.

Having gone through the file, the Commission found that the RTI application was not legible. The appellant was directed to submit a legible copy of the RTI application in the Commission.

The case was last heard on **14.09.2020** through video conferencing at DAC Jalandhar. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent was absent. The Commission received a letter from the PIO-JDA vide which the PIO had forwarded the RTI application under section 5(4) to the APIO-Estate Officer (R)- JDA Jalandhar asking them to provide the information to the appellant.

As per order, the appellant did not submit legible copy of RTI application. The appellant was directed to submit legible typed copy of RTI application to the Commission with a copy to the PIO. The appellant was also directed to inspect the record by fixing a mutually convenient date and time with the PIO and get the relevant information. The appellant agreed for the same. The PIO was directed to allow inspection of the record and provide the relevant information. The APIO-Estate Officer (R) was impleaded in the case and directed to provide the information.

Hearing dated 04.11.2020:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Jalandhar. The respondent pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant has received the information and is satisfied.

Since the information has been provided, no further course of action is required. The case is **disposed off and closed.**

Chandigarh
Dated 04.11.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

CC to Estate Officer, JDA Jalandhar



Dr. Arvinder Pal Kaur.
H No-B-2/1139, Lehal Colony,
Patiala.

...Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Chairman-cum-Managing Director,
PSPCL, Patiala.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Pr. Secretary,
Deptt of Power Govt of Punjab,
Chandigarh

Respondent

Appeal Case No. 2088 of 2019

PRESENT: Dr.Bhupiner Pal Singh on behalf of the appellant
Sh.Kamalpreet Singh, Dy. Manager PSPCL for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 21.12.2018 has sought information on 26 points regarding action taken on office order dated 24.04.2018 in respect of salary of Dr.Arvinnder Pal Kaur Gill – name & designation of competent authority in office order dated 15.05.2017 –action taken report on application dated 26.07.2018 sent to CE/HRD-PSPCL Patiala – reasons for not giving salary for 10 days – copy of letter dated 07.12.2018 –office order on letter dated 26.10.2018 - and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of Chairman-cum-MD, PSPCL Patiala. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed a first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 29.01.2019, which took no decision on the appeal.

The case was first heard on 22.10.2019. The respondent present from the office of Department of Power, Govt of Punjab pleaded that since the information relates to the office of Chairman-cum-Managing Director, PSPCL Patiala, the RTI application was transferred to them on 04.01.2019. The respondent present from the office of PSPCL Patiala brought the information and handed over to the appellant. As per appellant, the information was incomplete. Having gone through the RTI application and the information provided by the respondent, following was concluded:

Points-8	-	No required
Point-9	-	To provide
Points-13, 16, 17,18,21	-	To provide whatever the information is available on Record
Points-24&25	-	PIO to procure and provide

Rest of the information had been provided. The appellant was directed to go through the information and point out the discrepancies, if any at the next date of hearing.

The case was again heard on **08.01.2020**. The appellant pointed out the discrepancies. The respondent provided the information on points- 9, 13 & 25. Regarding point-16, the PIO-Powercom was directed to provide whatever the document is available which defines the powers of the Administrative Secretary.

Points 17&18: The respondent stated that the information is not available. The PIO was directed to give this in writing on an affidavit.
PointNo.24 The PIO to remove the anomaly.

On the date of hearing on **28.05.2020**, the respondent present from the office of PSPCL Patiala provided the information on point-24 during the hearing. The representative present for the appellant was not satisfied with the affidavit regarding points 17 & 18. The representative also approached the Commission about the inadequacy of few more points. The respondent from Powercom was absent. Hearing both the parties, following was directed:

- Point-17&18 - The PIO to provide proper affidavit duly attested.
- Point-16 - PIO-Powercom to provide
- Point-13 - To provide whatever instruction is available
- Point-10 - PIO to procure from the concerned person and provide
- Point-12 - To provide link

On the date of hearing on **20.07.2020**, the representative present on behalf of the appellant informed that they have received the information on point-12 but the PIO has not supplied the information on points 10 & 13. The appellant further informed that the affidavit regarding information relating to points-17 & 18 provided by the PIO was not in proper form and the copy of information regarding point-16 was not legible.

The respondent was absent. The PIO was directed to provide information on points 10 & 13. The PIO was also directed to provide affidavit regarding points 17 & 18 in a proper form and legible copy of information regarding point-16.

On the date of last hearing on 24.09.2020, as per respondent, the information had been provided. As per appellant, the information was incomplete. Hearing both the parties, the PIO was directed for the following:-

- Point-10 The PIO has sought information for entire dispensaries under PSPCL, it be provided
- Point-13 PIO to provide noting of nomenclature used in this office for administration purpose.
- Point-16 PIO to provide legible copy.
- Point-17&18 Sort out the discrepancies regarding affidavit.

Hearing dated 04.11.2020:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. As per respondent, complete information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant has received the information and is satisfied.

Since RTI application has been well answered and information has been provided to the best possible extent, no further course of action is required. The case is **disposed off and closed**.

Sd/-

Chandigarh
Dated: 04.11.2020

(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh. Karamjit Singh, S/o
Sh. Maghar Singh,
1169, Khanna Nagar,
Bye Pass road,
Lehra Gaga, Distt. Sangrur.

...Appellant

Versus

Public Information

Officer, O/o Director
Administrator, PSPCL,
Patiala.

First Appellate Authority,

O/o Chief Engineer, H.O,
PSPCL, TheMall, Patiala

Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3285 of 2019

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
Sh.Lalpreet Singh, Jt Secy(Tech) PSPCL for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 24.04.2019 has sought information on 11 points regarding rules/regulations for taking decision of issuing charge sheet No.25,26,27,28 & 29 relating to providing unauthorized AP connection and other information concerning the office of Director Administration, PSPCL Patiala. The appellant was not satisfied with the reply of the PIO dated 29.05.2019 from after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 04.06.2019 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case was first heard on 24.12.2019. Sh.Nachattar Singh, SDO PSPCL LehraGaga was present who pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant was not satisfied. Having gone through the file and hearing both the parties, the PIO-Director Administration, PSPCL Patiala was directed to provide the information as per available record within 10 days. The PIO was also directed to be present on the next date of hearing.

On the date of hearing on 28.05.2020 and **20.07.2020**, both the parties were absent. The case was adjourned.

On the date of last hearing on 24.09.2020,, both the parties were absent. The PIO vide email has sought adjournment due to one of their staff members testing Corona positive, and rest of the staff members having been placed under quarantine. The appellant vide email also sought exemption and requested for further hearing after 19.10.2020. The case was adjourned.

Hearing dated 04.11.2020:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. The respondent present pleaded that complete information has been supplied to the appellant. The appellant is absent and vide email has informed that he has received the information and is satisfied.

Since the information has been provided, no further course of action is required. The case is **disposed off and closed.**

Chandigarh
Dated:04.11.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden, Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - psic30@punjabmail.gov.in
Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Sh.Karamjit Singh, S/o Maghar Singh,
1169, Khanna Nagar, Bye Pass
Road, Lehra Gaga,
Distt. Sangrur.

...Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Director Administrator,
PSPCL, Patiala.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Chief Engineer, H.O,
PSPCL, Patiala

Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3286 of 2019

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
Sh.Lalpreet Singh, Jt.Secy (Tech) PSPCL for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 13.03.2019 has sought information regarding charge sheet No.29 dated 11.01.2017 file No.11053 comprising rules/instructions for awarding punishment to the employees and other information concerning the office of Director Administration, PSPCL Patiala. The appellant was not satisfied with the reply of the PIO dated 10.04.2019 after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 22.05.2019 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case was first heard on 24.12.2019. The respondent pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant was not satisfied and stated that the reply has not been given from the PIO of the office from which he has sought the information.

The PIO-Director Administration, PSPCL Patiala was directed to relook at the RTI application and respond to all the points of the RTI application and provide the information as per available record. The PIO was also directed to be present on the next date of hearing.

On the date of next hearing on 29.05.2020 and on 20.07.2020, both the parties were absent. The case was adjourned.

On the date of last hearing on 24.09.2020, both the parties were absent. The PIO vide email sought adjournment stating that due to one of their staff members having been tested Corona positive, rest of the staff members having been quarantined. The appellant vide email also sought exemption and requested for further hearing after 19.10.2020. The case was adjourned.

Hearing dated 04.11.2020:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. The respondent present pleaded that complete information has been supplied to the appellant. The appellant is absent and vide email has informed that he has received the information and is satisfied.

Since the information has been provided, no further course of action is required. The case is **disposed off and closed**.

Chandigarh
Dated:04.11.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Smt.Avtar Kaur, D/o Sh.Surinder
Singh, Village Neelpur, Tehsil
Rajpura,
Distt.Patiala

Appellant

Vs

Public Information Officer,
O/o SSP,
Patiala.

First Appellate Authority
O/o IGP, Patiala Range,
Patiala.

Respondent

Appeal Case .No. 4481 of 2019

PRESENT: Mrs.Avtar Kaur as the Appellant
Sh.Hakam Singh, ASI for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 20.06.2019 has sought information regarding enquiry report on FIR No.46 dated 27.02.2018 Police Station City Rajpura alongwith statement of witnesses and other information concerning the office of SSP Patiala. The appellant was not satisfied with the reply of the PIO dated 09.07.2019 after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 22.08.2019 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case came up for hearing first on 29.05.2020 through video conferencing at DAC, Patiala. The respondent present pleaded that since the case after completion of enquiry report has been presented in the court, the appellant to get the information from the court. The appellant claimed that they have checked from the Civil Court and as per information, the case for cancellation of FIR has not been presented in the court.

The respondent was directed to relook at the RTI application and if the information is in the custody of the police, the same be provided to the appellant within 10 days

On the date of hearing on 20.07.2020, which was held through video conferencing at DAC Patiala, the appellant informed that the police has not submitted the case for cancellation of FIR in the court. The respondent was absent and vide email sought adjournment. The PIO was directed to comply with the earlier order of the Commission and provide the information to the appellant under the RTI Act.

On the date of last hearing on 24.09.2020, the respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant was absent. The case was adjourned.

Hearing dated 04.11.2020:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Jalandhar.

The respondent has supplied the information during the hearing. The appellant has received the information and is satisfied.

Since the information has been provided, no further course of action is required. The case is **disposed off and closed**.

Sd/-

Chandigarh
Dated:04.11.2020

(KhushwantSingh)
State InformationCommissioner



Sh.Jasbir Singh, S/o ShHarbans Singh,
Village Jalal Khera, P.O Sular ,
DistPatiala.

....Appellant

Vs

Public Information Officer,
O/o SSP,
Patiala.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o SSP,
Patiala.

.....Respondent

Appeal Case .No. 4583 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Jasbir Singh for the Appellant
Sh.Hakam Singh, ASI for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 16.09.2019 has sought information regarding FIR No.125 filed against Jasbir Singh and Harbans Singh on 07.08.2014 and other information concerning the office of SSP Patiala. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 21.10.2019 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case came up for hearing first on 29.05.2020 through video conferencing at, Patiala. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent present pleaded that since the case after completion of enquiry report has been presented in the court, the appellant to get the information from the court. The copy of FIR had been provided to the appellant. The PIO-SSP was directed to relook at the RTI application and reply that under the RTI Act), under whose custody this information lies and how can the petitioner obtain it.

On the date of hearing on **20.07.2020**, both the parties were absent. The case was adjourned.

On the date of hearing on 24.09.2020, the appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent stated that since the enquiry report along with complete file has been presented in the court, no information is available with them.

Having gone through the RTI application and hearing both the parties, the respondent was directed to provide information on points 2 & 3. Appellant was directed get the rest of the information from the court as per procedure of the court.

Hearing dated 04.11.2020:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. The respondent present pleaded that complete information has been supplied to the appellant. The appellant has received the information and is satisfied.

Since the information has been provided, no further course of action is required. The case is **disposed off and closed**.

Chandigarh
Dated:04.11.2020

Sd/-
(KhushwantSingh)
State InformationCommissioner

Sh.Jasbir Singh, S/o ShHarbans
Singh, Village Jalal Khera, P.O Sular ,
Dist Patiala.

.....Appellant

Vs

Public Information Officer,
O/o SSP,
Patiala.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o SSP,
Patiala.

.....Respondent

Appeal Case .No. 4584 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Jasbir Singh for the Appellant
Sh.Hakam Singh, ASI for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 16.09.2019 has sought information regarding copy of complaint No.1032 CPRC dated 07.06.2014 filed by Sh.Sohan Singh against Jasbir Singh and Harbans Singh and other information concerning the office of SSP Patiala. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 21.10.2019 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case came up for hearing on 29.05.2020 through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent present pleaded that since case after completion of enquiry report has been presented in the court, the appellant to get the information from the court. The copy of FIR had been provided to the appellant.

The PIO-SSP was directed to relook at the RTI application and reply that under whose custody this information lies and how can the petitioner obtain it.

On the date of hearing on **20.07.2020**, **both** the parties were absent. The case was adjourned.

On the date of last hearing on 24.09.2020, the appellant claims that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent stated that since the enquiry report along with the complete file has been presented in the court, no information is available with them.

Having gone through the RTI application and hearing both the parties, the respondent was directed to provide information on points 3 & 4. Appellant to get the rest of the information from the court as per due procedure.

Hearing dated 04.11.2020:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. The respondent present pleaded that complete information has been supplied to the appellant. The appellant has received the information and is satisfied.

Since the information has been provided, no further course of action is required. The case is **disposed off and closed**.

Chandigarh
Dated:04.11.2020

Sd/-
(KhushwantSingh)
State InformationCommissioner

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

Smt. Rachana Devi,
127, Phulkian Enclave,
Patiala.

...Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o EO, BDA,
Bathinda.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Addl, Chief Administrator,
BDA, Bathinda

Respondent

Appeal Case No. 2018 of 2019

PRESENT: None for the Appellant

Sh. Amandeep Singh, Jr. Assistant O/o BDA for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 31.12.2018 has sought information regarding status of work for drinking water in PUDA enclave Budhlada along with work for construction of boundary wall and other information concerning the office of EO BDA Bathinda. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed a first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 28.02.2019 which disposed off the appeal on 20.03.2019 ex-parte since the appellant did not appear before the First Appellate Authority.

On the date of first hearing on 21.10.2019, the respondent pleaded that the information has been supplied to the appellant vide letter dated 18.03.2019. The appellant was not satisfied on points a, c & d. The respondent further pleaded that the concerned dealing person was on medical leave due to illness. The appellant stated that he filed RTI application on 31.12.2018 and even after a lapse of nine months, he has not been provided the complete information.

Having gone through the record, the Commission observed that the information had been provided on points b, c & e. However, there was an enormous delay in providing the information, the PIO was issued **show cause notice and directed to file reply on an affidavit**. The PIO was again directed to provide the information on points a & d within 10 days.

The case was again heard on **08.01.2020**. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant. The PIO however, did not respond to the show cause notice. At the hearing, the representative of the PIO stated that at the time of filing RTI application, Sh. Amarjit Singh was the PIO who has since retired. The PIO at the time of issue of show cause was Sh. Vinod Bansal in the capacity of EO-BDA Bathinda. The EO-BDA had not responded to the show cause.

The PIO was given one last opportunity to file a reply to the show cause notice issued for delay in providing the information.

Appeal Case No. 2018 of 2019

On the date of hearing on **28.05.2020**, the PIO was absent. Sh.Gurpreet Singh representing the PIO on Mobile W/S video sent a reply via email on behalf of the PIO which was taken in the file of the Commission. The reply was not from the PIO. In the reply, the respondent mentioned that at the time of RTI application, Sh.Udaydeep Singh Sidhu, PCS was the EO-cum-PIO for the period from Jan.2019 to July,2019 and Sh.Vinod Bansal, PCS was PIO-cum-EO from Oct 2019 to Dec.2019 and at that time the post of PIO-cum-EO BDA was lying vacant after the transfer of Sh.Vinod Bansal. The respondent had not informed the present posting of these officers.

The respondent was directed to clarify –

Who was the PIO when the RTI application was filed;
Who was the PIO when the show cause notice was issued.

On the date of next hearing on **20.07.2020**, both the parties were absent. The appellant vide email informed that she had received the information but with a delay of more than one year.

The Commission received a letter diary No.6607 on 15.06.2020 from APIO-cum-Asstt.Estate Officer, BDA regarding period of stay of the officers as PIO-cum-Estate officer from the date of filing of RTI which was taken on the file of the Commission. Having gone through the letter, it was observed that Sh.Udaydeep Singh was the PIO for maximum period when the RTI application was filed and Sh.Vinod Bansal was the PIO receiving the Commission's orders to provide the information.

As per information given by the APIO-cum-AEO,BDA, Sh.Vinod Kumar Bansal posted as Assistant Commissioner (General) Ludhiana and Sh.Udaydeep Singh was posted as Director Lotteries, Punjab at Chandigarh

Since both the officers who served as PIOs on different times, had failed to implement the RTI Act, the Commission issued a **show cause** notice to both the PIOs Sh.Vinod Kumar Bansal and Sh.Udaydeep Singh Sidhu **under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 and directed to file reply on an affidavit.**

The Commission also observed that the appellant had to suffer undue inconvenience to get the information, the PIO was directed to pay an amount of **Rs.3000/-** via demand draft drawn through Govt. Treasury as compensation to the appellant for the loss and detriment suffered by him of having to file the appeals and not getting information in time. The PIO was directed to duly inform the Commission of the compliance of the order and submit proof of having compensated the appellant.

On the date of last hearing on 24.09.2020, none was present on behalf of the PIO-respondents. The commission received reply of Sh.Udaydeep Singh Sidhu, Director Punjab State Lotteries (earlier PIO-cum-EO,BDA Bathinda) which was taken on the file of the Commission.

The reply of Sh.Vinod Bansal, Assistant Commissioner(General)Ludhiana (earlier PIO-cum-EO BDA Bathinda) was not received and the letter of show cause sent to him had been returned by the postal authorities with the remarks 'Left'. As per information from the DC Office Ludhiana, Sh.Vinod Bansal was again transferred from Ludhiana and currently posted as SDM, Maur, District Bathinda and that he was going to retire on 30.09.2020.

The PIO-EO, BDA had also not sent a compliance report regarding payment of compensation amount to the appellant. The present PIO-EO, BDA was directed to comply with the earlier order of the Commission and send proof of having paid the compensation amount to the appellant. The decision on the reply to show cause notice would be taken on the next date of hearing.

Hearing dated 04.11.2020:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC, Patiala. The respondent present pleaded that the compensation amount has been paid to the appellant vide demand draft No.001720 dated 14.10.2020 vide letter dated 22.10.2020 with a copy to the Commission.

Having gone through the reply of the PIO submitted during the last hearing, I accept the plea of the PIO and drop the show cause.

Since the information stands provided and the compensation has been paid to the appellant, no further course of action is required.

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

Chandigarh
Dated:04.11.2020

Sd/-
(KhushwantSingh)
State InformationCommissioner

CCto: Sh.Udaydeep Singh
Sidhu, Director,
Punjab
StateLotteries,
Yojna Bhawan,
Sector33-A,
Chandigarh.(Earlier PIO-cum-EO, BDA)