



Sh. Saroop Singh,
 S/o Sh. Bachan Singh,
 R/o Village Choure, Block Sri Hargobindpur,
 Teh. Batala, Distt. Gurdaspur.

Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
 O/o District Development and Panchayat Officer,
 Gurdaspur.

Respondent

Complaint Case Nos.1032 and 1033 of 2018

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA	Date of Complaint
12.01.2018	Nil	Nil	Nil	26.09.2018

Present: Complainant- Sh. Saroop Singh.
 Respondent- None.

ORDER

The following order was made by the Commission on 25.07.2019:

16.04.2019

“Since the complainant, respondent are the same and the information sought for is almost identical, the single order shall dispose of both the complaints.

The complainant had sought information about the income having accrued and the expenditure incurred during the incumbency of the former sarpanch of village Chaura, Block Sri Hargobindpur, Tehsil Batala, District Gurdaspur from 2013 to 2018. Sh. Narinder Singh, Panchayat Secretary appearing on behalf of the respondent says that the information is quite voluminous. Nonetheless, it has partially been delivered on the complainant. He assures to provide the rest expeditiously. The complainant also seems in agreement with the contention of the respondent.”

The case has come up today. The complainant says that despite having assured during the course of hearing on the previous date the respondent has refused to provide him the information.

The PIO is, thus, issued a show cause notice to explain in a self- attested affidavit as to why a penalty @ Rs.250/- per day of delay subject to maximum of Rs.25,000/- till the complete information is furnished, be not imposed under Section 20(1) of RTI Act, 2005 on him for causing 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 the detriment suffered by him.

In addition to the written reply, the PIO is also given an opportunity under Section 20(1) proviso thereto, for a personal hearing before the imposition of such penalty on



Complaint Case No.1032 and 1033 /2018

the next date of hearing. He may take note that in case he does not file his written reply and does not avail himself of the opportunity of personal hearing on the 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.”

“The cases have again been taken up today. The incumbent Panchayat Secretary Sh. Narinder Singh submits that the original record continues to be retained by one Sh. Dalbir Singh his predecessor who has not passed it on his transfer. He has also shown us some communications issued by the BDPO, Sri Hargobindpur in this regard.

The Commission takes a very serious note of the conduct of the respondent. The show cause notice issued earlier is now directed at Sh. Dalbir Singh, PIO – cum – Panchayat Secretary, O/o BDPO, Dhariwal who shall explain his conduct for not parting with the record and show cause as to why the penalty proposed should not be imposed upon him for willful and malafide suppression of information. Both Sh. Narinder Singh and Sh. Dalbir Singh, Panchayat Secretaries are directed to file their written replies also before the next date of hearing”.

04.06.2019

“Sh. Narinder Singh, Panchayat Secretary, representative of the respondent, submits that almost the entire record has been provided to the complainant. The Commission observes that the Show Cause Notice already issued on 24.01.2019 was directed against Sh. Dalbir Singh, PIO-cum-Panchayat Secretary, O/o BDPO Dhariwal. He has failed to explain the delay and reasons for providing the information. The Commission is well within its right to impose penalty even at this juncture. However, final opportunity is afforded to Shri Dalbir Singh, Panchayat Secretary to submit in writing as to why the penalty mentioned in the show cause notice should not be imposed. Be it noted that no further opportunity shall be given to him.”

25.07.2019

“The case has come up today. Shri Dalbir Singh, Panchayat Secretary,



-3-

Complaint Case No.1032 and 1033 /2018

despite having earlier been issued a couple of notices has refused to disclose the information and attend the hearings in the court. Show cause Notice was issued to him on 04.06.2019 for imposition of penalty for having violated the provisions of Section 7(1) of the RTI Act.

*He has not come up with any explanation much less a valid one. The delay is beyond 100 days as can be made out from the chronology of filing applications and appeals mentioned above. He is culpable for being penalized. Therefore, exercising its authority under Section 20(1) of the Act, the Commission imposes a penalty of Rs.25,000/- @ Rs.250/- per day for 100 days to be recovered from his salary by the BDPO Dhariwal in 5 equal installments commencing from the month of September, 2019. It shall be deposited in the Govt. treasury under the head: - **0070-Other Administrative Services- 60 Other Services- 800 Other Receipts- 86 Fee under RTI Act, 2005.** A copy of the challan shall be sent to the Commission for record immediately.*

The aforesaid PIO has shown grave misconduct and indiscipline. His appointing authority is desired to issue him charge sheet and take appropriate action as per rules governing his service conditions.

*The information has to be provided, he cannot get away with the same. The Commission while exercising the powers vested in it under Section 18(7), issues a bailable warrant for a sum of Rs.25,000/- and directs the Senior Superintendent of Police, Gurdaspur to serve it upon him so as to appear in the office of Commission on **05.09.2019 at 11.30 AM with the original record.***

Contd...pg....4



-4-

Complaint Case No.1032 and 1033 /2018

Sh. Dalbir Singh, Panchayat Secretary, is not present. The bailable warrant issued to ensure his presence in the court has also not been returned by the police authority. The Senior Superintendent of Police, Gurdaspur, is issued a reminder to do the needful. The BDPO, Dhariwal, is desired to report to the Commission by coming present in person as to whether the amount of penalty as imposed above has been recovered from his salary or not.

To come up on **15.10.2019 at 11.30 AM.**

05.09.2019

**Sd/-
(Yashvir Mahajan)
State Information Commissioner**

CC: The Senior Superintendent of Police, Gurdaspur.

CC: The Block Development & Panchayat Officer, Dhariwal to ensure that this order is delivered on Sh. Dalbir Singh, Panchayat Secretary, for necessary action.



Smt. Sunita Bakshi,
W/o Sh. K.K Bakshi,
H.No. 74/8, Shiv Mandir Street,
New Swaraj Nagar, Mundi Kharar,
Distt Mohali.

Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Senior Superintendent of Police,
Mohali.

Respondent

Complaint Case No.1147/2018

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA	Date of Second Appeal
02.07.2018	Nil	Nil	Nil	24.10.2018

Present: Complainant- Smt. Sunita Bakshi.
Respondent- None.

ORDER

The following order was made by this forum on 23.07.2019:

“The complainant is aggrieved with the inaction of the police on complaint filed by her against one Master Manoj for having thieved her mobile phone, which according to her is highly priced. The respondents are absent and no written reply has been filed by them. The Commission takes serious note of their absence. They are directed to provide the information to the complainant immediately under intimation to the Commission, failing which the Commission shall be constrained to take penal action against them.”

“The case has come up today. The respondent represented by Constable Sunil Kumar submits that original complaint was marked to one Sh. Raj Kumar, ASI who has yet to apprise the police station authorities of the action having been taken on the same. The respondent seeks sometime to inform the complainant.

The request is acceded. The matter shall be heard on 14.03.2019 at 11.30 AM. Before that the complainant should be informed about the status of enquiry into her complaint.”

It is a long standing case. Despite having been afforded opportunities, the respondents have failed to file a written reply to the notice of the Commission. The Commission takes a strong exception to the lackadaisical attitude of the respondents. They are once again advised to do the needful failing which it shall be presumed that they are willfully sitting over the information and penal consequences shall follow”.



-2-

Complaint Case No.1147/2018

The Commission is intrigued to see that the directions of the Commission have gone abegging. On every hearing, the proxy of the PIO comes up with a stock reply that they are looking into the matter. The respondents have not even bothered to file a written reply. The Complainant is senior citizen who is being harassed.

The Commission feels the PIO is willfully obstructing the flow of information in violation of the provisions under Section 7(1) of the RTI Act. The PIO Shri Bhagwant Singh Riar, SHO PS Kharar is hereby issued show cause notice to explain in a self- attested affidavit as to why a penalty @ Rs.250/- per day of delay subject to maximum of Rs.25,000/- till the complete information is furnished, be not imposed under Section 20(1) of RTI Act, 2005 on him for causing willful delay / denial of the information to the RTI applicant and why the compensation be not awarded to the Appellant under Section 19 (8) (b) of the Act for the detriment suffered by him.

In addition to the written reply, the PIO is also 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 take note that in case he does not file his written reply and does not avail himself of the opportunity of personal hearing on the 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.”

The complainant submits that she has been furnished with the information and is satisfied. She is not inclined to pursue the matter further. In view of the same, the case is **filed** and show cause notice is also **discharged**.

05.09.2019

PS: Constable Sh. Maninder Singh came present after the course of hearing.

**Sd/-
(Yashvir Mahajan)
State Information Commissioner**



Sh. Devi Singh,
S/o Sh. Milkhi Ram,
R/o Village-Manku Majra,
Tehsil-Anandpur Sahib,
Distt. Ropar.

Sh. Roop Chand,
S/o Sh. Pooran Chand,
R/o Village- Manku Majra,
Tehsil – Anandpur Sahib,
District Ropar

Complainants

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Block Development and Panchayat Officer,
Nurpur Bedi, Distt. Ropar.

Respondent

Complaint Case Nos.77 and 78 of 2019

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA	Date of Second Appeal
23.05.2018/25.01.2018	Nil	Nil	Nil	16.01.2019

Present: Complainants- Shri Roop Chand, & Sh.Devi Singh.
Respondent- Sh. Pritam Singh, Panchayat Secretary.

ORDER

The following order was passed on 23.07.2019:-

30.05.2019

“The complainant has sent a request through e.mail to defer the matter. His request is accepted. Meanwhile, the respondent shall ensure that the admissible information is provided”.

None is present on behalf of the respondents. The Commission takes strong exception to the indifference shown by them. PIO in the O/o BDPO Nurpur Bedi is desired to file written explanation for having failed to provide the information to the complainants. From perusal of the application, it is suggested that the information sought is humongous which may comprise thousands of papers. The information in such a quantum, the Commission feels, does not tend to

Contd...pg...2



-2-

Complaint Case No.77 and 78 of 2019

serve any public cause. Nonetheless, in the interest of fair play, the Commission directs the respondents to allow him inspection of the record available with them on a duly intimated date and time in writing and provide him certified copies of the documents not beyond 100 pages.”

23.07.2019

“The respondents are again absent despite the displeasure of the Commission conveyed to the respondents on their callous conduct. The BDPO has violated the provisions of Section 7(1) of RTI Act and has rendered himself liable for penal consequences.

The BDPO Nurpur Bedi is hereby issued a show cause notice to explain in a self- attested affidavit as to why a penalty @ Rs.250/- per day of delay subject to maximum of Rs.25,000/- till the complete information is furnished, be not imposed under Section 20(1) of RTI Act, 2005 on him for causing willful delay / denial of the information to the RTI applicant and why the compensation be not awarded to the Appellant under Section 19 (8) (b) of the Act for the detriment suffered by him.

In addition to the written reply, the PIO is also 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 take note that in case he does not file his written reply and does not avail himself of the opportunity of personal hearing on the date fixed, it will be

Contd...pg...3



-3-

Complaint Case No.77 and 78 of 2019

resumed that he has nothing to say and the Commission shall proceed to take further proceedings against him ex parte.”

The matter has been taken up today. Sh. Pritam Singh, Panchayat Secretary, submits that he has recently joined. He further says that the record in question has been supplied to the complainants. He has produced an acknowledgement of the record having been received by the complainants. The complainants say that it was inadequate. Nonetheless, another opportunity is afforded to them to peruse the record and seek the copies to the barest minimum and relevant to their cause.

A memo from the BDPO has also been presented in which it has been submitted that he is occupied in the conduct of the elections of the chairman and vice chairman of Block Samiti and is not in the position to join the proceedings. It has also been submitted that he has just joined and shall take the appropriate measures to satisfy the complainants in providing information. The matter is adjourned to be heard on **24.10.2019 at 11.30 AM.**

05.09.2019

**Sd/-
(Yashvir Mahajan)
State Information Commissioner**



Sh. Malkit Khan,
S/o Sh. Jumma Khan,
R/o Vill. Ballipur, PO Kaliana,
Tehsil & Distt. Patiala

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Block Development & Panchayat Officer, Patiala.

First Appellate Authority
O/o Block Development & Panchayat Officer, Patiala.

Respondents

Appeal Case No.1253/2019

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA	Date of Second Appeal/ Complaint
12.11.2018	Nil	15.01.2019	Nil	02.04.2019

Present: Appellant- None.
Respondents- Sh. Baljit Singh Sohi, BDPO, Patiala.

ORDER:

The following order was made on 23.07.2019:

“The respondents are absent on trot. They have not provided the information to the appellant. No reply has been filed. The Commission takes serious view of their indifference.

The BDPO Patiala is issued a show cause notice to explain in a self-attested affidavit as to why a penalty @ Rs.250/- per day of delay subject to a maximum of Rs.25,000/- till the complete information is furnished, be not imposed under Section 20(1) of RTI Act, 2005 on him for causing willful delay / denial of the information to the RTI applicant and why the compensation be not awarded to the Appellant under Section 19 (8) (b) of the Act for the detriment suffered by him.

In addition to the written reply, the PIO is also 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 take note that in case he does not file his written reply and

Contd...pg...2



-2-

Appeal Case No.1253/2019

does not avail himself of the opportunity of personal hearing on the 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.”

The case has come up today. Sh. Baljit Singh Sohi, BDPO, Patiala, has appeared in person. He has filed a reply in the shape of affidavit. He submits that he has just joined and having monitored the case and provided the information to the appellant to his satisfaction. An acknowledgement issued by the appellant has also been shown to the Commission. He regrets the delay and attributes it to the frequent transfers of the Panchayat Secretaries. Whereas the Commission appreciates the prompt action having been taken by the incumbent BDPO, his predecessor is upbraided for having slept on the matter. The Director, Department of Rural Development and Panchayat, is desired to take view of his conduct and convey him the displeasure of the Commission.

The matter is **disposed**.

05.09.2019

**Sd/-
(Yashvir Mahajan)
State Information Commissioner**

CC: The Director, Department of Rural Development and Panchayat, Sector-62, Mohali, for necessary action.

PS: Sh. Malkit Khan, the appellant, came present after the course of hearing at 01.00 PM.

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
RED CROSS BUILDING, SECTOR-16, MADHYA MARG, CHANDIGARH
Tele No. 0172-2864112, FAX No. 0172-2864125, Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com
Email:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in



Smt. Surjit Kaur
R/o H.No.1634, Sector-70,
SAS Nagar (Mohali).

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Municipal Corporation,
Mohali.

First Appellate Authority
O/o Joint Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation,
Mohali.

Respondents

Appeal Case No.1316/2019

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA	Date of Second Appeal/ Complaint
19.06.2018	Nil	05.10.2018	Nil	04.04.2019

Present: Appellant- Sh. K.N.S. Sodhi, Proxy.
Respondents- Sh. Anil Kumar, XEN.

ORDER:

The following order was passed on 23.07.2019:-

06.06.2019

“The appellant has sought information about the tube-wells installed in the area of Municipal Corporation, Mohali besides some allied information. The respondents state that by and large the requisitions made in the application have been addressed to. However, the information pertaining to Executive Engineer, Division No.2, Water Supply & Sanitation is still wanting. The respondents are desired to arrange to provide the aforesaid information promptly to the appellant. They are also required to explain the delay in writing before the next date of hearing, failing which the penal consequences shall follow.”

23.07.2019

The case has come up today. Sh. Sidharath Singh Rana, Junior Engineer is present from Sub Division No.8 of Water Supply & Sanitation Department. He submits that the information sought and as mentioned in the aforesaid order has been delivered in person to the appellant. As the appellant is absent, the Commission presumes that she is satisfied

-2-



Appeal Case No.1316/2019

with the information supply to her.

Sh.Sidharath Singh Rana submitted a copy of the same which has been taken on record. Hopefully, the same is found to be in order. The Commission finds that a part of the information has been significantly delayed. The appellant may like to go through it and advert on the information supplied to her. Meanwhile, the Executive Engineer, Water Supply & Sanitation Department, Division No.2, Mohali is directed to explain the delay. He is issued a show cause notice to explain in a self- attested affidavit as to why a penalty @ Rs.250/- per day of delay subject to maximum of Rs.25,000/- till the complete information is furnished, be not imposed under Section 20(1) of RTI Act, 2005 on him for causing willful delay / denial of the information to the RTI applicant and why the compensation be not awarded to the Appellant under Section 19 (8) (b) of the Act for the detriment suffered by him.

In addition to the written reply, the PIO is also 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 take note that in case he does not file his written reply and does not avail himself of the opportunity of personal hearing on the 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.

Since the Municipal Corporation is not in the custody of the information sought for, their presence is exempted.”

The case has again come up today. Sh. Anil Kumar, XEN, is present. The appellant says that the reply filed by the respondents on his observations sent to them on

-3-



Appeal Case No.1316/2019

03.09.2019 has been evasive and is not specific to the queries made by him. His observations are handed over on spot to Sh. Anil Kumar, XEN. He is desired to send him the specific information available with regard to the same.

The matter shall be reheard on **24.10.2019 at 11.30 AM.**

05.09.2019

**Sd/-
(Yashvir Mahajan)
State Information Commissioner**



Sh. Gurmej Singh,
S/o Sh. Atma Singh,
R/o Pir Mohammad,
Tehsil-Zira, Distt. Ferozepur.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Block Development and Panchayat Officer,
Makhu, Ferozepur.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o District Development and Panchayat Officer,
Ferozepur.

Respondents

Appeal Case No.1211/2019

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA	Date of Second Appeal/ Complaint
24.12.2018	Nil	28.01.2019	Nil	07.03.2019

Present: Appellant- Shri Gurmej Singh.
Respondents- None.

ORDER:

The following order was passed on 23.07.2019:-

28.05.2019

"The appellant, vide his original application dated 24.12.2018, has sought to know the information about the details of nominations made for the election of Sarpanch and Panches of Gram Panchayat of Village Peer Mohammad, Block Makhu, District Ferozepur and the documents relating to the acceptance or rejection of their nomination papers. Having failed to find response even after filing first appeal with the DDPO, the appellant has been constrained to file 2nd appeal with the Commission.

The Commission has received a memo from BDPO Makhu to the address of SDM Zira to respond to the Commission's notice. The Commission is not inclined to approve the conduct of the BDPO who, apparently, has violated the provisions of RTI Act. The DDPO surprisingly has also failed to discharge his duty as First Appellate Authority which the Commission decries vehemently. In case the information is not available with him, the BDPO should have transferred the application to the concerned authority under Section 6(3) of RTI Act. Having failed to do so, he has made himself liable for penal action under Section 20(3) of the RTI Act.

The BDPO Makhu, District Ferozepur is issued a show cause notice to explain in a self- attested affidavit as to why a penalty @ Rs.250/- per day of delay subject to maximum of Rs.25,000/- till the complete information is furnished, be not imposed under Section 20(1) of RTI Act,



Appeal Case No.1211/2019

2005 on him for causing willful delay / denial of the information to the RTI applicant and why the compensation be not awarded to the Appellant under Section 19 (8) (b) of the Act for the detriment suffered by him.

In addition to the written reply, the PIO is also 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 take note that in case he does not file his written reply and does not avail himself of the opportunity of personal hearing on the 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.”

23.07.2019

“Shri Karamjeet Singh, Panchayat Secretary, O/o BDPO Makhu is present along with Sh.Sukhchain Singh, SDO, Talwandi Bhai, who was Returning Officer during Panchayat elections. The respondent says that the record, after the election, was deposited with the BDPO Zira. The normal course for them was to transfer the application to BDPO Zira u/s 6(3) of the RTI Act. Nonetheless, the Commission on the information of respondents directs the BDPO Zira to look into the application which stands transferred to him. He shall immediately look into it and take appropriate action to impart the information to the appellant. Since the Returning Officer is not in the custody of record, he is exempted from further appearance.”

The case has again come up today. Sh. Gurmej Singh is present. None is present on behalf of the respondents. It transpires that the date of hearing in the aforesaid order was inadvertently mentioned as 15.09.2019, whereas in the open court it was announced to be heard on 05.09.2019.

The matter now shall be reheard on **10.10.2019 at 11.30 AM.**

Contd..pg...3



-2-

Appeal Case No.1211/2019

Meanwhile, the BDPO, Zira, is directed to ensure that the sought for information is provided to the information seeker. In event of his failure, the show cause notice issued to BDPO, Makhu, shall be deemed to be directed to him for imposition of penalty.

To come up on **10.10.2019 at 11.30 AM.**

05.09.2019

**Sd/-
(Yashvir Mahajan)
State Information Commissioner**



Sh.Lal Chand S/o Sh.Chaman Lal Virhe,
R/o Garhi Sheru, Rahon Road,
PO Mattewara, Via Basti Jothewal,
Tehsil & District-Ludhiana.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Deputy Commissioner of Police,
Mini Secretariat, Ludhiana.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Commissioner of Police,
Mini Secretariat, Ludhiana.

Respondents

Appeal Case Nos.3101, 3102,3103, 3104, and 3105/2019
(Life & Liberty)

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA	Date of Second Appeal/ Complaint
26.07.2019	Nil	09.08.2019	Nil	26.08.2019

Present:

Appellant- None.

**Respondents- SI Usha Rani;
ASI Ramesh Kumar, O/o Commissioner of Police,
Ludhiana.**

ORDER

Since the appellant and the respondents are same and the information concerns and emanates from the same incident, the single order shall dispose off all the appeals.

Notice was issued to the respondents on the request of the appellant to treat it as a case of life and liberty under proviso to section 7(1) of the RTI Act as he was a victim of an assault and the FIR under Section 307 and other sections of IPC stand registered on 23.05.2019 in the jurisdictional police station. The appellant is absent, as the notices for hearing were sent only a couple of days before, seemingly it has not been delivered to him. The respondents nonetheless are present. They submit that the information sought by the appellant with regard to the counter application filed by his opponents has been provided to him. They further add that investigation in the case has already been completed and the



Appeal Case Nos.3101, 3102,3103, 3104, and 3105/2019

Charge sheet has been filed in the Court. He should approach the office of the concerned magistrate to seek the information relating to investigation and the charge sheet. They further say that the original incident occurred in May. As of now according to them, there is no apprehension of breach of peace or imminent threat of life and liberty of anybody.

In order to arrive at just conclusion the appellant is desired to respond to the submissions of the respondents expeditiously. The matter shall be heard on **25.09.2019 at 11.30 AM in the office of the Commission at Chandigarh.**

05.09.2019

**Sd/-
(Yashvir Mahajan)
State Information Commissioner**

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
RED CROSS BUILDING, SECTOR-16, MADHYA MARG, CHANDIGARH
Tele No. 0172-2864112, FAX No. 0172-2864125, Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com
Email:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in



Sh. Iqbal Singh Rasulpur, General Secretary,
University Human Rights Organisation
VPO Rasulpur, Tehsil Jagraon,
District Ludhiana-142035.

Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Addl. Director General of Police, IVC,
Punjab, Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority
O/o Addl. Director General of Police, Punjab
Chandigarh.

Respondent

Complaint Case No.19/2017

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA	Date of Second Appeal/ Complaint
13.06.2016	Nil	Nil	Nil	27.12.2016

Present:

Complainant- Sh. Satinderpal Singh, Advocate.

Respondent- Sh. Amandeep Singh, Intelligence Assistant.

ORDER

The respondents have filed a fresh reply in the matter. A copy has been handed over on spot to the complainant. He intends to file a rejoinder on the same. He should do it before the next date of hearing.

To come up on **29.10.2019 at 11.30 AM.**

05.09.2019

Sd/-
(Yashvir Mahajan)
State Information Commissioner

