



Dr. Rajinder Kumar Singla, (9417538456)

H No 102, Sector 23 A,
Chandigarh-160023.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o Director of Public Instruction (SE), Punjab,
Mohali.

.....Respondent

Complaint Case No.167 of 2021

(Cisco Webex Proceedings)

RTI application filed on : 10-02-2020
PIO replied on : -

Present: Appellant: Dr. Rajinder Kumar Singla (on call)
Respondent: Sh. Gaurav Sharma (Sr. Asst.)

ORDER:

1. This order may be read with the reference of previous order dated 06.07.2021.
2. Respondent, Sh. Gaurav Sharma stated that he has supplied the sought information to the appellant. On other hand the appellant prayed the Commission to grant compensation towards harassment and delay caused to him due to Respondents.
3. **In view of the harassment and detriment caused to the appellant** Commission directs that the **compensation of Rs. 2000/-** be paid to the appellant by the public authority in terms of section 19(8)(b) of the Act.
4. Accordingly, this instant complaint case is disposed of with the directions to submit proof of having compensated the appellant. However, the liberty is granted to the appellant to approach the Commission within one month in case any submission regarding the receiving of compensation amount.

Chandigarh
Dated: 05.10.2021

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



Dr. Narinder Kumar Kohli, (9814309009)
394/6, Onkar Nagar, Hanuman Chowk,
Gurdaspur.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Public Information Officer
O/o Improvement Trust,
Gurdaspur.

Versus

.....Respondent

Complaint Case No.178 of 2021
(Cisco Webex Proceedings)

RTI application filed on : 16-07-2020
PIO replied on : 10-11-2020

Present: None.

ORDER:

1. This order may be read with the reference of previous order dated 06.07.2021.
2. **Written Submission by Respondent:** A letter dated 21.06.2021 vide diary no. 13311 is received in the Commission vide which with the compliance of the previous order of the Commission the respondent authority has filled a point wise reply in affidavit form. This correspondence is taken on record.
3. According to the submissions made by the respondent, the Commission observes that no further action is required to be taken in this case. Hence, the case is disposed of and closed.

Chandigarh
Dated: 05.10.2021

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



Sh. Lakhvir Singh, (8288964412)

S/o Sh. Naranjan Singh,
R/o Village Ratgarh, P.O Dhanetha,
Tehsil Samana, Distt Patiala.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o District Development and Panchayat Officer,
Patiala.

.....Respondent

Complaint Case No.183 of 2021

(Cisco Webex Proceedings)

RTI application filed on : 18-11-2020
PIO replied on : -

Present: Complainant: Sh. Lakhvir Singh

Respondent: Sh. Jagtar Singh (Tax Collector) (APIO)

ORDER:

1. This order may be read with the reference of previous order dated 24.05.2021 and 06.07.2021 vide which the appellant was asked to submit his ID proof to the respondent authority followed to that the information has to be supplied , but the appellant failed to do so.
2. The complainant has approached the Commission under the provision of Section 18 of the RTI Act, 2005, no directions for providing further information can be given by the Commission.
3. In 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. Since there is an alternative and efficacious remedy of first appeal available to the Complainant under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, which has not been availed in the instant case and the First Appellate Authority has not had the occasion to review the decision of the PIO, as envisaged under the RTI Act by passing a detailed well reasoned speaking order.
5. If, however, the complainant does not feel satisfied with the decision of the First Appellate Authority, he will be at liberty to file a Second Appeal before the Commission under Section 19(3) of the RTI Act, 2005.
6. In view of the observations noted above, the instant case is remanded to the concerned First Appellate Authority. The appeal is disposed of accordingly, with the above observations.

Sd/-

(Maninder Singh Patti)

State Information Commissioner, Pb.

Chandigarh

Dated: 05.10.2021



Sh. Kuldeep Singh, (9872869086)

S/o Sh. Sarwan Singh,
R/o RurkiKalan, Tehsil Balachaur,
DisttNawanshahr.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat,
RurkiKalan, Block Saroa, Tehsil Balachaur,
DisttNawanshahr.

.....Respondent

Complaint Case No.189 of 2021
(Cisco Webex Proceedings)

RTI application filed on : 16-10-2020
PIO replied on : 23-10-2020

Present: Complainant: Sh. Kuldeep Singh

Respondent: Sh. Ashok Kumar (Panchyat Secy.)

ORDER:

1. This order may be read with the reference of previous order dated 12.07.2021.
2. Respondent, Sh. Ashok Kumar stated that he has supplied the sought information on other hand complainant; Sh. Kuldeep Singh stated that he is not satisfied with the same.
3. The complainant has approached the Commission under the provision of Section 18 of the RTI Act, 2005, no directions for providing further information can be given by the Commission.
4. In 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).
5. Since there is an alternative and efficacious remedy of first appeal available to the Complainant under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, which has not been availed in the instant case and the First Appellate Authority has not had the occasion to review the decision of the PIO, as envisaged under the RTI Act by passing a detailed well reasoned speaking order.
6. If, however, the complainant does not feel satisfied with the decision of the First Appellate Authority, he will be at liberty to file a Second Appeal before the Commission under Section 19(3) of the RTI Act, 2005.
7. In view of the observations noted above, the instant case is remanded to the concerned First Appellate Authority. The appeal is disposed of accordingly, with the above observations.

Chandigarh
Dated: 05.10.2021

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



Sh. Bhupinder Singh Dhanda, (9501695350)
S/o Late Sh. Balbir Singh, S/o Sh. Sadhu Ram ,
R/o Village Thalla, Tehsil Phillaur, Distt Jalandhar.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer
O/o Deputy Registrar, Cooperative Societies,
R.O. Office, Jalandhar.

.....Respondent

Public Information Officer
O/o Thalla Cooperative Agriculture Multipurpose,
Jalandhar.

Complaint Case No.210 of 2021
(Cisco Webex Proceedings)

RTI application filed on : 24-11-2020
PIO replied on : 25-12-2020

Present: Complainant: **Sh. Bhupinder Singh Dhanda**
Respondent: Sh. Malkit Ram (Asst. Reg)

ORDER:

1. This order may be read with the reference of previous order dated 12.07.2021.
2. The complainant has approached the Commission under the provision of Section 18 of the RTI Act, 2005, no directions for providing further information can be given by the Commission.
3. In 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. Since there is an alternative and efficacious remedy of first appeal available to the Complainant under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, which has not been availed in the instant case and the First Appellate Authority has not had the occasion to review the decision of the PIO, as envisaged under the RTI Act by passing a detailed well reasoned speaking order.
5. If, however, the complainant does not feel satisfied with the decision of the First Appellate Authority, he will be at liberty to file a Second Appeal before the Commission under Section 19(3) of the RTI Act, 2005.
6. In view of the observations noted above, the instant case is remanded to the concerned First Appellate Authority. The appeal is disposed of accordingly, with the above observations.

Chandigarh
Dated: 05.10.2021

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



Sh. Amritpal Singh, (9815256776)
S/o Sh. Darbara Singh,
House No B-1/1151, Street No 7,
Guru TegBahadur Nagar, Tarn Taran.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer
O/o SSP,
Batala.

.....Respondent

First Appellate Authority
O/o DIG, Border Range,
Amritsar.

Appeal Case No.888 of 2021
(Cisco Webex Proceedings)

RTI application filed on	:	27-10-2020
PIO replied on	:	-
First appeal filed on	:	14-12-2020
First Appellate Authority order	:	-

Present: Appellant: Sh. Amritpal Singh (on call)
Respondent: Sh. Sh. Parminder Singh(SHO) 9803330435

ORDER:

1. This order may be read with the reference of previous order dated 12.07.2021.
2. Appellant, Sh. Amritpal Singh has acknowledged the receiving of sought information and he is satisfied with the same.
3. According to the submissions made by the appellant, the Commission observes that no further action is required to be taken in this case. Hence, the case is disposed of and closed.

Chandigarh
Dated: 05.10.2021

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



Sh. Jasbir Singh Sekhon, (9914808666)
S/o Sh. Kartar Singh,
Village Tandi, P.O Laroya, Distt Jalandhar.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

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

.....Respondent

First Appellate Authority
O/o Addl. Deputy Commissioner (Development),
Jalandhar.

Appeal Case No.963 of 2021
(Cisco Webex Proceedings)

RTI application filed on	:	20-07-2018
PIO replied on	:	-
First appeal filed on	:	21-09-2018
First Appellate Authority order	:	-

Present: None

ORDER:

1. This order may be read with the reference of previous order dated 12.07.2021.
2. After, going through the facts and record of the case file and the reply given by the respondent PIO the show cause notice issued to him on 12.07.2021 is hereby withdrawn. Since, the complete information has already been supplied to the appellant, the respondent-Public Information Officer o/o District Development and Panchayat Officer, Jalandhar is advised to be careful in future while dealing with the RTI application(s) as per the assurance given failing which the adverse view will be taken. Hence, case is disposed of and closed.

Chandigarh
Dated: 05.10.2021

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