



Sh. S. P. Verma, (7589328784)
143, NMS Colony, Tripuri,
Patiala-147004.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer
O/o Civil Surgeon,
Patiala.

.....Respondent

First Appellate Authority
O/o Civil Surgeon,
Patiala.

Appeal Case No.327 of 2021

Present: Appellant: Sh. S. P. Verma (On Telephone Call)
Respondent: Dr. Shelly (DHO), 9815912034

ORDER:

1. This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 10.03.2021.

Information Sought:

Supply Office Letter No. COVID/20/96 dated 30-06-2020 issued by Nodal Officer, Covid Care Centre, Meritorious School, Patiala to the Civil Surgeon, Patiala
Supply File-Notings made and all Office Correspondence done and exchanged as to and on the above-said Office Letter No. COVID/20/96 dated 30-06-2020.
Supply Action Taken, File-Notings made, Office Correspondence done and exchanged, and Orders passed on my Representation dated 10-07-2020 submitted vide CSO Receipt/Diary No. 5911 dated 15-07-2020 to the Civil Surgeon, Patiala.
Supply Names, Offiec-Designations, Place of Posting, Service-Tenure/Period of the Doctors - Medical Officers & Ayush Doctors, Nursing-Staff, Pharmacy-Staff, Medical Laboratory-Staff employed under Govt. of Punjab and under Mission Fateh-National Health Mission & NRHM, Punjab and posted at Mata Kaushlya Hopsital-Patiala, Rajindra Hospital & CCC-RH, Patiala and Covid Care Centre, Meritorious School, Patiala since April, 2020 who are suffering from Diabetes Mellitus, Hypertension, Renal Diseases etc. including the Immuno-compromised ones.

2. Respondent, Dr. Shelly pleaded that the sought information has been supplied to the appellant and he is satisfied with the same. A written submission pertaining to same has received by the undersigned dated **30.03.2021** vide diary no. **7302**.
3. Telephonically, appellant Sh. S. P. Verma submitted that the sought information has been supplied to him after a long delay and hence the respondent PIO should be penalized for the same.
4. As the information stands supplied therefore, no cause of action is required in this case. Hence, the instant complaint case is **disposed & closed**.

Moreover, with regard to the prayer of the appellant for imposing penalty upon the PIO, the Commission does not find any mala fide intention on the part of the PIO in denying the information to the appellant and hence the question of imposition of any penalty does not arise.

Chandigarh
Dated: 06.04.2021

Sd/-
(Maninder Singh Patti)
State Information Commissioner



Sh. Parveen Kumar Sayal,

Partner, Syal & Co, Octroi Contractor,
Sirhind-140406.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o Director, Local Govt, Punjab,
Sector-35 A, Chandigarh.

.....Respondent

First Appellate Authority

O/o Director, Local Govt, Punjab,
Sector-35 A, Chandigarh.

Appeal Case No.353 of 2021

Present: Appellant: Absent

Respondent: Sh. Rajinder Kumar (Sr.Asst.), 9872550275

ORDER:

1. This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 10.03.2021

Information Sought:

Submittal to reason:

(i) Certified Copy of the letter vide which my letter dated 05-10-2020 has been forwarded to Sh. Amit Borsla, Regional Deputy Director, Urban Local Bodies, Cum 1st appellate authority, Ferozepur Road, Mini Secretariate, Ludhiana.

(ii) Certified Copy of E-Me Action taken on my letter dated 15-09-2020 addressed to the above mentioned appellate authority with a copy ^{by E-Mail} to Sh. Bhupinder Singh IPS, Director, Local Govt. titled as Non-removal of deficiencies. My the P.O. pointed out by the applicant vide letter dated 22-2-20 under RTI.

2. Respondent, Sh. Rajinder Kumar handed over the information pertaining to the points enumerated in the RTI application and has further assured the Commission that he would send the same to the appellant through registered post.
3. On this, the Commission directed to send the sought information on the appellant what's number also.
4. **Keeping in view the facts of the case and the submissions made by the respondent authority, the undersigned bench is of considered view that on the assurance of respondent authority this instant appeal case is **Disposed of** and **Closed** with the directions to submit proof of having sent the information to 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 information.**

Moreover telephonically, the Commission has apprised the appellant, Sh. Parveen Kumar Sayal about the due course of the court proceedings.

Chandigarh
Dated: 06.04.2021

Sd/-
(Maninder Singh Patti)
State Information Commissioner



Sh. Balwinder Singh(Sr.Constable), (7009764216)

S/o Sh. Ajaib Singh, Village Mallu Duara,
PO Khoker Faujia, Tehsil Batala,
Distt Gurdaspur.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o Commandant, First Commando Batalian,
Bahadargarh, Distt Patiala.

.....Respondent

First Appellate Authority

O/o cum Inspector General Police,
Commando Battalions, Bahadargarh,
Distt Patiala.

Appeal Case No.360 of 2021

Present: None

ORDER:

1. This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 10.03.2021.

Information Sought:

5. ਸੂਚਨਾ ਪ੍ਰਾਪਤ ਕਰਨ ਸਬੰਧੀ ਵੇਰਵਾ
(ੳ) ਮੰਗੀ ਗਈ ਸੂਚਨਾ ਦਾ ਵਿਸ਼ਾ
(ਅ) ਮਿਲਾਵਟ ਜਿਸ ਨਾਲ ਸੂਚਨਾ ਸਬੰਧਤ ਹੈ।
(ੲ) ਸੂਚਨਾ ਪ੍ਰਾਪਤੀ ਦਾ ਵਿਸਥਾਰ

ਮਾ. ਨੰ. 02 ਨਿਪੀ 5 ਤੇ 41842045, 467.46819, P.S. V.B. A
ਜਦੋਂ, ਮਿਲਾਵਟ ਕਰਨ ਦੀ ਕੋਸ਼ਿਸ਼ ਕੀਤੀ।
ਮਿਲਾਵਟ ਵਿਭਾਗ ਦੇ ਮੁਖੀ ਨੇ ਮਾ. ਨੰ. 02 ਨਿਪੀ 5 ਤੇ 41842045, 467.46819, P.S. V.B. A
ਵਿਭਾਗ ਦੇ ਮੁਖੀ ਨੂੰ ਮਿਲਾਵਟ ਕਰਨ ਦੀ ਕੋਸ਼ਿਸ਼ ਕੀਤੀ।
ਜਦੋਂ, ਮਿਲਾਵਟ ਕਰਨ ਦੀ ਕੋਸ਼ਿਸ਼ ਕੀਤੀ।

2. **Written Submission by Appellant:** An email dated 05.04.2021 is received by the bench of undersigned vide which the appellant **Sh. Balwinder Singh** has acknowledged that the sought information has been provided to him and is satisfied with the same. This email is taken on record.

As the information stands supplied therefore, no cause of action is required in this case. Hence, the instant appeal case is **disposed & closed**

Chandigarh
Dated: 06.04.2021

Sd/-
(Maninder Singh Patti)
State Information Commissioner



Sh. Surinder Kumar Maluja, (9646546613)

S/o Sh. Om Parkash, R/o Street No 2,
Near Shani Dev Mandir, Patel Nagar, Malout,
Distt Sri Muktsar Sahib.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o Chief Agriculture Officer,
Sri Muktsar Sahib.

.....Respondent

First Appellate Authority

O/o Chief Agriculture Officer,
Sri Muktsar Sahib.

Appeal Case No.367 of 2021

Present: Appellant: Absent

Respondent: Sh. Maninder Singh (ADO), 7589025143

ORDER:

1. This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 10.03.2021.

Information Sought:

- 1) ਮਲੋਟ ਦਫਤਰ ਅਧੀਨ ਏਰੀਏ ਵਿੱਚ ਜਿਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਦੁਕਾਨਦਾਰਾਂ/ਫਰਮਾਂ ਦੀ ਲਿਸਟ ਜਿਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਦੇ ਸੈਪਲ ਭਰੇ ਗਏ ਹਨ।
- 2) ਭਰੇ ਗਏ ਸੈਪਲਾਂ ਵਿੱਚੋਂ ਜਿਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਦੁਕਾਨਦਾਰਾਂ ਦੇ ਸੈਪਲ ਫੇਲ ਪਾਏ ਗਏ ਹਨ ਦੀ ਲਿਸਟ।
- 3) ਮਹਿਕਮੇ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਫੇਲ ਸੈਪਲਾਂ ਵਾਲੀਆਂ ਫਰਮਾਂ ਖਿਲਾਫ ਕੀਤੀ ਗਈ ਕਾਰਵਾਈ ਦੇ ਪੱਤਰ ਵਿਹਾਰ ਦੀਆਂ ਕਾਪੀਆਂ।

2. Respondent, Sh. Maninder Singh pleaded that the information pertaining to point no. 1 & 2 of the RTI application has been supplied to the appellant dated 18.08.2021 and the information pertaining to point no. 3 is a third party information and hence cannot be finished. A letter dated 08.05.2021 vide diary no. 5415 is received by the wherein the same is mentioned.
3. After hearing the party and on perusal of the relevant documents on file, the Commission found no reason to disagree with the replies of the respondents. The replies of respondents upheld.

The matter is **disposed of** accordingly at Commission's end.

Sd/-

(Maninder Singh Patti)
State Information Commissioner

Chandigarh
Dated: 06.04.2021



Smt. Rajpal Kaur, (9417691095)

W/o Late Sh. Gurmeet Singh,
R/o Village Panjawa Mandal,
Tehsil Abohar, Distt Fazilka.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o SSP,
Fazilka.

.....Respondent

First Appellate Authority

O/o DIG, Ferozepur Range,
Ferozepur Cantt.

Appeal Case No.373 of 2021

Present: Appellant: Smt. Rajpal Kaur (On Telephone Call)

Respondent: Sh. Puneet Puri (Clerk), 7508183002

ORDER:

1. This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 10.03.2021

Information Sought:

ਸੂਚਨਾ ਦਾ ਵਿਸ਼ਾ:

ਦਰਖਾਸਤ 09/03/2020 ਅਤੇ 06/08/2020
ਵਲੋਂ ਰਾਜਪਾਲ ਕੌਰ ਬਰ ਖਿਲਾਫ ਸੁਮਿਤਰ ਕੌਰ ਵਗੈਰਾ

2. Written Submissions by Respondent: A letter dated 01.04.2021 vide diary no. 7513 is received in the Commission vide which the respondent authority has mention that the requisite information comprising 38 pages has been supplied to the appellant through registered post dated 31.03.2021 vide letter reference no. 589. This letter is taken on record with all supporting enclosures.

3. Respondent, Sh. Puneet Puri referred to the aforesaid correspondence pleaded that sought information has supplied to the appellant thorough registered post dated 31.03.2021.

5. Keeping in view the facts of the case and the submissions made by the respondent authority, Commission finds that the RTI application has been **suitably replied** and the information has been supplied to the **best extent**. The matter is **disposed of** accordingly.

However, telephonically, the Commission has apprised the appellant Smt. Rajpal Kaur about the due course of the court proceedings.

Chandigarh
Dated: 06.04.2021

Sd/-
(Maninder Singh Patti)
State Information Commissioner



Sh. Gurbax Singh, (7528950026)

Editor India's Justice,
Village Bholapur, P.O Ramgarh,
Chandigarh Road, Ludhiana-141123.

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o Sub Divisional Magistrate,
Nabha, Distt Patiala.

.....Appellant/Complainant

.....Respondent

First Appellate Authority

O/o Sub Divisional Magistrate,
Nabha, Distt Patiala.

Appeal Case No.374 of 2021

Present: Appellant: Sh. Gurbax Singh (On Telephone Call)
Respondent: Sh. Nirmal Singh (Sr. Asst.), 9417788663

ORDER:

1. This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 10.03.2021.

Information Sought:

- 1) Re-assignment files received in the SDM office from January 2020 to 4-9-2020, their details should be given.
 - 2) From January 2020 to 4-9-2020, provide me name of clerk which has handle Motor Transport in the office of SDM office.
 - 3) The numbers of the learning licenses issued during the above period (Jan. 2020 to 4-9-2020) and the names of the applicants should be mentioned.
 - 4) The names and license numbers of the applicants who passed the test at automotive test drive track during the above period (Jan. 2020 to 4-9-2020) should be given, also provide me details of fails records.
 - 5) Details of the traffic challans issued during the said period, their challan numbers and offences detail and the amount of fines levied from them should be given.
2. Respondent, Sh. Nirmal Singh pleaded that sought information has supplied to the appellant thorough post dated 11.02.2021. A copy of the same is submitted to the undersigned bench in the court.
 3. As the information stands supplied therefore, no cause of action is required in this case. Hence, the instant appeal case is **disposed & closed**.

However, telephonically, the Commission has apprised the appellant Sh. Gurbax Singh about the due course of the court proceedings.

Chandigarh
Dated: 06.04.2021

Sd/-
(Maninder Singh Patti)
State Information Commissioner



Sh. Gurmeet Singh, (9501421959)

S/o Sh. Surmukh Singh,
Distt Pardhan Anti Corruption Front 2072,
Bhai Mastan Singh Nagar,
Sri Muktsar Sahib-152026.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o Chief Engineer, K.A.D.
Water Resource Department, Punjab,
Sector 17, Chandigarh, 160017

.....Respondent

First Appellate Authority

O/o Secretary, Electricity and Irrigation Department,
Punjab Civil Secretariat, Chandigarh.

Appeal Case No.394 of 2021

Present: Appellant: Sh. Gurmeet Singh

Respondent: Sh. Daya Ram (Sr.Asst.), 9463675302

ORDER:

1. This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 10.03.2021

Information Sought:

- 1) ਲੜੀ ਨੰ 01 ਤੇ ਸਬੰਧ ਵਿੱਚ ਇਸ ਦਫਤਰ ਦੇ ਦਫਤਰੀ ਹੁਕਮ ਨੰ 1594/195-1616/2 ਨ.ਗ.ਅ-2/2016 ਮਿਤੀ 21/03/2017 ਰਾਹੀਂ ਕਲਰਕਾਂ/ਜੂਨੀਅਰ ਸਹਾਇਕਾਂ ਤੋਂ ਸੀਨੀਅਰ ਸਹਾਇਕ ਪੱਦ ਉਨਤੀ ਦੇ ਹੁਕਮਾਂ ਦੀ ਕਾਪੀ ਆਪ ਨੂੰ ਭੇਜੀ ਜਾਂਦੀ ਹੈ।
- 2) ਲੜੀ ਨੰ 02 ਦੇ ਸਬੰਧ ਵਿੱਚ ਆਪ ਦੀ ਮੰਗ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਡਿਸਪੈਚ ਰਜਿਸਟਰ ਦੀ ਕਾਪੀਆਂ ਆਪ ਨੂੰ ਭੇਜੀ ਜਾਂਦੀਆਂ ਹਨ।
- 3) ਲੜੀ ਨੰ 03 ਦੇ ਸਬੰਧ ਵਿੱਚ ਦੱਸਿਆ ਜਾਂਦਾ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਜਿਸ ਸਰਕਲ/ ਮੰਡਲ ਦਫਤਰ ਵਿੱਚ ਕਰਮਚਾਰੀ ਤੈਨਾਤ ਹੁੰਦਾ ਹੈ ਉਸ ਦਫਤਰ ਵਿਖੇ ਹੀ ਕਰਮਚਾਰੀ ਦਾ ਸੇਵਾ ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਮੈਨਟੇਨ ਕੀਤਾ ਜਾਂਦਾ ਹੈ, ਜੇਕਰ ਆਪ ਨੂੰ ਇਸ ਸਬੰਧੀ ਸੂਚਨਾ ਲੋੜੀਂਦੀ ਹੈ ਤਾਂ ਸਿੱਧੇ ਤੌਰ ਤੇ ਸਬੰਧਤ ਦਫਤਰ ਨਾਲ ਤਾਲਮੇਲ ਕੀਤਾ ਜਾਵੇ।

2. Respondent, Sh. Daya Ram has brought the requisite information in the court and handed over the same to the appellant in the court. After perusing the information so supplied the appellant has showed satisfaction for the same.

3. As the information stands supplied therefore, no cause of action is required in this case.

Hence, the instant appeal case is **disposed & closed**.

Chandigarh
Dated: 06.04.2021

Sd/-
(Maninder Singh Patti)
State Information Commissioner



FINAL ORDER

Sh. Akash Verma, (9501125474)

80, New Officer Colony,
Stadium Road, Patiala-147001.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o Thapar Institute of Engineering & Technology,
Patiala.

.....Respondent

First Appellate Authority

O/o Thapar Institute of Engineering & Technology,
Patiala.

Appeal Case No.129 of 2021

RTI application filed on	:	22/10/2020
PIO replied on	:	10/11/2020
First appeal filed on	:	13/11/2020
First Appellate Authority order	:	10/12/2020
Second Appeal dated	:	24/12/2020
Date of Hearings	:	15/02/2021, 17/03/2021
Date of Decision	:	06/04/2021

Present: Appellant: Sh. Akash Verma

Respondent: Adv. Rajat Khanna (counsel for the respondent)

ORDER

1. The Appellant/Complainant filed appeal/complaint case dated 24.12.2020 before this Commission. Accordingly, the case has been taken up today.

2. Information sought by the Appellant and Background of the Case

- 1) Facility, Infrastructure for testing of Automobiles w.r.t. subject matter in a confined Environment/Road trials. (Both static & dynamic tests).
- 2) List of team of Class Approved/Certified/Qualified – Experts/Technicians as per point No.1 & Subject matter.
- 3) Records pertaining to Date & Certification/Approval regarding grant of status to Thapar University as an “Authorised Automobile Institution” w.r.t. subject matter.
- 4) List of specific equipment available for assessment as per subject matter.
- 5) List of category of Automobiles which can be inspected as per subject matter.
- 6) List of Authorised persons/signatory who are competent to issue “Defect Free Certificate” or Certificate of Standardization as per subject matter.”

3. The PIO in his reply dated 10.11.2020 had refused to provide the said information on the ground that Thapar Institute of Engineering & Technology is a private body and doesn't fall under purview of RTI Act 2005. Aggrieved by this, the Appellant filed the first appeal. The First Appellant Authority in his order upheld the stand taken by PIO. Therefore the present Second Appeal has been filed by the Appellant before this Commission u/s. 19 of the RTI Act 2005.
4. On the first date of hearing i.e., 15.02.2021 after going through the documents on record and hearing both the parties in the present case, this Commission had passed the following Order:

"After going through the documents on record and submissions made by the respective parties, this Commission finds that it is an undisputed fact that Thapar Institute of Engineering and Technology has been established by the Pepsu Government in 1955 consequent upon entering into an agreement with the Mohini Thapar Charitable Trust with a view to promote technical education in the State. Under the agreement a joint Charitable Trust was created and Rs. 30 Lakh each by Mohini Charitable Trust and the Pepsu Government was subscribed to the Institute. On 19.09.1955, Pepsu Government issued a Notification under Section 4 of the Land of Acquisition Act to the effect that land measuring 250 acres was likely to be required for public purposes. The land was provided by the Pepsu Government, free of cost, for the establishment of the Respondent Institute. Thus it is clear that the present Institute has been established on the land given by the Government, free of cost at the public expense for a public purpose for imparting education which is a very important service to the Society at large.

It has also come forth that the Respondent has been provided significant financial assistance by the State Government to set off its deficits. The details of the grants received by them during the previous few years have been mentioned in the Judgment dated 26.06.2018 passed by the CIC annexed along with the present Appeal, therefore the same are not being reproduced herein for the sake of brevity.

Thus upon a harmonious & conjoint reading of the aforesaid facts and the Judgment dated 26.06.2018 passed by the CIC, this Commission is of the firm opinion that the Respondent Institute certainly falls within the four walls of the definition of a 'Public authority' which is provided under Section 2(h)(i) of the RTI Act 2005 as it passes the test of being substantially financed by the appropriate Government on two accounts viz., firstly since it has been established on the land given by the Government free of cost and secondly it has also been receiving grants from the Government from time to time.

*At this juncture it would not be inappropriate to refer to the following decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **D.A.V. College Trust and Management Society &Ors. v. Director of Public Instructions &Ors.** reported as **(2019) 9 SCC 185** wherein while interpreting the*

meaning of term 'substantially financed' occurring u/s. 2(h)(i) of the RTI Act, 2005, the Hon'ble Apex Court has held that if an Institution is established on the land given by the State then it would certainly mean that it is substantially financed by the Government.

26. In our view, "substantial" means a large portion. It does not necessarily have to mean a major portion or more than 50%. No hard-and-fast rule can be laid down in this regard. Substantial financing can be both direct or indirect. To give an example, if a land in a city is given free of cost or on heavy discount to hospitals, educational institutions or such other body, this in itself could also be substantial financing. The very establishment of such an institution, if it is dependent on the largesse of the State in getting the land at a cheap price, would mean that it is substantially financed. Merely because of financial contribution of the State comes down during the actual funding, will not by itself mean that the indirect finance given is not to be taken into consideration. The value of the land will have to be evaluated not only on the date of allotment but even on the date when the question arises as to whether the said body or NGO is substantially financed.

That so far as the sole contention advanced by the of the Ld. Counsel for the Respondent regarding the decision of the CIC dated 26.06.2018 being stayed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court is concerned, this Commission is of the view that the effect of the order of stay in a pending case before the Hon'ble High Court does not amount to wiping out the said decision and at the same time such interim order does not destroy the binding effect of the Judgment of the CIC as a precedent on this Commission because while granting the interim stay, the Hon'ble High Court did not lay down any proposition of law inconsistent with the one declared by the decision of the CIC which is impugned before the Hon'ble High Court. In the case of **Shree Chamundi Mopeds Ltd. v. Church of South India Trust Assn., reported as (1992) 3 SCC 1** the Hon'ble Supreme Court while pointing out the difference between an order of stay of operation of the Order and an order quashing the Order itself has held that the pendency of an Appeal or the grant of interim stay does not wipe out a Judgment, leave alone quash it. The relevant excerpt is reproduced as follows:

While considering the effect of an interim order staying the operation of the order under challenge, a distinction has to be made between quashing of an order and stay of operation of an order. Quashing of an order results in the restoration of the position as it stood on the date of the passing of the order which has been quashed. The stay of operation of an order does not, however, lead to such a result. It only means that the order which has been stayed would not be operative from the date of the passing of the

stay order and it does not mean that the said order has been wiped out from existence. This means that if an order passed by the Appellate Authority is quashed and the matter is remanded, the result would be that the appeal which had been disposed of by the said order of the Appellate Authority would be restored and it can be said to be pending before the Appellate Authority after the quashing of the order of the Appellate Authority. The same cannot be said with regard to an order staying the operation of the order of the Appellate Authority because in spite of the said order, the order of the Appellate Authority continues to exist in law and so long as it exists, it cannot be said that the appeal which has been disposed of by the said order has not been disposed of and is still pending. We are, therefore, of the opinion that the passing of the interim order dated February 21, 1991 by the Delhi High Court staying the operation of the order of the Appellate Authority dated January 7, 1991 does not have the effect of reviving the appeal which had been dismissed by the Appellate Authority by its order dated January 7, 1991 and it cannot be said that after February 21, 1991, the said appeal stood revived and was pending before the Appellate Authority.

It is pertinent to mention that the aforesaid Judgment has also been relied upon by a Division Bench of the Hon'ble Calcutta High Court in the case of **PijushKanti Chowdhury v. State of West Bengal &Ors. reported as (2007) 3 CHN 178 : (2007) 54 AIC 952 (Cal) : (2007) 3 ICC 824 (Cal) (DB).**

In view of the what has been stated herein above, this Commission has come down to the conclusion that much water has flown since the Judgment dated 26.06.2018 passed by the CIC, has been stayed by the Hon'ble High Court and now a precedent has been laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of D.A.V. College Trust and Management Society (Supra) which has clearly expanded the scope of the words 'substantially financed' occurring u/s. 2(h)(i) of the RTI Act 2005 and accordingly held that land given to the educational institutions free of cost or at discounted rates itself amounts to substantial financing. Therefore in view of the aforesaid recent Judgment of the Apex Court it is clear that since the Respondent Institute has been established on the 250 acres of land given by the Government and has also received significant financial assistance by the Government given to the Respondent Institute to set off its deficits, from time to time, therefore it has been substantially financed by the Government and accordingly falls in the definition of the a 'pubic authority' as provided u/s. 2(h)(i) of the RTI Act 2005 and is thus liable to provide information under the Act.

5. Thereafter the Commission adjourned the matter to 17.03.2021 with the directions to the PIO to provide clear and specific information to the Appellant within a period of 15 days in accordance with the provisions of the RTI Act, 2005 from the date of receipt of this order.
6. On 17.03.2021 both parties were present. The Respondent filed a written statement before the Commission dated 25.02.2021 vide diary no. 4381. The Appellant on the other hand submitted a rejoinder rebutting the stand taken by the Respondent in their written statement filed before this Commission. A copy was also handed over to the Respondent.
7. Accordingly after making their respective submissions, Sh. Rajat Khanna, Advocate, counsel for the Respondent pleaded for adjournment in the present case, to enable him to consult the Respondent – Institute (i.e. Thapar Institute of Engineering & Technology) regarding providing the information and submitting a considered response. In view of the aforesaid plea the Commission adjourned the matter for hearing on 06.04.2021.
8. Thereafter, today i.e., on 06.04.2021, Sh. Rajat Khanna, Advocate, counsel for the respondent, submitted a letter dated 06.04.2021, before the Commission. The said letter is addressed to the Appellant, Sh. Akash Verma wherein the information sought by him has been provided by the Respondent-Institute. This correspondence is taken on record. A copy the same is handed over to the Appellant.
9. Keeping in view the facts of the case and in light of the aforesaid letter dated 06.04.2021 issued by the Respondent – Institute to the Appellant herein, it is evident that the information sought by him under the present RTI Application has been provided to him and therefore their reply adequately addresses the same.
10. The matter is disposed of accordingly at Commission's end.

Chandigarh
Dated: 06.04.2021

Sd/-
(Maninder Singh Patti)
State Information Commissioner