



Sh. Ravjot Singh, (9814500076)
83 - J, Sarabha Nagar,
Ludhiana – 141001

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

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

.....Respondent

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

Appeal Case No.973 of 2022
(Cisco Webex Proceedings)

Present: Appellant: Absent
Respondent: ASI, Ramesh Kumar

ORDER (First Hearing):

1. The Appellant/Complainant filed above mentioned appeal/complaint case in the Commission dated 23.02.2022. Accordingly, the case is fixed for today.
2. The commission is in receipt of acknowledgement letter from appellant Sh. Ravjot Singh vide which he has stated that he has received the requisite information and has requested to close the case.
3. As the information stands supplied therefore, no cause of action is required in this case. Hence, the instant appeal case is **disposed & closed**.

Sd/-

Chandigarh
Dated: 06.07.2022

(Maninder Singh Patti)
State Information Commissioner, Pb.



Sh. Jatinder Kumar, (9872324111)Appellant/Complainant
C/o Sachkhand Mishthan Bhandha,
Nehru Gate, Nawanshahr.

Versus

Public Information OfficerRespondent
O/o EO, Nagar Council,
Nawanshahr.

First Appellate Authority

O/o Regional Deputy Director, Local Govt,
Jalandhar.

Appeal Case No.985 of 2022
(Cisco Webex Proceedings)

Present: Appellant: Sh. Jatinder Kumar
Respondent: Sh. Bharat Bhushan (clerk)

ORDER (First Hearing):

1. The Appellant/Complainant filed above mentioned appeal/complaint case in the Commission dated 24.02.2022. Accordingly, the case is fixed for today.
2. Respondent, Sh. Bharat Bhushan stated that the information/ reply pertaining to the sought information in this case has already been supplied to the appellant in the case no. 276,277,278,279 & 280/ 2021 dated 16.04.2021 in affidavit form and no any other information is pending in the office record.
3. The commission is receipt of an affidavit from the respondent wherein the aforesaid statement of the respondent Sh. Bharat Bhushan is mentioned.
4. After hearing both the parties and going through the information supplied by the respondent authority, the Commission finds that the RTI application has been suitably replied and the information has been supplied to the best extent. Moreover, the factual position has been brought to the notice of the appellant by the respondent.

Therefore, no cause of action is required in this case. Hence, the instant appeal case is disposed & closed.

Sd/-

Chandigarh
Dated: 06.07.2022

(Maninder Singh Patti)
State Information Commissioner, Pb.



Sh. Jaswant Sarpal, (9465477771)

S/o Sh. Darbari Lal Sarpal,
House No. 2220/2, Arian Street,
I/s Mahan Singh Gate, Amritsar.

Versus

.....Appellant/Complainant

Public Information Officer

....Respondent

O/o Deputy Commissioner of Police,
Amritsar.

First Appellate Authority

O/o Commissioner of Police,
Amritsar.

Appeal Case No.3619 of 2021
(Cisco Webex Proceedings)

Present: Appellant: Absent

Respondent: Sh. Surinder Singh (ASI) 9780575800 alongwith
Sh. Balwant Singh (ASI, PS Kotwali)

ORDER (First Hearing):

1. The Appellant/Complainant filed above mentioned appeal/complaint case in the Commission dated 28.02.2022. Accordingly, the case is fixed for today.
2. **Subject matter of information Sought:** Matter related with the order dated 29.08.2019 of SIC, Sh. Avtar Singh Kaler in appeal case no. 1927 of 2019, itself is enough to prove there fraud corruption, on the basis appeal case had been disposed of.

Required information:-

- 1) Copy of RTI Application dt. 21-07-2018.
 - 2) Copy of all the produced documents on the basis above said appeal case had been disposed of
 - 3) Disclosed the deal between both (PIO-cum-DCP ASR and SIC-Chd) had been done on the basis police got order in their favour without producing/ supplying the document i.e. power position, status are money.
 - 4) Reply in this regard also be taken from SIC S. Avtar Singh Kaler on which the ground SIC disposed of the above said appeal.
3. Respondent, Sh. Surinder Singh stated that applicant **Sh. Jaswant Sarpal** seek some information from one wing of the public authority, and based on the responses file a bunch of RTI questions from the same wing of same public authority, or from other authority. This will have a continuous harassing effect on the public authority.

As the PIOs go on answering more and those questions are generated out of the same and in the same proportion the number of repeated first appeals and second appeals also will be growing. As this matter was previously addressed by the bench Ld. CIC Dr. S.S Channi (AC: 1983/2017) and by the Ld. SIC Sh. Avtar Singh Kaler (1927/2019). He further added that moreover, the information sought by the Appellant in the RTI application of point no. 3 and 4 dated 27/05/2021 is not 'information' under Section 2(f) of the RTI Act.

“Section 2(f) -Information means any material in any form, including records, documents, memos e-mails, opinions, advices, press releases, circulars, orders, logbooks, contracts, reports, papers, samples, models, data material held in any electronic form and information relating to any private body which can be accessed by a public authority under any other law for the time being in force; The definition cannot include within its fold answers to the question why which would be the same thing as asking the reason for a justification for a particular thing. The Public Information Authorities cannot expect to communicate to the citizen the reason why a certain thing was done or not done in the sense of a justification because the citizen makes a requisition about information. Justifications are matter within the domain of adjudicating authorities and cannot properly be classified as information.”

The definition cannot include within its fold answers to the question why which would be the same thing as asking the reason for a justification for a particular thing. The Public Information Authorities cannot expect to communicate to the citizen the reason why a certain thing was done or not done in the sense of a justification because the citizen makes a requisition about information. Justifications are matter within the domain of adjudicating authorities and cannot properly be classified as information.”

- 3. Keeping in view the facts of the case and in the light of the aforementioned settled position of law, this Commission is of the considered opinion that the contention of the respondent is found reasonable and there appears no reason to interfere with the same.**

Moreover, this Court is of the considered view that the applicant has no reason to approach this Court again for the same relief when the earlier RTI application has been adequately addressed and was dismissed. **It may also be noted that keeping with the principles of judicial discipline and propriety this bench of the Commission cannot remark on the merits of action taken as a Second Appellate Authority by another coordinate bench.**

“A settled canon of administration of justice is that no litigant should be permitted to misuse the judicial process by filing frivolous petitions. No litigant has a right to unlimited drought upon the Court time and public money in order to get his affairs settled in the manner as he wishes. In any event there is no justifiable reason in such a case to permit the petitioner to invoke the extraordinary jurisdiction of the Court under RTI Act once again seeking similar relief.”

Appeal Case No.3619 of 2021
(Cisco Webex Proceedings)

4. In view of the position above and in the circumstances of the case, this bench of Commission observes that the instant appeal case is devoid of merit. hence the case is disposed of and closed.

Chandigarh
Dated: 06.07.2022

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