



Sh. Vikrant Sharma,
H No- 43, Gurmeet Nagar,
Mithapur Road, Model Town,
Jalandhar City.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Sub Divisional Engineer,
Model Town Commercial,
Sub Division No-2, PSPCL BootanPind,
Jalandhar City.

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 745 of 2019

PRESENT: None for the Complainant
Sh.HarjinderSingh Bansal, Dy. Chief Engineer PSPCL for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first fixed for hearing on 18.12.2019. Both the parties were absent. The case was adjourned.

The case was again heard on **17.02.2020**. The complainant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent was absent. Having gone through the record, the Commission observed that the complainant has come to the commission without going to the First Appellate Authority. The case was remanded back to the First Appellate Authority with the direction to consider and dispose off the appeal within the prescribed period of 30 days.

The Commission further observed that there has been an enormous delay of nine months in attending to the RTI application and the respondent was also absent on 2nd consecutive hearing. The PIO was issued a **show cause notice under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 and directed to file reply on an affidavit**

The case came up for further hearing on 03.06.2020 through video conferencing at DAC Jalandhar. The appellant informed that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent was absent nor had sent any reply to the show cause notice. The PIO was given one last opportunity to comply with the earlier order of the Commission and directed to appear personally on the next date of hearing alongwith reply to the show cause notice on an affidavit. The First Appellate Authority was also directed to consider and dispose off the appeal as per earlier order of the Commission.

On the date of last hearing on **22.07.2020** which was held through video conferencing at DAC Jalandhar, the respondent pleaded that the information has been supplied to the appellant and the appellant has agreed to withdraw his complaint. The respondent also send a copy of an affidavit stating therein the reasons for delay in providing the information which was taken on the file of the Commission. The appellant was absent.

Complaint Case No. 745 of 2019

Since the reply submitted by the respondent-SDO was not from the PIO, who happened to be the Deputy Chief Engineer, PSPCL Circle Jalandhar, the reply of the SDO was not accepted and the PIO was directed to send reply to the show cause notice issued on 17.02.2020 for delay in providing the information.

Hearing dated 07.09.2020:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Jalandhar. The PIO is present and informed that the complete information has already been supplied to the complainant and the complainant is satisfied with the information. The complaint is absent nor has communicated any discrepancies.

The PIO has also sent reply through email which has been taken on the file of the Commission.

Having gone through the reply, the Commission accepts the plea of the PIO and drop the show cause with a warning to the PIO to attend the RTI applications well within the time prescribed under the RTI Act.

No further course of action is required. The case **is disposed off and closed.**

**Chandigarh
Dated 07.09.2020**

**Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner**

**CC to: The Chief Engineer, PSPCL,
Circle, Jalandhar.**



ShRanjit Singh, S/o ShMaghar Singh,
R/o Near Guru Kaul School,
BhagtaBhaika, DisttBathinda.

... Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o NaibTehsildar,
BhagtaBhaika, DisttBathinda.

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 262 of 2020

PRESENT: Sh.Ranjit Singh as the Complainant
Sh.Avtar Singh, NaibTehsildarBhagtaBhaika for the Respondent

ORDER:

The complainant through RTI application dated 30.10.2020 has sought information regarding area of land allotted after the murabbabandi of land bearing mutation No.7011/7012 and area of land after girdawari in said mutation numbers and other information concerning the office of NaibTehsildarBhagtaBhaika. The complainant was not provided the information after which the complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 19.03.2020.

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Bathinda. The respondent present pleaded that the copy of mutation has been provided to the complainant and since the information sought by the complainant is in question form, no further information can be provided. However, the Commission makes it clear that if the information exists even though it is sought in question form, it be provided.

The Commission also observes that rest of the RTI application is vague. So no further course of action is required except that the PIO will provide girdawri for the last 12 years to the complainant.

With the above order, the case is **disposed off and closed**.

Chandigarh
Dated 07.09.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



ShKewal Singh, S/o ShRoshanLal,
667, Model Town, Phase-1,
Bathinda.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Commissioner, MC,
Bathinda.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Commissioner, MC,
Bathinda.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 751 of 2020

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
Sh.Ravi Kumar, Suptd.O/o MC Bathinda for the Respondent

ORDER:

The complainant through RTI application dated 326.08.2019 has sought information that under what section of the RTI act, the ID of the appellant is asked for seeking information under the RTI Act and other information concerning the office of Commissioner, MC Bathinda. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 26.11.2019 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Bathinda. The respondent present pleaded that the information containing 14 pages has been provided to the appellant. The respondent further informed that the ID proof is mandatory as per order of the Hon'ble High Court in CWP 4787 of 2011.

The appellant is absent. The appellant is further directed to get/download the order from the website of the Hon'ble High Court.

No further course of action is required. The case is **disposed off and closed.**

Chandigarh
Dated 07.09.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh.Gurmukh Singh, S/o Sh.Natha Singh,
VPO Hohsiarpur, Tehsil Kharar,
Distt.Mohali.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Land Acquisition Collector,
GMADA, Mohali

First Appellate Authority,
O/o EO, GMADA,
Mohali

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1085 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Gurmukh Singh as the Appellant
Sh.Tarlochan Singh, O/o Deptt of Horticulture and Sh.Harpal Singh, O/o
LAC GMADA for the Respondent

ORDER: The appellant through RTI application dated 24.12.2018 has sought information regarding i) & ii) assessment of Jamun Trees standing on the land bearing khasra No.10//25-3 & compensation iii & iv) assessment of trees & khasra No.20//48 & compensation and other information concerning the office of Land Acquisition Collector, GMADA Mohali. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed a first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 30.01.2019, which took no decision on the appeal.

The case was first heard on 27.06.2019. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant was not satisfied and stated that the PIO has not provided the assessment report of the trees standing on particular khasra numbers for which he had sought the information.

Having gone through the record, the Commission instructed the department of Forest, Punjab and the department of Horticulture to complete the assessment within 45 days and once the assessment is completed and sent to the Land acquisition department, the information be provided to the appellant.

The case was again heard on **16.10.2019**. The respondent present from the office of GMADA informed that they have already written to the department of Forests for supply of information but the information has not been provided. The respondent present from Forest Department pleaded that since the information sought by the appellant relates to the assessment of fruit trees, the same had to be conducted by the Horticulture department and the information was to be provided by them. The PIO-Department of Horticulture, Punjab, was again directed to look at the RTI application and provide the information. The PIO-Department of Forest was exempted.

The case was again heard on **23.12.2019**. The respondent present from the office of GMADA informed that they have already written to the Forest Department for supply of information. The respondent present from the Forest Department informed that GMADA has not identified the khasra no. and has not deposited requisite fee for assessment of trees.

Appeal Case No. 1085 of 2019

The Commission observed that it is an inter-department issue and directed the PIO-GMADA to coordinate with Forest Department and complete the requisite formalities to prepare the assessment report and to provide the complete information to the appellant.

The respondent from Horticulture department was absent. The Commission has received a letter from PIO-Horticulture department stating they are only to do assessment of fruits of fruit trees and the assessment of non-fruit trees is to be done by the Forest Department. The appellant was asking for copy of assessment of Jaman trees standing on land bearing khasra No.10//25-3. The PIO-Horticulture department was directed to relook the RTI and provide the complete information.

On the date of last hearing on **30.06.2020**, the respondent present from the office of Horticulture department informed that the information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant was not satisfied and stated that the information that has been provided, was not sought by him. The respondent informed that since no trees were found, no assessment was done. The PIO-Horticulture Department was directed to give this in writing on an affidavit that no trees were found and no assessment was done.

The respondent present from the office of LAC GMADA pleaded that the assessment was to be done by the Forest Department. The Forest Department has not given the reply.

The PIO-GMADA was directed to pursue with the Forest Department regarding assessment of trees standing on Khasra No.20/48 and provide the information to the appellant.

Hearing dated 07.09.2020:

The respondent present from the Horticulture department pleaded that as per order of the Commission, an affidavit has been provided to the appellant mentioning therein that no trees were found inkhasra No.20/48 and no assessment was made. The appellant has received the affidavit.

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

Chandigarh
Dated 07.09.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

CC to: 1. PIO-Department of Forests, Punjab, Mohali

2. PIO-Directorate of Horticulture, Punjab,
KhetiBhawan, 3rd Floor, Near Dara Studio,
Sector 56-A, Mohali.