



Sh. Sohan Lal Jain,  
H No-1355, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor,  
Sector-68, Mohali.

... Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o Secretary,  
Department of Health & Family Welfare,  
Punjab Civil Secretariat-2, Sector 9,  
Chandigarh.

...Respondent

**Complaint Case No. 15 of 2021**

**PRESENT: Sh.Sohan Lal as the Complainant**  
**None for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The complainant through RTI application dated 19.10.2020 has sought information regarding action taken on the application dated 06.05.2017 sent to the Chief Minister for action against Dr Sudesh Gupta (now civil surgeon Sangrur) & others – a copy of rule on the basis of which action has been taken – posting order of Sr Assistant & other officials worked at Pb Civil secretariat from 06.02.1989 to till date - action taken on application dated 01.12.2016 and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of Secretary, Department of Health & Family Welfare, Pb Chandigarh. The complainant was not provided with the information after which he filed a complaint in the commission.

On the date of the first hearing on 11.05.2021, both the parties were absent. The case was adjourned.

On the date of the next hearing on **10.08.2021**, the appellant claimed that the PIO has not supplied the information.

Since it was a complaint case and the complainant had 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 this as an appeal case and dispose of the same within a period of 30 days as prescribed under the RTI Act.

However, since the respondent was absent on 2<sup>nd</sup> consecutive hearing nor had sent any reply to the RTI application as well as there has been an enormous delay of more than ten months in attending to the RTI application, the PIO was issued a **show-cause notice under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 for not supplying the information within the statutorily prescribed period of time and directed to file reply on an affidavit.**

On the date of the last hearing on 13.12.2021, Sh.Gurjeet Singh, PIO appeared and submitted his reply which was taken on record. In the reply, the PIO has mentioned that since they did not receive any notice/order of the Commission except the order of the Commission dated 10.08.2021, they could not appear before the commission. The respondent further informed that they have sent a reply to the complainant vide letter dated 06.12.2021 with a copy to the Commission.

The Commission was not in agreement with the reply of the PIO since the RTI application was filed on 19.10.2020 which was duly received by them and the reply was sent to the complainant on 06.12.2021 with a delay of more than one year only after the issuance of show cause notice.

### **Complaint Case No. 15 of 2021**

Since the responsibility to ensure the timely transmission of the information to the appellant lies on the PIO, Sh.Gurjeet Singh- PIO-O/o Secretary, Department of Health and Family Welfare, Pb, Chandigarh was held guilty for not providing the information on time as prescribed under section 7 and a penalty of **Rs.10,000/-** was imposed on Sh.Gurjeet Singh- PIO-O/o Secretary Department of Health and Family Welfare, Pb, Chandigarh and directed to produce a copy of the challan as evidence of depositing the penalty in the Govt Treasury.

The PIO-O/o Secretary, Department of Health and Family Welfare, Pb, Chandigarh was also directed to pay an amount of **Rs.2,000/-** via demand draft as compensation to the appellant for the loss and detriment suffered by him of having to file the appeals and not getting information in time and submit proof of having compensated the appellant.

Further as per the complainant, the First Appellate Authority had not taken any decision on the appeal as per the order of the Commission. The First Appellate Authority, Secretary- Department of Health & Family Welfare, Pb was again directed to consider this an appeal case and dispose of the same within the time prescribed under the RTI Act.

#### **Hearing dated 08.03.2022:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Mohali. As per the complainant, the PIO has not provided the compensation amount and the First Appellate Authority has also not taken any decision on the order of the Commission.

Earlier order stands. The PIO- O/o Secretary, Department of Health and Family Welfare, Pb, is given one more opportunity to comply with the earlier order of the Commission which still stands and appear before the Commission on the next date of hearing.

Further, since the First Appellate Authority has not complied with the order of the Commission, the First Appellate Authority is again directed to ensure that this case is heard and disposed of within 30 days of the receipt of the order.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **25.04.2022** at 11.00 AM.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated:08.03.2022**

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

**CC to:First Appellate Authority,**  
**Secretary, Department of Health & Family Welfare,**  
**Pb Civil Secretariat-2, Sector 9,**  
**Chandigarh**



Sh.Karamjit Singh, S/o Sh Joginder Singh,  
Thuthian Wali Road, Near Maal Mandi,  
Ward NO-1, Mansa.

... Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o Director,  
Social Security of Women and Child Development  
Deptt, Pb, Chandigarh.

...Respondent

**Complaint Case No. 116 of 2021**

**Present: Sh.Karamjit Singh as the Appellant**  
**None for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The complainant through RTI application dated 01.09.2020 has sought information regarding leave availed by Kuljeet Kaur Anganwari worker Center No.134, Bhatti Basti, Mansa from 01.01.2020 to 22.08.2020 – the name of the person who receives the ration in the centre in place of Kuljeet Kaur and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of Director Social Security of Women & Child Development Department Pb Chandigarh. The complainant was not provided with the information after which the complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 15.01.2021.

On the date of the first hearing on 16.06.2021, both the parties were absent. The case was adjourned.

On the date of the last hearing on **25.10.2021**, the appellant was absent and vide letter received in the Commission on 29.06.2021 informed that he received copies of some information from Child Development Project Officer, Mansa but the information was incomplete.

The respondent was absent on 2<sup>nd</sup> consecutive hearing. There was nothing on record that shows that the PIO had replied RTI application within the time prescribed under the RTI Act. The PIO was issued a **show-cause notice under section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 for not supplying the information within the statutorily prescribed period of time and directed to file a reply on an affidavit.**

**Hearing dated 08.03.2022:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Mansa/Mohali. As per the complainant, the PIO has not supplied the complete information. The complainant further informed that he filed an RTI application on 01.09.2020 whereas the PIO had raised an amount of Rs.24/- as a fee for 12 pages only vide letter dated 14.01.2021.

The respondent is absent nor has filed a reply to the show-cause notice.

**Complaint Case No. 116 of 2021**

The PIO is given one last opportunity to file a reply to the show-cause notice otherwise it will be presumed that the PIO has nothing to say on the matter and the Commission will act against the PIO as per provisions of section 20 of the RTI Act.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **03.08.2022 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Mansa. The PIO to appear at Chandigarh.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated 08.03.2022**

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



Sh. Rajinder Kumar, S/o. Sh. Mehar Chand,  
Ward NO-2, Supreme Enclave,  
Near Vishvkarma Bhawan,  
Link Road, Mansa.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o Director,  
Local Govt, Sector-35-A,  
Chandigarh.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o Director,  
Local Govt, Sector-35-A,  
Chandigarh.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 3216 of 2020**

**PRESENT: Sh.Rajinder Kumar as the Appellant**  
**Smt.Sudha Rani PIO for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant through RTI application dated 30.07.2020 has sought information regarding the decision taken by Director Local Govt on general meeting of NC Mansa – remarks of EO dated 06.03.2020 and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of Director Local Govt. Pb Chandigarh. The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 31.08.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case came up for hearing first on 31.03.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Mansa. As per the appellant, the PIO had not provided the information.

The respondent present pleaded that the information has already been supplied to the appellant vide letter dated 17.08.2020. The respondent also submitted a copy of the information to the Commission which was sent to the appellant along with the order.

The appellant was directed to point out the discrepancies if any, to the PIO with a copy to the Commission and the PIO was directed to remove the same.

On the date of hearing on **16.06.2021**, as per the respondent, the information had been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 17.08.2020.

However, the appellant alleged that the PIO is misleading the court since the document which the respondent claims to have sent along with the letter dated 17.08.2020 is signed by the authorities only on 11.09.2020 and 21.01.2020. The appellant also sent a letter dated 30.04.2020 which was received in the Commission on 04.05.2020 along with a copy of documents signed by the authorities on 11.09.2020 and 21.10.2020.

Since there was prima-facie evidence that the PIO might have misled the court, the PIO was issued a **show-cause notice under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 and directed to file a reply on an affidavit.**

On the date of the last hearing on **25.10.2021**, the respondent was absent. The Commission received a reply from the PIO on 19.08.2021 which was taken on the file of the Commission.

Having gone through the reply to the show-cause notice, one last opportunity was afforded to the PIO with the direction to appear personally on the next date of hearing and explain the facts.

**Hearing dated 08.03.2022:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Mansa/Mohali. The respondent is present at Chandigarh and has filed his reply which has been taken on record.

Due to technical fault in the VC, the appellant could not be heard.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **03.08.2022 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Mansa. The PIO to appear at Chandigarh.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated 08.03.2022**

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



Sh. Rajinder Kumar, S/o. Sh. Mehar Chand,  
Ward NO-2, Supreme Enclave,  
Near Vishvkarma Bhawan,  
Link Road, Mansa.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o Director,  
Local Govt, Sector-35-A,  
Chandigarh.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o Director,  
Local Govt, Sector-35-A,  
Chandigarh.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 3217 of 2020**

**PRESENT: Sh.Rajinder Kumar as the Appellant**  
**Smt.Sudha Rani PIO for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant through RTI application dated 24.07.2020 has sought information regarding FIR No.11 dated 02.08.2017 PC Act 1988 Thana Vigilance Bureau Bathinda against Rajinder Kumar Clerk of NC Mansa – a copy of the letter dated 06.09.2019 – a copy of the letter in reference to which letter dated 06.09.2019 was written – a copy of DO letter dated 16.01.2020 of Punjab Vigilance Bureau and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of Director Local Govt. Pb Chandigarh. The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 31.08.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case came up for hearing on 31.03.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Mansa. As per the appellant, the PIO had not provided the information.

The respondent present pleaded that the information has already been supplied to the appellant vide letter dated 17.08.2020. The respondent also submitted a copy of the information to the Commission which was sent to the appellant along with the order.

The appellant was directed to point out the discrepancies if any, to the PIO with a copy to the Commission and the PIO was directed to remove the same.

On the date of hearing on **16.06.2021**, as per the appellant, he received the information from the PIO on 20.04.2021 which was incomplete since the PIO had not supplied the information on point1 & 3 and the information on point-2 was not attested. The appellant pointed out the discrepancies vide the letter received in the Commission on 04.05.2021.

A copy of the letter was sent to the PIO with the direction to sort out the discrepancies and provide complete information. If the information is not available on the record, to give in writing on an affidavit that the information that has been provided is true, complete and no other information is available in the record relating to this RTI application.

On the date of the last hearing on **25.10.2021**, the **respondent** informed that the discrepancies have been sorted out and the complete information has been provided to the appellant.

The appellant informed that he received the information on points 1 & 3 but the PIO has not supplied the copy of the letter of vigilance bureau in reference to which letter dated 06.09.2019 was written relating to point-2.

The PIO was directed to provide the information on point-2 if exists in the record. If the information is not available, give it in writing on an affidavit.

**Hearing dated 08.03.2022:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Mansa/Mohali. The respondent is present at Chandigarh and informed that the information relating to point-2 after collecting from the vigilance bureau has been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 15.02.2022 with a copy to the Commission.

Due to technical fault in the VC, the appellant could not be heard.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **03.08.2022** at 11.00 AM through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Mansa. The PIO to appear at Chandigarh.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated:08.03.2022**

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





Sh.Lajpat Rai Garg, S/o Sh.Harbans Lal,  
B-3/287, Romana Street, Jaito,  
Distt.Faridkot.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o Principal Secretary,  
Local Govt, Pb,  
Sector 35-A, Chandigarh.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o Addl, Chief Secretary,  
Local Govt, Pb,  
Sector 35-A, Chandigarh.

...Respondent

**Appeal case No.611 of 2020**

**Present: Sh.Lajpat Rai as the Appellant**  
**None for the Respondent**

**ORDER:** This order should be read in continuation with the previous order.

The appellant through RTI application dated 05.11.2019 has sought information 08 points regarding action taken on the letters sent by DC Faridkot for taking necessary action against the employees of MC Jaito – action taken on application dated 21.09.2019 and letters sent from 01.12.2017 to 08.02.2018 against Jagmohan Lal and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of Addl. Chief Secretary, Local Govt Punjab. The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 13.12.2019 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case has already been heard on 26.08.2020, 18.01.2021, 04.08.2021 & 25.10.2021.

On the date of the last hearing on **04.08.2021**, the appellant as per the order of the Commission had sent a typed copy of the RTI application and observed the reply of the PIO-Local Govt. Ferozepur was different from the information that had been sought in the RTI application since his applications about which he is seeking information are in the custody of the office of Principal Secretary Local Govt. Pb Chandigarh.

The respondent was absent.

Having gone through the RTI application and the reply of the office of Dy. Director Local Govt. Ferozepur, The Commission found that the reply is vague and not in accordance with the RTI application. As per the appellant, the information had been sought from the office of Principal Secretary, Local Govt. Pb Chandigarh and the information lies in the custody of that department.

The PIO-Principal Secretary, Local Govt. Punjab, Chandigarh was impleaded in the case and directed to relook at the RTI application (a copy of which was sent along with the order) and provide point-wise information as per available in their record. If it is in the custody of any other section of the department, the PIO-Principal Secretary procure it from the concerned section /district and provide the sought information as per the RTI Act.

**Appeal case No.611 of 2020**

On the date of the last hearing on **25.10.2021**, both the parties were absent. The case was adjourned.

**Hearing dated 08.03.2022:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The appellant is present at Chandigarh and informed that the PIO has not supplied the information.

The respondent is absent on 3<sup>rd</sup> consecutive hearing. The PIO is given one last opportunity to appear personally before the Commission on the next date of hearing alongwith the explanation for not providing the information failure to which penal action under section 20 of the RTI Act will be taken.

To come up for further hearing on **03.08.2022 at 11.00 AM** through a video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Faridkot. The PIO to appear through VC at Chandigarh.

**Chandigarh  
Dated 08.03.2022**

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

**CC to PIO-Additional Deputy Commissioner,  
Urban Development,  
Faridkot**



Sh. Lajpat Rai, S/o Sh . Harbans Lal,  
H O-B-3/287, Romana Street,  
Jaito, Distt Faridkot.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o SDM, Jatio,  
Faridkot.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o SDM, Jatio,  
Faridkot.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 3128 of 2020**

**Present: Sh.Lajpat Rai as the Appellant**  
**None for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant through the RTI application dated 27.07.2020 has sought information regarding the application forwarded by DC Faridkot – enquiry reports and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of SDM Jaito. The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 31.08.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 08.03.2022 through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The respondent was absent.

Having gone through the RTI application, the Commission observed that the RTI application is not legible. The appellant was directed to send a typed legible copy of the RTI application with a copy to the PIO.

The PIO was directed to provide whatever information is available in the record as per the RTI Act.

On the date of the hearing on **16.06.2021**, the appellant sent a legible typed copy of the RTI application. As per the appellant, the PIO had not supplied the information.

The respondent was absent on 2<sup>nd</sup> consecutive hearing nor had complied with the order of the Commission. The PIO was given one more opportunity to provide information to the appellant whatever is available in the record and appear before the Commission on the next date of hearing along with the explanation for the delay in providing the information.

On the date of the last hearing on **25.10.2021**, the appellant was absent and vide letter received in the Commission on 05.10.2021 sought adjournment.

The case was adjourned.

**Hearing dated 08.03.2022:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. As per the appellant, the PIO has not supplied the information.

The respondent is absent.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **03.08.2022 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Faridkot.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated 08.03.2022**

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



Sh Rajinder Singh, S/o Sh Nachhatar Singh,  
VPO Khemuana, Distt Bathinda.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o SSP,  
Faridkot.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o IGP, Faridkot Range,  
Faridkot.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 3880 of 2020**

**PRESENT:   None for the Appellant**  
**Sh.Pawandeep Singh, HC for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant through the RTI application dated 16.03.2020 has sought information regarding a copy of the crime register from the year 2000 and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of SSP Faridkot. The appellant was denied the information by the PIO vide letter dated 08.07.2020 on the ground that a crime register was a secret record and hence its details cannot be provided. Not being satisfied with the reply, the appellant filed a first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 17.08.2020 which disposed of the appeal on 23.09.2020 upholding the PIO's view.

The case last came up for hearing on 04.08.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Bathinda/Faridkot. As per the appellant, the PIO had wrongfully denied the information since the record relating to FIRs etc. along with status was already available on the internet and hence calling register a secret document was untenable.

After hearing both the arguments, the PIO was directed to send a copy of the record/crime register to the Commission in a sealed cover for the further perusal of this case.

On the last date of hearing on **25.10.2021**, the Commission received a copy of the record from the PIO in a sealed cover which was taken on the file of the Commission.

The respondent reiterated his earlier plea that the crime register is a secret record and hence its details cannot be provided.

However, the appellant claimed that the Bathinda office has already provided a copy of the crime register.

**Appeal Case No. 3880 of 2020**

The appellant was directed to send a copy of the document that has been provided by the Bathinda office to the commission to analyse the provided document.

**Hearing dated 08.03.2022:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot/Bathinda.

The appellant is absent nor has sent the copy of the crime register claimed to have been supplied by Bathinda's office.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **03.08.2022 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Faridkot. The appellant is to appear through VC at DAC Bathinda.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated:08.03.2022**

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