



Shri Pal Singh,  
S/o Shri Sardara Singh,  
R/o Village Katli,  
Tehsil & Distt. Roopnagar.

.....Appellant.

**Vs**

Public Information Officer,  
O/ o APO, MANREGA,  
Block Roopnagar.

First Appellate Authority:  
O/o DDPO,  
Roopnagar.

.....Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 2390 of 2021**

**Present:-** Shri Pal Singh, appellant is absent.  
Shri Maninder Singh, PIO-cum-APO, MANREGA, Block Roopnagar is present.

**O R D E R**

Shri Pal Singh, appellant filed RTI application dated 15.10.2020 before the SPIO-cum-BDPO, Roopnagar. The RTI application was transferred U/s 6(3) of the RTI Act, 2005 to Shri Maninder Singh, APO, MANREGA, Block Roopnagar vide letter dated 23.10.2020. When no information was provided to the appellant, then he filed First Appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 04.12.2020 and then Second Appeal before the Punjab State Information Commission on 18.05.2021. The case was registered and allocated to the Bench. Notice of hearing was issued to both the parties for today through **CISCO Webex Meetings Software**.

The appellant is absent today, whereas the respondent is present and he stated the sought for information has been provided to the appellant by hand on 02.08.2021 and he has executed a duly signed receipt after receiving the information.

The Commission has received an e-mail sent by the SPIO, which is a copy of duly signed receipt made by Shri Pal Singh, appellant and it is submitted by him that he has received the information regarding the MANREGA scheme and he is satisfied.

As the sought for information has been provided to the appellant by the SPIO and the appellant is satisfied, so the present appeal case is **disposed of and closed**.

**Dated: 08.09.2021**

**( Avtar Singh Kaler )**  
**State Information Commissioner, Punjab**



Shri Bittu,  
S/o Shri Om Kumar,  
Village Bholapur Jhabewal,  
PO Ramgarh, Distt. Ludhiana.

.....Appellant.

**Vs**

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

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

.....Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 2396 of 2021**

**Present:-** Shri Bittu, appellant is absent.  
ASI Tarsem Lal-1689/LDH is present on behalf of SPIO, O/o Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana.

**O R D E R**

Shri Bittu, appellant filed RTI application dated 24.12.2020 and sought some information from the SPIO, O/o Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana. When no information was provided to the appellant, then he filed First Appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 23.02.2021 and then Second Appeal before the Punjab State Information Commission on 19.05.2021. The case was registered and allocated to the Bench. Notice of hearing was issued to both the parties for today through **CISCO Webex Meetings Software**.

The appellant is absent today, whereas the respondent is present and he stated that the sought for information has already been provided to the appellant in Appeal Case no. 1882 of 2021, which was disposed of vide order dated 12.08.2021. He further stated that now again the information has been provided to the appellant.

The Commission has received an e-mail sent by the SPIO, which is a copy of letter no.2396 dated 07.09.2021 along with a copy of report dated 09.02.2021 and a copy of Order dated 12.08.2021 passed in Appeal Case no. 1882 of 2021.

As the sought for information has already been provided to the appellant by the SPIO in Appeal Case no. 1882 of 2021 and the PIO has again provided the sought for information to the appellant, so the present appeal case is **disposed of and closed**.

**Dated: 08.09.2021**

**( Avtar Singh Kaler )  
State Information Commissioner, Punjab**



Shri R.P. Sharad,  
# 27, Dashmesh Nagar,  
Garha Road, Jalandhar.

.....Appellant.

**Vs**

Public Information Officer,  
O/ o Deputy Commissioner,  
Jalandhar.

First Appellate Authority:  
O/o Deputy Commissioner,  
Jalandhar.

.....Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 2380 of 2021**

**Present:-** Shri R.P. Sharad, appellant is present.  
None present on behalf of the SPIO, O/o Deputy Commissioner, Jalandhar.

**O R D E R**

Shri R.P. Sharad, appellant filed RTI application dated 03.02.2021 and sought some information from the SPIO, O/o, Deputy Commissioner, Jalandhar. When no information was provided to the appellant by the SPIO, then he filed First Appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 15.03.2021 and then Second Appeal before the Punjab State Information Commission on 18.05.2021. The case was registered and allocated to the Bench. Notice of hearing was issued to both the parties for today through **CISCO Webex Meetings Software**.

The appellant is present today, whereas the respondent SPIO is absent. The appellant stated that the sought for information has not been provided to him by the SPIO.

The appellant filed RTI application dated 03.02.2021 and as mentioned in his RTI application that he has filed an application on 07.10.2020, which was consigned to record by the Deputy Commissioner, Jalandhar vide letter no. 3988/ALC-4/LA. The appellant sought information ***“you are requested to reveal the reason(s) that led to a rejection of the request contained in the said application”***.

The appellant sought the reasons regarding the consignment of his application to the record room. The reply regarding this has been sent to the appellant by the office of Deputy Commissioner, Jalandhar vide letter dated 21.12.2020 and the appellant filed appeal before the Punjab State Information Commission, which is fixed for today.

The Commission has received an e-mail sent by the office of Deputy Commissioner, Jalandhar, which is a copy of letter no.3489 dated 08.09.2021. I have gone through the said reply.

The appellant sought the reasons for the consignment of his application to the record room, but he cannot ask the reasons under the Right To Information Act, 2005 and it does not cover within the definition of information as defined under the RTI Act, 2005. So, the present appeal case is **disposed of and closed**.

**Dated: 08.09.2021**

**( Avtar Singh Kaler )**  
**State Information Commissioner, Punjab**

Shri Parminder Singh,  
S/o Late Shri Harbans Singh,  
R/o E-67, First Floor, Vishnu Garden,  
New Delhi-18.

.....Appellant.

**Vs**

Public Information Officer,  
O/ o SHO, Police Station,  
Jodhewal, Distt. Ludhiana.

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

.....Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 2382 of 2021**

**Present:-** Shri Parminder Singh, appellant is absent.  
ASI Radhey Sham-2124/LDH is present on behalf of the SPIO, O/o SHO, Police  
Station, Jodhewal, Distt. Ludhiana.

**ORDER**

Shri Parminder Singh, appellant filed RTI application dated 02.02.2021 before the SPIO, O/o Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana. The RTI application was transferred U/s 6(3) of the RTI Act, 2005 to the SPIO-cum-SHO, Police Station, Jodhewal, Distt. Ludhiana vide letter no.526 dated 18.02.2021. When no information was provided to the appellant by the SPIO, then he filed First Appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 18.03.2021 and then Second Appeal before the Punjab State Information Commission on 18.05.2021. The case was registered and allocated to the Bench. Notice of hearing was issued to both the parties for today through **CISCO Webex Meetings Software**.

The appellant is absent today, whereas the respondent is present and he stated that the reply/information has been provided to the appellant through e-mail on 07.09.2021.

The Commission has received an e-mail sent by the respondent, which is a copy of letter no.420-A dated 07.09.2021 vide which the reply/information was sent to the appellant.

I have gone through the RTI application dated 02.02.201 and also gone through the reply/information sent by the respondent, PIO-cum- SHO, Police Station, Jodhewal, Distt. Ludhiana.

The appellant has not mentioned any number nor mentioned the number of FIR. The appellant is not seeking information regarding any specific instance, rather, he is seeking information on the basis of whims. So, the RTI application filed by the appellant is vague and is not specific and his appeal is **hereby disposed of** with the observation that in case the appellant wants some information, then he can file fresh RTI application by mentioning the specific number of FIR.

**Dated: 08.09.2021**

**( Avtar Singh Kaler )**  
**State Information Commissioner, Punjab**



Shri Manjit Rai,  
H.No. 89, Mann Singh Nagar,  
Ladhewali Road, P.O. Chugitti,  
Jalandhar.

.....Appellant.

**Vs**

Public Information Officer,  
O/ o DEO (SE),  
Hoshiarpur.

First Appellate Authority:  
O/o DEO (SE),  
Hoshiarpur.

.....Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 2385 of 2021**

**Present:-** Shri Manjit Rai, appellant is present.  
Shri Rakesh Kumar, SPIO-cum-Deputy DEO, O/o DEO (SE), Hoshiarpur is present.

**ORDER**

Shri Manjit Rai, appellant filed RTI application dated 26.02.2021 and sought some information from the SPIO, O/o, DEO (SE), Hoshiarpur. When no information was provided to the appellant by the SPIO, then he filed First Appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 27.03.2021 and then Second Appeal before the Punjab State Information Commission on 18.05.2021. The case was registered and allocated to the Bench. Notice of hearing was issued to both the parties for today through **CISCO Webex Meetings Software**.

Both the parties are present today.

The appellant stated that the complete sought for information has not been provided to him by the SPIO.

The Respondent SPIO stated that regarding point no. 1 of the RTI application the norms of RTE Act has been sent to the appellant on 20.07.2021 on his e-mail. He further stated that the information regarding point no. 2 of the RTI application has also been sent to the appellant on 20.07.2021 on his e-mail and the information sought through point no. 3 of the RTI application is Nil.

I have gone through the RTI application dated 26.02.2021 and the information sought by the appellant through point no. 3 of the RTI application is vague and it does not cover within the definition of information as defined under Right To Information Act, 2005.

As the respondent SPIO has provided the information regarding point no. 1 and 2 of the RTI application to the appellant and so far as the information regarding point no.3 of the RTI application is concerned that is vague and it does not cover within the definition of information as defined under Right To Information Act, 2005. Hence the present appeal case is **disposed of and closed**.

**( Avtar Singh Kaler )**

**Dated: 08.09.2021**

**State Information Commissioner, Punjab**



Shri Ashwani Kumar,  
S/o Mohan Lal,  
R/o 339, Street No.3,  
Guru Nanak Nagar,  
Near Gurbax Colony, Patiala.

.....Appellant.

**Vs**

Public Information Officer,  
O/ o Distt. Education Officer (SE),  
Patiala.

First Appellate Authority:  
O/o Distt. Education Officer (SE),  
Patiala.

.....Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 2387 of 2021**

**Present:-** Shri Ashwani Kumar, appellant is absent.  
Smt. Sarabjit Kaur, Jr. Asstt. is present on behalf of the SPIO, O/o Distt.  
Education Officer (SE), Patiala.

**ORDER**

Shri Ashwani Kumar, appellant filed RTI application dated 17.11.2020 and sought some information from the SPIO, O/o, Distt. Education Officer (SE), Patiala. When no information was provided to the appellant by the SPIO, then he filed First Appeal before the First Appellate Authority and then Second Appeal before the Punjab State Information Commission on 18.05.2021. The case was registered and allocated to the Bench. Notice of hearing was issued to both the parties for today through **CISCO Webex Meetings Software**.

The appellant is absent today, whereas the respondent is present on behalf of the SPIO and she stated that the information sought by the appellant is related with the third party and cannot be provided to the appellant and reply regarding this has already been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 18.03.2021.

The Commission has received an e-mail sent by the SPIO, which is a copy of letter dated 03.09.2021 along with a copy of letter dated 18.03.2021.

I have gone through letter dated 03.09.2021 and the SPIO submitted that the appellant sought information regarding Smt. Jyoti Rani, teacher, Govt. High School, Gangrola, Patiala, but as the information relates with the third party, hence it was denied.

I have gone through the RTI application dated 17.11.2020 and also gone through the reply sent by the SPIO. The appellant sought information regarding the departmental inquiry against Shri Jyoti Rani. The inquiry report is a matter between the employer and the employee and is personal information of the employee, Smt. Jyoti Rani. So, the information is denied being personal information U/s 8(1)(j) of the Right to Information Act, 2005. Hence the present appeal case is **disposed of and closed**.

**Dated: 08.09.2021**

**( Avtar Singh Kaler )**  
**State Information Commissioner, Punjab**

Shri Kant Raman Singh, S/o Shri Aridalan Singh,  
Tower-C, Apartment No.64,  
6<sup>th</sup> Floor, DLF Icon, DLF, Phase-V,  
Chakarpur, Gurgaon-122002.

..... Appellant

**Vs**

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Deputy Commissioner, Tarn Taran.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o Deputy Commissioner,  
Tarn Taran.

.....Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 1655 of 2021**

**Present:-** Adv. Gunjan Mehta is present on behalf of Shri Kant Raman Singh, Appellant.  
Shri Arvinder Pal Singh, SPIO-cum-DRO, O/o Deputy Commissioner,  
Tarn Taran is present.

**O R D E R**

Shri Kant Raman Singh, appellant filed RTI application dated 08.10.2020 and sought some information from the SPIO, O/o Deputy Commissioner, Tarn Taran

**Today the case was heard through CISCO WEBEX SOFTWARE.**

Advocate Gunjan Mehta is present on behalf of the appellant and Shri Arvinder Pal Singh, SPIO-cum-DRO is also present. The Counsel of the appellant stated that complete sought for information has not been provided to the appellant.

The respondent stated that as was directed vide Order dated 15.07.2021 the appellant was contacted and he sent Advocate Rajesh Bhandari on his behalf to receive the information and Advocate Rajesh Bhandari visited the office on 30.07.2021 and after inspection, the copies of Jamabandis for the year 1959-60 and copies of mutation nos. 382, 383, and 384 had been provided to him. He further stated that the remaining information was discussed with Advocate Rajesh Bhandari and he was advised to contact the concerned Halqa Patwari for which he also agreed.

The Commission has received a mail sent by the SPIO on 18.8.2021, diarized vide no.18380 which is a copy of letter no. 1268 dated 13.08.2021 along with copy of letter dated 30.07.2021.

I have gone through letter dated 30.07.2021 vide which the SPIO has provided the copies of Jamabandis for the year 1959-60 and copies of mutation nos. 382, 383, and 384 to Advocate Rajesh Bhandari, who visited the office of the SPIO on behalf of the appellant on 30.07.2021. Advocate Rajesh Bhandari has made a duly signed noting on the said letter after receiving the information.

The SPIO has provided the information to the Counsel of the appellant which was available in the office of the public authority and for the remaining information the appellant is advised to contact the concerned Halqa Patwari. With this observation the present appeal case is **disposed of and closed**.

**Dated: 08.09.2021**

**(Avtar Singh Kaler)**  
**State Information Commissioner, Punjab.**





Shri Sanjeev Thakur,  
Village Gudha Khurd,  
P.O. Madhopur Cantt.-145024.

..... Appellant

**Vs**

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Distt. Development & Panchayat Officer,  
Pathankot.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o Deputy Commissioner,  
Pathankot.

.....Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 1651 of 2021**

**Present:-** Shri Sanjeev Thakur, appellant is absent.  
Shri Satish Kumar, SPIO-cum-Distt. Development & Panchayat Officer,  
Pathankot is present.

**O R D E R**

Shri Sanjeev Thakur, appellant filed RTI application dated 30.09.2020 before the SPIO, O/o Deputy Commissioner, Pathankot. The RTI application was transferred U/s 6(3) of the RTI Act, 2005 to the SPIO, O/o Distt. Development & Panchayat Officer, Pathankot vide letter dated 07.10.2020.

**Today the case is heard through CISCO WEBEX SOFTWARE.**

The appellant is absent today, whereas the respondent SPIO is present.

The respondent stated that the information sought by the appellant relates with the office of District Food and Supply Controller, Pathankot and accordingly letter no. 8950 dated 09.10.2020 was written to District Food and Supply Controller, Pathankot for providing the sought for information to the appellant. He further stated that the concerned SPIO has sent the sought for information to the appellant vide letter no. 1910 dated 09.11.2020.

The Commission has received a mail sent by the District Food and Supply Controller, Pathankot on 16.07.2021, diarized vide no. 15713, which is a copy of letter no. 1425 dated 13.07.2021 along with copy of letter no. 1910 dated 09.11.2020 and copies of information.

I have gone through letter no. 1425 dated 13.07.2021 and it is submitted by the District Food and Supply Controller, Pathankot that the sought for information has already been provided to the appellant in appeal case no. 1384 of 2021 vide letter no. 1910 dated 09.11.2020.

As the SPIO has provided the sought for information to the appellant, so the present appeal case is **disposed of and closed**.

**Dated: 08.09.2021**

**(Avtar Singh Kaler)**  
**State Information Commissioner, Punjab.**





Shri Sarabjit Singh Minhas, RTI Activist (M: 98722-58726),  
H.No. 1375, Gali Chobran Wali,  
Verka (Amritsar).

..... Appellant

**Vs**

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Secretary,  
Shiromani Gurudwara Prabandhak Committee,  
Amritsar.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o President,  
Shiromani Gurudwara Prabandhak Committee,  
Amritsar.

.....Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 699 of 2020**

Present:- Shri Sarabjit Singh Minhas, appellant is present.  
Shri Simarjeet Singh, SPIO, O/o Shiromani Gurudwara Prabandhak Committee,  
Amritsar is present.

**O R D E R**

Shri Sarabjit Singh Minhas, appellant filed RTI application dated 19.06.2019 and sought information from the SPIO, O/o Secretary, Shiromani Gurudwara Prabandhak Committee, Amritsar regarding the CCTV Cameras installed in the Gurudwara premises.

**Today the case is heard through CISCO Webex Meetings Software.**

Both the parties are present today.

The appellant stated that the SPIO has not provided the complete sought for information till date.

The SPIO stated that complete information specifically point-wise has been sent to the appellant vide letter no. 60031 dated 01.09.2020 and then vide letter no. 60068 dated 14.12.2020.

The Commission has received an e-mail sent by the SPIO, which is a copy of letter no. 60058 dated 06.09.2021 along with copy of letter no. 60031 dated 01.09.2020, copy of letter no. 60068 dated 14.12.2020 and attested copies of information.

I have gone through the RTI application dated 19.06.2019 and also gone through the information sent by the SPIO. The SPIO has sent point-wise information/reply to the appellant vide letter no. 60031 dated 01.09.2020 and letter no. 60068 dated 14.12.2020. So, the SPIO has resolved the matter involved in the RTI application. Thus, the present appeal case is **disposed of and closed**.

**Dated: 08.09.2021**

**(Avtar Singh Kaler)**  
**State Information Commissioner, Punjab.**



Smt. Kirandeep Kaur,  
Principal, Govt. Girls Sr. Sec. School,  
Machhiwara Sahib, Distt. Ludhiana.

..... Appellant

**Vs**

Public Information Officer,  
O/o DEO (SE), 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, DC Office Complex,  
Ludhiana.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o DEO (SE), 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, DC Office Complex,  
Ludhiana.

.....Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 1920 of 2021**

**Present:-** Smt. Kirandeep Kaur, appellant is present along with Advocate Karambir Singh Chawla.  
Shri Paramjit Singh, SPIO-cum-Suptd., O/o District Education Officer (SE),  
Ludhiana is present.

**O R D E R**

Smt. Kirandeep Kaur, appellant along with her counsel Advocate Karambir Singh Chawla is present and Shri Paramjit Singh, SPIO-Superintendent, O/o District Education Officer (SE), Ludhiana i.e. public authority is also present.

Smt. Kirandeep Kaur, appellant has filed RTI application dated 25.11.2020 and sought some information from the office of the public authority i.e. District Education Officer (SE), Ludhiana. When no information was provided to her by the SPIO, then she filed First Appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 20.01.2021 and then filed Second Appeal before the Punjab State Information Commission on 16.04.2021. On receipt of the Second Appeal by the Bench, the Notice of hearing was issued to both the parties for 11.08.2021.

On 11.08.2021, the case was heard through CISCO WEBEX MEETINGS SOFTWARE. Both the parties were present i.e. Advocate Karambir Singh Chawla, the counsel for the appellant and Shri Paramjit Singh, SPIO-Superintendent, O/o District Education Officer (SE), Ludhiana. The SPIO stated that the information was sent to the appellant on 06.08.2021 vide letter no. 267648-49. The counsel of the appellant stated that the appellant is not satisfied with the information provided to her by the SPIO and requested for some time to go through the information and the appellant was directed that in case she is not satisfied with the information, then she should bring the deficiencies in writing to the notice of the SPIO and the SPIO was further directed that in case the appellant would submit the deficiencies, then the attested copies of information regarding the deficiencies be sent to the appellant within a week from the receipt of deficiencies and the case was adjourned for 01.09.2021.

On 01.09.2021 both the parties were present through CISCO WEBEX MEETINGS SOFTWARE. The SPIO stated that the appellant brought the deficiencies in writing on 15.08.2021 and the information regarding the deficiencies was sent to the appellant on 31.08.2021. The SPIO further submitted that the information which was available in the office of the public authority i.e. District Education Officer (SE), Ludhiana has been provided to the appellant and except that no other information is available in the office of the public authority. The appellant was not satisfied, then Shri Paramjit Singh, SPIO-Superintendent was directed that he should file duly attested affidavit in two sets by submitting that the information which was available in the office of the public authority i.e. District Education Officer (SE), Ludhiana has been provided to the appellant and except that no other information is available in the office of the public authority i.e. District Education Officer (SE), Ludhiana and the case was adjourned for 08.09.2021.

Today i.e. on 08.09.2021, both the parties have come present personally in compliance to the Order dated 01.09.2021.

Shri Paramjit Singh, SPIO-Superintendent, O/o District Education Officer (SE), Ludhiana has submitted affidavit dated 07.09.2021 duly signed and duly attested by the Notary Public in two sets. One original affidavit is taken in the file of the Commission and the other original affidavit is handed over to the appellant, Smt. Kirandeep Kaur.

Advocate Karambir Singh Chawla, the counsel for the appellant submitted a representation dated 08.09.2021 duly signed by the appellant and himself, which is taken in the file of the Commission.

I have gone through the RTI application dated 25.11.2020 and also gone through letter no.267648/49 dated 06.01.2021 vide which the information was sent to the appellant by the SPIO and heard both the parties i.e. the appellant, her counsel and the SPIO at length involving in this appeal case.

Before discussing the case, I would like to go through the definition of information as defined U/s 2(f) of the Right To Information Act, 2005, which defines the "information" as following :-

***"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;***

After hearing both the parties and going through the case file, specifically the RTI application dated 25.11.2020, the information sent by the SPIO, duly attested affidavit dated 07.09.2021 submitted by the SPIO and the representation given by the appellant, I feel that some points in the RTI application does not come within the definition of 'information' as envisaged U/s 2(f) of the Right To Information Act, 2005.

The Public Information Officer is duty bound to provide the information to the information seekers in the form in which the information lies in the office of the public authority and he is not supposed to generate, create, collect and collate the information.

Shri Paramjit Singh, SPIO-Superintendent, O/o District Education Officer (SE), Ludhiana has provided the information to the appellant vide letter no.267648/49 dated 06.01.2021 and then 13 pages of information was provided to the appellant on 31.08.2021. The SPIO also stated that the information which was available in the office of the public authority i.e. District Education Officer (SE), Ludhiana has been provided to the appellant and except that no other information is available in the office of the public authority. Then in compliance to the Order dated 01.09.2021 Shri Paramjit Singh, SPIO-Superintendent has submitted two sets of affidavit dated 07.09.2021 duly attested by Notary Public and one original affidavit has been handed over to the appellant during the course of hearing.

I have gone through the contents of the affidavit dated 07.09.2021 and it is submitted by the SPIO that the information which was available in the office of the public authority i.e. District Education Officer (SE), Ludhiana has been provided to the appellant as per annexure and except that no other information is available in the office of the public authority.

I have heard both the parties and gone through the case file, specifically the duly attested affidavit dated 07.09.2021 submitted by Shri Paramjit Singh, SPIO-Superintendent, O/o District Education Officer (SE), Ludhiana that the information which was available in the office of the public authority i.e. District Education Officer (SE), Ludhiana has been provided to the appellant and except that no other information is available in the office of the public authority i.e. District Education Officer (SE), Ludhiana.

So, as the information sought by the appellant, which was available in the office of the public authority i.e. District Education Officer (SE), Ludhiana has already been provided to the appellant and except that no other information is available in the office of the public authority i.e. District Education Officer (SE), Ludhiana, so there is no need to proceed the case further. Hence the present appeal case is **disposed of and closed**.



Shri Varinder Singh,  
S/o Shri Sant Singh,  
R/o Village Jogimajra,  
Tehsil Payal, Distt. Ludhiana.

..... Appellant

**Vs**

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Block Development and Panchayat Officer,  
Maloud,  
Tehsil Payal, Distt. Ludhiana.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/ Block Development and Panchayat Officer,  
Ludhiana.

.....Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 1547 of 2021**

**Present:-** Shri Varinder Singh, appellant is absent.  
Shri Jarnail Singh, Suptd. is present on behalf of the SPIO, O/o Block  
Development and Panchayat Officer, Maloud, Tehsil Payal, Distt. Ludhiana.

**O R D E R**

Shri Varinder Singh, appellant filed RTI application dated 23.06.2020 and sought some information from the SPIO, O/o Block Development and Panchayat Officer, Maloud, Tehsil Payal, Distt. Ludhiana.

**Today the case is heard through CISCO Webex Meetings Software.**

The appellant is absent today, whereas the respondent is present on behalf of the SPIO and he stated that the sought for information comprising of 79 pages has been provided to the appellant by hand on 02.09.2021.

The Commission has received an e-mail sent by the SPIO, which is a copy of letter no. 380 dated 08.09.2021, copy of letter no. 374 dated 02.09.2021, copy of letter no. 7051 dated 31.08.2021 and a duly signed submission made by Shri Varinder Singh, appellant.

I have gone through letter no. 380 dated 08.09.2021 and it is submitted by the SPIO that the sought for information has been provided by hand to the appellant vide letter no. 374 dated 02.09.2021. I have also gone through the written submission made by Shri Varinder Singh, appellant in which he has submitted that he has received the sought for information.

As the SPIO has provided the sought for information to the appellant and the appellant has admitted through his written submission that he has received the information, so the present appeal case is **disposed of and closed**.

**Dated: 08.09.2021**

**(Avtar Singh Kaler)**  
**State Information Commissioner, Punjab.**