



Col Retd. Amarjit Singh, S/o Lt Sh S Raghbir Singh,
R/o K-902, Vikram Vihar, Sector-27,
Panchkula.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Director,
Deptt of Health and Family Welfare,
Sector-34-A, Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Director,
Deptt of Health and Family Welfare,
Sector-34-A, Chandigarh.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 2544 of 2021

PRESENT: Col.Retd. Amarjit Singh as the Appellant
Sh.Alok Gupta, Sr.Assistant for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through an RTI application dated 11.01.2021 has sought information 11 points regarding No. of hospitals registered under Clinical Establishment (Registration and Regulation) Ordinance 2020 – has Indus International Hospital been registered under this regulation – when was the last inspection of facilities and staff at Indus International Hospital was done – the minimum standard required to be maintained to operate intensive care – whether BAMS doctor can be employed as part of intensive care – minimum standard to be maintained for mortuary and other information as enumerated in the RTI application from the office of Director Health and Family Welfare, Pb Chandigarh. The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the first appellate authority on 01.03.2021 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 12.10.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Mohali. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information even after a lapse of ten months.

The respondent present requested fifteen days time to provide the complete information. The PIO was directed to provide whatever information available in the record to the appellant within fifteen days and send a compliance report to the Commission.

On the date of the last hearing on **01.02.2022**, both the parties were absent. The case was adjourned.

Hearing dated 09.03.2022:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Mohali. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 18.02.2021, 18.03.2021 & 19.10.2021. The Commission has received a copy of the reply of the PIO dated 19.10.2021 which has been taken on record.

The appellant is not satisfied with the information/reply on points 2 & 3.

Appeal Case No. 2544 of 2021

Having gone through the RTI application, reply of the PIO and hearing both the parties, it has been concluded that points 2 & 3 are to be reconciled and replied to as discussed during the hearing for which the PIO has asked for one week's time.

The PIO is directed to reconcile points 2 & 3 and provide whatever information is available in the record as per the RTI Act within 10 days of the receipt of the order and send a compliance report to the Commission.

No further interference of the commission is required. **Case is disposed of and closed.**

Chandigarh
Dated: 09.03.2022

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.**

Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Sh. Jatinder Pal Singh, S/o Sh Manjeet Singh,
1886/56, Inder Nagri, Jalalabad (West),
Distt Fazilka.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o SDM,
Jalalabad.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o SDM,
Jalalabad.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 481 of 2021

**PRESENT: None for the Appellant
 None for the Respondent**

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 21.08.2020 has sought information regarding details of funds received relating to Covid-19 from District office – Punjab Govt./WHO or other institution/authority – utilization of the funds along with bills and copy of rules as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of Department of SDM Jalalabad. The appellant was not provided information after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 03.11.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case came up for hearing last on 23.06.2021. Both the parties were absent. The case was adjourned.

On the date of the last hearing on **26.10.2021**, both the parties were absent.

The respondent was absent on 2nd consecutive hearing. There was nothing on file which showed that the PIO had supplied the information. Further, there has been an enormous delay of more than one year and two 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.**

The PIO was again directed to provide information to the appellant within 10 days of the receipt of the order.

Hearing dated 09.03.2022:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Fazilka. The respondent is absent and vide letter received in the commission on 24.01.2022 has sent a reply which has been taken on record. In the said reply, the PIO has mentioned that they did not receive the RTI application of the appellant and on receipt of the order dated 26.10.2021 of the Commission, the appellant was contacted to procure a copy of the RTI application from him. Thereafter, the information has been supplied to the appellant vide letter dated 24.12.2021 and the appellant has given his statement that he is satisfied with the information and does not want to pursue the case further.

Appeal Case No. 481 of 2021

The appellant is absent on 2nd consecutive hearing nor is represented. It is presumed that the appellant has received the information and is satisfied.

Since the information has been provided and the appellant does not want to pursue the case further, the show cause is dropped and the case is **disposed of and closed**.

Chandigarh
Dated :09.03.2022

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh. Mohan Lal Punia, S/o Sh Nathu Ram,
R/o village Taja Patti, Tehsil Abohar,
Distt Fazilka..

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o CDPO, Abohar,
Block Abohar Office, Distt Fazilka.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o District Social Security Officer,
DC Complex, Fazilka.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 468 of 2021

PRESENT: Sh.Mohan Lal Punia as the Appellant
Ms.Gurvinder Pal Kaur, Supervisor for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through an RTI application dated 25.02.2020 has sought information regarding copies of applications along with attached documents submitted by Lakshmi Devi w/o Satish Kumar and Priyanka d/o Satish Kumar for availing pension benefits – a copy of the order of approval of pension – bank branch and bank account number in which the pension is deposited monthly from 2019 as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of CDPO Abohar. The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 28.10.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 23.06.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Fazilka. As per the appellant, the PIO had not supplied the information.

The respondent was absent. The case was adjourned.

On the date of the last hearing on **26.10.2021, the appellant claimed** that the PIO has not supplied the information.

The respondent was absent on 2nd consecutive hearing. There has been an enormous delay or 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 a reply on an affidavit.**

The PIO was again directed to provide information to the appellant within 10 days of the receipt of the order.

Hearing dated 09.03.2022:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Fazilka. As per the respondent, the information has been supplied to the appellant and the appellant has acknowledged having received the information.

The appellant is present and informed that he has received the information and does not want to pursue the case further. The appellant has also sent his statement through email that he has received the information and his appeal case may be closed.

Since the information has been provided and the appellant does not want to pursue the case further, the show cause is dropped and the case is **disposed of and closed**.

Chandigarh
Dated :09.03.2022

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh Rajinder Pal Singh,
C/o Ikwon Optical Centre (DAV College Road),
63, Shaheed Bhagat Singh Colony,
West, Fazilka.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Secretary,
Social Justice Empowerment and Minority Deptt,
Pb, SCO-6, Phase-1, Mohali.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Principal Secretary,
Social Justice Empowerment and Minority Deptt,
Pb, SCO-6, Phase-1, Mohali.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3157 of 2021

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
Sh.Jaspreet Singh, Sr.Assistant for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through an RTI application dated 25.01.2021 has sought information regarding reservation policy in Govt service regarding caste names like Ramdasia Sikh or Ravidasia Sikh etc. in the Scheduled Caste certificate not mentioned in SC/ST constitution Act 1950/CS list of caste list of Punjab and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of Secretary, Social Justice Empowerment and Minority Deptt. Pb Mohali. The appellant was not satisfied with the information provided by the PIO vide letter dated 18.02.2021 after which the appellant filed a first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 03.04.2021 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case last came up for hearing on 05.01.2022 through video conferencing at DAC Fazilka/ Chandigarh. Both the parties were absent. The case was adjourned.

Hearing dated 09.03.2022:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Fazilka/Chandigarh. The respondent present pleaded that the information has already been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 18.02.2021. Thereafter, the appellant raised some query which was replied vide letter dated 21.12.2021 and the appellant was also asked that if he is still not satisfied with the information, he may specify and get information but the appellant has not specified.

The appellant is absent on 2nd consecutive hearing nor is represented as well not communicated any discrepancies.

I have gone through the RTI application and the reply of the PIO and find that the RTI application has been sufficiently replied to.

No further interference of the Commission is required. The case is **disposed of and closed.**

Chandigarh
Dated: 09.03.2022

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commission



Ms. Nippy Garg, D/o Sh. Sukhdarshan Lal Garg,
21784, Street No-2, Shiv Mandir Colony,
PowerHouse Road, Bathinda.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Director,
Department of Local Govt,
Sec-35-A, Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Director,
Department of Local Govt,
Sec-35-A, Chandigarh.

... Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3348 of 2020

Present: Ms. Nippy Garg as the Appellant
Sh. Hardeep Singh, Sr. Assistant for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case first came up for hearing on 03.03.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Bathinda. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 04.09.2020 with a copy to the Commission.

The appellant was not satisfied and informed that the information is incomplete. Having gone through the RTI application, the information provided by the PIO and hearing both the parties, the following was concluded:

- | | | |
|--------------|---|---|
| Point-1 to 4 | - | Sufficiently replied |
| Point-5 | - | To provide salary calculation |
| Point-6 | - | To provide a copy of rule/order according to which Retired persons were recruited/working in the department |
| Point-7 | - | Provide heads of account |

The information was to be provided within 10 days of the receipt of the order.

On the date of hearing on **15.06.2021**, the respondent informed that the information on points 5, 6 & 7 has been sent to the appellant on 17.04.2021 with a copy to the Commission. As per the appellant, the information was been received.

Having gone through the information, the Commission observed that the PIO had sent the information to the wrong address. A copy of the information was sent to the appellant along with the order. The appellant was directed to point out the discrepancies to the PIO with a copy to the Commission and the PIO is directed to sort out the same.

On the date of the hearing on **22.09.2021**, the respondent informed that the information has been provided to the appellant.

The appellant informed that she received a letter dated 01.09.2021 of the PIO on 06.09.2021 whereby the PIO informed that the RTI application relating to point No.5&7 has been sent to Deputy Controller(Finance & Accounts) Local Govt. whereas it should have been transferred under section 6(3) within five days. Further, relating to point-6, the PIO has provided the application of Sh.Surmukh Singh and copy of the order of Sh.Rajpal Suptd. whereas the appellant had sought a copy of the rule/office order on the basis of which the retired persons are recruited and working in the department.

As per the respondent, there was no such rule.

The PIO was directed to give in writing on an affidavit that no such rule exists in the record. The PIO was also directed to procure the information relating to points 5 & 7 from the concerned PIO and provide to the appellant within 15 days with a copy to the Commission.

On the date of the last hearing on **25.01.2022**, the respondent informed that the information on points 5, 6 & 7 has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 11.10.2021. The respondent further informed that in compliance with the order of the Commission, an affidavit has been sent to the Commission vide letter dated 16.11.2021.

The appellant informed that the PIO has not supplied a copy of the salary calculation relating to point-5. The appellant had also not received the affidavit.

A copy of the letter received from the PIO on 23.10.2021 and affidavit in original was sent to the appellant alongwith the order and a copy of the affidavit was retained in the record.

The PIO was directed to sort out the discrepancies and provide salary calculation/salary structure to the appellant regarding point-5.

Hearing dated 09.03.2022:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Bathinda/Chandigarh. As per the respondent, the information, as well as affidavit as per the order of the Commission, has been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 10.02.2022.

The appellant informed that she has not received the information and the affidavit provided is not as per the order of the Commission.

The respondent has submitted a copy of the order/letter dated 30.07.2015 of the Directorate Local Govt. regarding salary calculation relating to point-5 which is being sent to the appellant alongwith the order.

The affidavit of the PIO is not in accordance with the previous order of the Commission. The PIO is directed to provide a revised affidavit mentioning therein that there is no rule (relating to point-6) and the information that has been provided is true and complete. The affidavit should be on stamp paper duly signed by the PIO. The information be provided within 15 days of the receipt of the order.

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

Chandigarh
Dated 09.03.2022

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner