



Sh. Tejinder Singh,
R/o Village-Bholapur,
P.O- Ramgarh, Chandigarh Road,
Ludhiana.

Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Municipal Council,
Zirakpur, Distt. SAS Nagar.

Respondent

Complaint Case No.1245/2018

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA	Date of Complaint
17.02.2018	Nil	Nil	Nil	04.12.2018

Present: None is present on behalf of the complainant.
Sh. Gurinder Singh, Superintendent, MC Office, Zirakpur – for Respondent.

ORDER

The Commission finds that no reply has been filed by the respondent on the complaint and the notice of the Commission. It takes a very strong exception to the cavalier attitude of the respondent. A final opportunity is afforded to them to file a written reply to the Commission.

To come up on **23.05.2019 at 11.30 AM.**

Sd/-

09.04.2019

(Yashvir Mahajan)
State Information Commissioner



S. Jasbir Singh,
Village Bolapur. Jhabewal,
Post Office Ramgarh, District Ludhiana.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Sub District Magistrate,
Fatehgarh Sahib.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Deputy Commissioner,
Fatehgarh Sahib.

Respondents

Appeal Case No.3516/2018

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA	Date of Second Appeal/ Complaint
23.08.2018	13.08.2018	06.07.2018	Nil	10.10.2018

Present: None on behalf of the Appellant.
Sh. Amarjit Singh, Clerk, SDM Office – for Respondents.

ORDER

The following order was made on 26.12.2018:

“The appellant had sought information about the licensing and registration of vehicles and the staff handling it. The respondents have brought along the reply. As the appellant is absent they have been desired to transmit it by post to him.

As far as Point No. 4 of his application is concerned, the respondents say that this work is being handled by Regional Transport Authority, Patiala. They are advised to forward it to him under Section 6(3) of the RTI Act, who shall provide the information to the appellant under intimation to the Commission. The Commission feels that the respondents in the SDM Office, Fatehgarh Sahib have duly informed the appellant. As such they are exempted from future hearings.

The Regional Transport Authority, Patiala shall provide the information about Point No. 4 to the appellant.”

The case has come up today for hearing. The appellant has communicated in writing that he has received the information to his satisfaction. No further action is called for. The appeal is **disposed.**

Sd/-

09.04.2019

(Yashvir Mahajan)
State Information Commissioner



Sh. Anil Kumar Sharma,
S/o Sh. Balak Ram Sharma,
Manager (Civil),
P & C Department, NJHPS,
VPO: Jhahri, Tehsil Rampur Ber,
Distt. Shimla (HP).

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Executive Officer,
Municipal Council, Zirakpur, Distt. SAS Nagar.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Deputy Director,
Local Bodies, Distt. Patiala, Punjab.

Respondents

Appeal Case No.800/2019

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA	Date of Second Appeal/ Complaint
19.07.2018	Nil	18.09.2018	Nil	08.01.2019

Present: Sh. Anil Kumar Sharma, Appellant in person.
Sh. Gurinder Singh, Superintendent, MC Office, Zirakpur for Respondents.

ORDER

The appellant is aggrieved with the shifting of an electricity pole installed in the vicinity of the house of the inhabitants. The Department of Power and Municipal Corporation are shifting the responsibility on each other. They should own the responsibility on which it lies. The Commission feels that such an issue should have been resolved by the respondents on merits keeping in view the policy framework on the subject. It is a grievance and should be addressed quickly. The E.O., MC, Zirakpur is advised to have a fresh look into the matter and resolve the issue. No information as defined in the RTI Act has been sought. No action as such on the part of RTI Commission is called for.

Disposed.

Sd/-

09.04.2019

(Yashvir Mahajan)
State Information Commissioner



Sh. Vishal Singh Chauhan, Advocate,
H.No.127, Sector 10 – A, Chandigarh.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Special Secretary to Govt. of Punjab,
Department of Home Affairs & Justice,
Punjab Civil Sectt.- 1, Chandigarh

Public Information Officer,
O/o Judicial - 1 Branch,
Department of Home Affairs and Justice, Govt. of Punjab,
Punjab Civil Sectt. – 1, Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority
O/o Secretary to Govt. of Punjab
Department of Home Affairs & Justice,
Punjab Civil Sectt.-1, Chandigarh.

Respondents

APPEAL CASE NOS.938 and 939 of 2018

Date of RTI application : 30.08.2017/17.07.2017
Date of First Appeal : 27.10.2017/31.08.2017
Date of Order of FAA : 12.01.2018Reply27.09.2017/04.08.2017
Date of 2nd Appeal/complaint : 12.03.2018/06.03.2018

Present: **Adv. Sourav Dhir, Counsel for Sh. Vishal Singh Chauhan, Appellant.**
1. Sh. P. S. Bajwa, Additional Advocate General, Punjab,
2. Adv. Sehajbir Singh for Respondent No. 11, 18, 24 and 35 respondents.

ORDER

In compliance with the orders passed by the Commission on 07.03.2019 the
appellant has furnished the copy of the written arguments to the respondents.

The matter is deferred for final argument on **23.05.2019 at 11.30 AM.**

09.04.2019

Sd/-
(Yashvir Mahajan)
State Information Commissioner



Sh. Gian Ram,
S/o Sh. Jammu Ram,
R/o Village-Subash Nagar,
Shutrana, Distt. Patiala.

Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Block Development and Panchayat Officer,
Patran, Distt. Patiala.

Respondent

Complaint Case Nos.1237, 1238, 1239 and 1240 of 2018

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA	Date of Complaint
27.08.2018	Nil	Nil	Nil	29.11.2018

Present: Sh. Gian Ram, Complainant in person.
Sh. Rajinder Kumar, Panchayat Secretary, BDPO Office, Patran – for Respondent.

ORDER

The following order was passed by this forum on 07.03.2019:

“As the complainant and the respondent are the same and the issue is identical, the single order shall dispose all the complaints.

The complainant has asked for the details of development works having taken place in the village Subhash Nagar Shatrana, Tehsil Patran, District Patiala over a period from 2008 onwards.

The respondent is absent. The Commission understands that providing of such information might have entailed a massive effort in making its photostat copies. The respondent is advised to allow him inspection of record and give him certified copies of the documents not beyond two hundred pages and report compliance before the next date of hearing failing which it shall be presumed that the respondent is willfully suppressing the information and the penal action as envisaged under Section 20(1) of the Act, shall follow.”

“The cases have come up for hearing today. Sh. Rajinder Kumar, Panchayat

Contd...page...2



-2-

Complaint Case Nos.1237, 1238, 1239 and 1240 of 2018

Secretary appearing on behalf of the respondent submits that the afore-mentioned order has not reached him. Nonetheless, on the advice of the BDPO he has come to attend the hearing. He has shown us a copy of the reply sent to the complainant wherein the description of amount of grants received by the gram panchayat in question has been communicated. It does not meet the complete requirement of the application. He is once again advised to allow him the inspection of the record and provide him number of copies of record as mentioned above free of cost."

The matter has again been taken up today. Sh. Rajinder Kumar, Panchayat Secretary says that despite having been summoned the complainant did not visit the office to inspect the record. Nonetheless he has brought along the record in the Court today. The complainant has inspected it and the documents identified have been provided to him. No malafide on the part of the respondent has been proved.

Disposed.

Sd/-

09.04.2019

**(Yashvir Mahajan)
State Information Commissioner**