



Sh. Manjit Singh,
H No-2877, Phase-7,
Mohali.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Water and Sanitation Department,
Division-1, Industrial Area-1, Mohali.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o SE,
Water Supply and Sanitation Department,
Phase-2, Mohali.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3224 of 2020

Present: None for the Appellant
Sh.Amritpal Singh, SDE for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 13.10.2020 has sought information on 12 points regarding overflowing of the sewerage from the main hall at the backside of SCF 12 & 13 in phase -7 Mohali, came into knowledge of the department via media, oral, written – action taken on the information – name and contact number of the officer responsible for health safety for not taking action – total number of complaints received regarding overflowing of sewerage main hall and other information as enumerated in the RTI application, concerning the office of SE Water Supply & Sanitation Department, Phase-2 Mohali. The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 19.10.2020 which took no decision on the appeal. The appellant had filed an appeal in the Commission under Life & Liberty, however, the Ld Chief Information Commissioner has ordered the case be considered under the general category since the appellant had not filed the RTI application with the PIO u/s 7(1) of the RTI Act.

The case last came up for hearing on 03.03.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Mohali. The case was adjourned.

Hearing dated 09.06.2021:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Mohali. The respondent present pleaded that the information has already been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 20.12.2020. The PIO has also sent a copy of the reply to the Commission through email which has been taken on the file of the Commission.

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

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

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

Chandigarh
Dated 09.06.2021

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh. Atul Bansal,
R/o H NO-2,, Model Road,
Street No-1, Nabha.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o AFSSO,
Food Civil Supplies Deptt,
Nabha, Distt Patiala.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o District Controller,
Food Civil Supply and Consumer Affairs.
Patiala.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3618 of 2020

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
Gurmeet Singh, Legal Assistant and Mrs.Jaspal Kaur, AFSSO for the
Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 27.07.2020 has sought information regarding details of food grains and seeds distributed during the period of the Corona pandemic in the months of April, May & June under Central/State schemes in Nabha – list of beneficiaries – stocks provided to all MCs and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of AFSSO, Food & Civil Supplies Department, Nabha. The appellant was not provided with the information since the appellant had not attached ID proof after which the appellant filed a first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 08.09.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case last came up for hearing on 23.02.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. The respondent present pleaded that since the appellant had not attached the ID proof, the appellant was asked to vide letter dated 07.09.2020 to send ID proof which he provided on 17.09.2020 and the information has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 29.09.2020 by AFSSO Nabha. The respondent further informed that the information is available on their website.

The appellant was absent and vide email sought exemption. Having gone through the RTI application and the reply of the PIO, the following was concluded:

- | | | |
|-----------|---|--|
| - Point-1 | - | The reply is not clear. The PIO is directed to relook and provide information |
| - Point-2 | - | Information is available on the website (epos.punjab.gov.in) |
| - Point-3 | - | No food grain/pulses has been distributed and no information is available. |

The appellant was directed to point out the discrepancies if any in writing to the PIO and the PIO was directed to remove the same.

Hearing dated 09.06.2021:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. The respondent present pleaded that in compliance with the order of the Commission, the complete information on point-1 has been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 25.03.2021 with a copy to the Commission through email.

The appellant is absent nor has communicated any discrepancies.

I have gone through the information supplied by the PIO on point-1 and found it is in order as per the RTI application.

Information stands provided. No further course of action is required. The case is **disposed of and closed.**

**Chandigarh
Dated 09.06.2021**

**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. Kuldeep Khan, S/o Sh. Asgar Khan,
Lachkani, P.O Lang, Distt Patiala.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o DC,
Patiala.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o DC,
Patiala.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3087of 2020

PRESENT: Sh.Kuldeep Khan for the Appellant
Sh.Navneet Gupta, Panchayat Secretary O/o BDPO for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through an RTI application dated 26.02.2020 has sought information regarding grants received from the Central Govt (from 01.01.2019 till date) in village Lachkari along with the purpose of the grant – grants received under MANREGA – grant received from Education Board for Govt. Senior Secondary School Lachkari 7 Primary school and Harijan children - grant received from health department – grant received from MLA/Minister fund – grants received from MP Fund – grant received from DC Patiala & Social Welfare Fund – auction held from 01.01.2014 for Panchayat Land and the utilisation of fund and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of DC Patiala. The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed a first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 20.08.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case last came up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. The respondent present from the office of BDPO informed that the information regarding points 1 and 3 to 9 has been provided to the appellant. The respondent present from the office of MANREGA informed that the information on point-2 has also been provided.

The appellant had confirmed receiving the information.

However, the appellant brought to the notice of the commission that the person representing the office of MANREGA may not be a competent authority to certify RTI documents. That the respondent who had certified the documents provided under the RTI Act was a Gram Rojagar Sahayak.

I saw merit in the appellant's observation and hence marked this case to the Deputy Commissioner, Patiala with the direction to file a suitable reply that whether the above-mentioned designations (Panchayat Secretary and Gram Rojagar Sahayak) are competent authorities to represent a public authority in the Information Commission.

If not, appropriate orders be passed to ensure that each Public authority appearing in the commission must be represented by the PIO, or a duly competent and authorised representative. There has been a constant slide in the rank of the officials appearing at the hearings at the commission, which must be rectified to uphold the true spirit of the RTI Act.

Hearing dated 09.06.2021:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. The respondent present informed that the competent authority to sign &certify the RTI documents is BDPO Patiala in case of MANREGA schemes.

The BDPO Patiala is directed to certify all the documents that have been provided to the appellant in reply to his RTI application and send a compliance report to the Commission within 15 days.

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

**Chandigarh
Dated 09.06.2021**

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

**CC to Block Development and Panchayat Officer
(BDPO), Patiala.**



Sh. Inder Mohan Singh,
1663, Sector-80,
Mohali.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Deputy Distt Manager,
Punjab State Civil Supplies Corporation Limited,
Giani Zail Singh Nagar, Ropar.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Deputy Distt Manager,,
Punjab State Civil Supplies Corporation Limited,
Giani Zail Singh Nagar, Ropar.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 309 of 2021

Present: None for the Appellant
Sh.Ram Labhaya, Sr.Auditor-cum-PIO-PUNSUP Ropar for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 08.01.2021 has sought information regarding the theft of wheat, as well as unserviceable items – the name of shellers allotted to Punsup Kharar Centre during 2011-12 & 2012-13 – letter issued to District office PUNSUP Ropar directing Gurmit Singh, PDC in charge to issue tarpaulins to allotted shellers – statement of dead stock articles(Tarpaulins only) issued to various shellers – ledgers/registers maintained at District office Ropar showing entries of Tarpaulins relating to 2011-12 & 2012-13 – PV reports of PUNSUP Kharar centre, deadstock articles pertaining to period 31.03.2011, 30.09.2011, 31.03.2012 & 30.09.2012 and other information as enumerated in the RTI application, concerning the office of Deputy District Manager, Punjab State Civil Supplies Corporation Limited, Giani Zail Singh Nagar, Ropar.

. The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 13.01.2021 which took no decision on the appeal. The appellant had filed an appeal under Life & Liberty. However, as per the order of CIC, the case is to be considered under the general category.

The case last came up for hearing on 03.03.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Mohali. The respondent was present at Chandigarh and pleaded that the available information has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 27.01.202, a copy of which was submitted to the Commission.

As per the appellant, the information was incomplete.

A copy of the information submitted by the PIO to this bench was sent to the appellant and the appellant was directed to point out the discrepancies if any to the PIO in writing with a copy to the Commission. The PIO was directed to remove the same immediately.

Hearing dated 09.06.2021:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Mohali. The PIO-PUNSUP Ropar is present and informed that the discrepancies as pointed out by the appellant have been sorted out and a copy of necessary instructions for effecting recovery relating to lost items as well as a copy of norms regarding apportionment of recovery in cases of losses/shortage has been provided through courier at the given address of the appellant. A copy of the same has been submitted by the PIO in the Commission which has been taken on the file of the Commission.

The appellant is absent. Having gone through the information that has been submitted by the PIO, I find that the information has been supplied to the best possible extent.

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

Chandigarh
Dated 09.06.2021

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner