



**Sh. Aman Singh, (9876000015)**

House No 123, Block-A,  
Sarabha Nagar, Ludhiana.

**Versus**

.....Appellant/Complainant

**Public Information Officer**

O/o MC, Zone-D,  
Ludhiana

.....Respondent

**First Appellate Authority**

O/o Commissioner, MC,  
Zone-D, Ludhiana.

**Appeal Case No. 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350 of 2021**

Present: Appellant : Sh. Amardeep Singh on behalf of appellant Sh. Aman Singh  
Respondent : Absent

**ORDER**

RTI application filed on	:	02/06/2020
PIO replied on	:	13/07/2020
First appeal filed on	:	04/08/2020
First Appellate Authority order	:	19/10/2020

1. The Appellant/Complainant filed above mentioned appeal/complaint cases in the Commission dated 31.12.2020. Accordingly, the cases are fixed for today. As both parties are same, therefore a single speaking order is being passed in all the above mentioned cases.

**2. Observations:**

Appellant's representative, Sh. Amardeep Singh is present for today's hearing.

Respondent PIO is absent in the court without any prior intimation to the Commission.

From a perusal of the relevant case records, it is noted that the appellant is aggrieved with the fact that the desired information was not provided to him

The PIO in his replies dated 19.10.2020, where the sought information was refused on following grounds:

- a) RTI application is in the question form (exemption u/s RTI Act 2005)
- b) Case is pending in the High court (exemption u/s 8 (1)h)
- c) RTI applications are Vague in nature and are not specific, etc.

Whereas, the PIO should have made efforts to provide the information asked for instead of rejecting the applications on ground that the applicant had asked questions. The applicant might have been called for file inspection under the Act. Rejecting the arguments put by the PIO and FAA, the Commission found the PIO guilty of not providing information under the RTI Act.

The PIO was supposed to justify how he arrived at the conclusion that this case was covered under section 8(1)h.

The Commission observed that there is complete negligence and laxity of the public authority in dealing with the RTI applications. **Many a time, PIOs opt for this option instead of providing information asked for. PIOs should be asked to give the information sought for and not take these options as an easy way out.**



**Appeal Case No. 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350 of 2021**

**3. Decision:**

In view of the above observations, the appellant is directed/ advised to ask the information specifically point wise in written form, from the respondent authority within 10 days from the issue of this order under intimation to the commission.

Keeping in view the facts of the case and the records placed in the file, it is evident that no satisfactory reply had been provided by the respondent in the matter and is absent today, which is a grave violation of the provisions of the [RTI Act](#), 2005. The Commission, instructs the PIO to show cause why action should not be taken under the provisions of the Act for this misconduct and negligence. The Commission therefore, directs the respondent to:

I - provide a clear and specific information to the Appellant within a period of 15 days on receipt of written submission from the appellant (as discussed above).

II - explain why penal action should not be taken as per [Section 20\(1\)](#) of the RTI Act, 2005, within 15 days.

from the date of receipt of this order.

To come up on **15.03.2021** at **11.30 AM**, to be heard through personal hearing at PSIC Chandigarh.

**Sd/-**

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 10.02.2021**

**(Maninder Singh Patti)**  
**State Information Commissioner**