



Sh. Inderjeet Singh, Ex- Panch,  
Village Sattowali, Block Adampur,  
Distt Jalandhar.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o District Development and Panchayat Officer,  
Jalandhar.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o Additional Deputy Commissioner (Development),  
Jalandhar.

Respondents

**Appeal Case No.3527/2018**

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
26.05.2018	Nil	01.08.2018	Nil	15.10.2018

**Present:** Sh. Inderjeet Singh, Appellant in person.  
Sh.Jagmohan Singh, Supdt., O/o BDPO, Adampur– for Respondents.

**ORDER**

**The case has been heard through Video Conferencing today.**

The following order was passed on 08.05.2019:-

*“Sh. Ajay Kumar, DDPO, Jalandhar says that the information sought pertains to the quasi-judicial adjudication and he should have applied with the copying agency of the concerned department. The appellant, on the other hand, denies it. He says that he has sought the information during the month of August, 2018 when the same was in the custody of the respondents. They should have provided it within the stipulated period. Having failed to do so, they have violated the provisions of Section 7(1) of the RTI Act.*

*Be that as it is, the respondents are directed to file a written reply to the averments made by the appellant as mentioned above.*

**08.05.2019**

*The case has come up today. Smt Baljit Kaur, submits that the information covering her office has been provided. However, the rest of information in contention is available with the O/o DDPO, Jalandhar. It is the obligation of PIO in office of DDPO, Jalandhar to do this needful. The Commission had desired the DDPO to part with the information under the RTI Act, 200. Their contention to approach the copying agency is overruled. Section 22 of the RTI Act, 2005 has the overriding effect and once the provisions of this Act are invoked the information shall be provided accordingly. This viewpoint has been upheld in the Apex Court also.*



-2-

**Appeal Case No.3527/2018**

*The DDPO shall ensure that the information is provided to the Appellant as advised earlier and in view of above observations immediately. He shall also explain his conduct that as to why taking cognizance of his defiance, he should not be penalized.*

10.07.2019

The case has come up today. Shri Jagmohan Singh, Supdt. O/o BDPO Adampur is present. He submits that the information relating to them, as already mentioned, has been provided to the appellant and rest of the information pertains to the DDPO Jalandhar who was advised vide order dated 08.05.2019 to provide it. The Commission finds that the DDPO, Jalandhar is behaving stubbornly and stone-walling the directions of Commission. He is willfully obstructing the flow of information and is violating the provisions of Section 7(1) of the RTI Act.

Shri Dharam Pal, DDPO is hereby issued a show cause notice to explain in a self-attested affidavit as to why a penalty @ Rs.250/- per day of delay subject to maximum of Rs.25,000/- till the complete information is furnished, be not imposed under Section 20(1) of RTI Act, 2005 on him for causing willful delay / denial of the information to the RTI applicant and why the compensation be not awarded to the Appellant under Section 19 (8) (b) of the Act for the detriment suffered by him.

In addition to the written reply, the PIO is also given an opportunity under Section 20(1) proviso thereto, for a personal hearing before the imposition of such penalty on the next date of hearing. He may take note that in case he does not file his written reply and does not avail himself of the opportunity of personal hearing on the date fixed, it will be presumed that he has nothing to say and the Commission shall proceed to take further proceedings against him ex parte.

**To come up on 28.08.2019 at 11.30 AM through V.C. at Jalandhar.**

**10.07.2019**

**Sd/-  
(Yashvir Mahajan)  
State Information Commissioner**



Sh. Sandeep Kumar Maluja,  
S/o Sh. Om Parkash,  
R/o Gali No. 2, Shanidev Mander Wali Gali, Patel Nagar,  
Malout, Distt Sri Muktsar Sahib.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Block Development and Panchayat Officer,  
Malout,  
Distt Sri Muktsar Sahib.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o District Development and Panchayat Officer,  
Sri Muktsar Sahib.

Respondents

**Appeal Case No.2896/2018**

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
06.02.2018	Nil	20.04.2018	Nil	29.08.2018

**Present:** Sh. Sandeep Kumar Maluja, Appellant in person.  
None is present for Respondents.

**Order**

**The case has been heard through video conferencing.**

The following order was made by this forum on 08.05.2019:

*The appellant has sought adjournment. He is seeking a detailed and exhaustive information for the period from 01.01.2013 to 01.01.2017 relating to more or less all the activities of panchayat.*

*Sh. Jatinder Singh, Panchayat Secretary appearing on behalf of the respondents says that the appellant has been duly informed vide a communication under registered cover. As the appellant is not present he may like to react in writing.*

**08.05.2019**

*The case been taken up today. Sh. Jatinder Singh, Panchayat Secretary, says that he has brought along the copy of bills which has been handed over to the appellant. However, it is found that copies of measurement book as well as the utilization certificates have not been supplied. The PIO/ Panchayat Secy. and JE, are hereby advised to explain their conduct in delayed provision of the information and explain as to why penalty should not be imposed on them.*

*To come up on 10.07.2019 at 11.30 AM through video conference at Sri Muktsar Sahib".*



-2-

10.07.2019

Neither the respondent is present nor any information has been provided to the appellant by the respondent. The BDPO, Malout is hereby issued a show cause notice to explain in a self-attested affidavit as to why a penalty @ Rs.250/- per day of delay subject to maximum of Rs.25,000/- till the complete information is furnished, be not imposed under Section 20(1) of RTI Act, 2005 on him for causing willful delay / denial of the information to the RTI applicant and why the compensation be not awarded to the Appellant under Section 19 (8) (b) of the Act for the detriment suffered by him.

In addition to the written reply, the PIO is also given an opportunity under Section 20(1) proviso thereto, for a personal hearing before the imposition of such penalty on the next date of hearing. He may take note that in case he does not file his written reply and does not avail himself of the opportunity of personal hearing on the date fixed, it will be presumed that he has nothing to say and the Commission shall proceed to take further proceedings against him ex parte.

**To come up on 04.09.2019 at 11.30 AM through V.C. at Sri MuktsarSahib.**

**10.07.2019**

**Sd/-  
(Yashvir Mahajan)  
State Information Commissioner**



Shri Sandeep Kumar Maluja,  
S/o Shri Om Parkash,  
R/o Gali No. 2, Shanidev Mander Wali Gali, Patel Nagar,  
Malout, Distt Sri Muktsar Sahib.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Assistant Excise & Taxation Commissioner,  
Sri Muktsar Sahib.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o Deputy Excise & Taxation Commissioner,  
Ferozepur.

Respondents

**Appeal Case No.2897/2018**

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
04.05.2018	Nil	20.06.2018	Nil	29.08.2018

**Present:** Sh. Sandeep Kumar Maluja, Appellant in person.  
Sh. Vikram Thakur, AETO – for Respondents.

**Order**

**The case has been heard through video conferencing.**

As was desired in the previous order on 0805.2019, the reply has been filed. The respondent submits that the details of the dealers registered with the Department and their GST No. as asked for have already been provided to him. The appellant indiscriminately is asking amount of tax paid and the penalty imposed on each dealer. The respondent is seeking exemption under Section 8(i)(j) of the Act. The Commission agrees that such an information should be provided only on plausible justification to serve the public cause. No such argument has been forwarded. The Commission cannot allow such a blanket information in the public cause. The Commission feels that the appellant has sufficiently been informed. No further intervention is called for. **Disposed.**

**10.07.2019**

**(Yashvir Mahajan)**  
**State Information Commissioner**

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**RED CROSS BUILDING, SECTOR-16, MADHYA MARG, CHANDIGARH**  
Tele No. 0172-2864112, FAX No. 0172-2864125, Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)  
Email:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in



Sh. Ripu Sudan Sharma,  
S/o Sh. Bujja Ram Sharma,  
R/o Ward No. 02, House No. 818,  
Garhshankar, Distt. Hoshiarpur.

Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Block Development and Panchayat Officer,  
Garhshankar, Distt. Hoshiarpur.

Respondent

**Complaint Case No.1241/2018**

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
24.07.2018	Nil	Nil	Nil	29.11.2018

**Present: None is present.**

**ORDER**

None is present. The respondents have failed to file a written reply to the notice of the Commission. It smacks of defiance and violation of the RTI Act. The BDPO Garhshankar is hereby issued a show cause notice to explain in a self-attested affidavit as to why a penalty @ Rs.250/- per day of delay subject to maximum of Rs.25,000/- till the complete information is furnished, be not imposed under Section 20(1) of RTI Act, 2005 on him for causing willful delay / denial of the information to the RTI applicant and why the compensation be not awarded to the Appellant under Section 19 (8) (b) of the Act for the detriment suffered by him.

In addition to the written reply, the PIO is also given an opportunity under Section 20(1) proviso thereto, for a personal hearing before the imposition of such penalty on the next date of hearing. He may take note that in case he does not file his written reply and does not avail himself of the opportunity of personal hearing on the date fixed, it will be presumed that he has nothing to say and the Commission shall proceed to take further proceedings against him ex parte.

**To come up on 28.08.2019 at 11.30 AM through V.C. at Hoshiarpur.**

10.07.2019

**Sd/-  
(Yashvir Mahajan)  
State Information Commissioner**



Smt Nirmal Devi (Panch),  
W/o Avtar Singh Jaswal,  
VPO Jandli, Distt. Hoshiarpur.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Panchayat Secretary,  
Gram Panchayat, Distt Hoshiarpur.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o Block Development and Panchayat Officer,  
Mahilpur, Hoshiarpur.

Respondents

**Appeal Case No.3424/2018**

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
25.06.2018	Nil	31.07s.2018	Nil	31.08.2018

**Present:** None is present on behalf of Appellant Smt. Nirmal Devi (Panch)  
Shri Ranjit Singh, Panchayat Secretary on behalf of respondents.

**ORDER**

**The case has been heard through video conferencing.**

The following order was passed on 06.03.2019:-

*"The appellant had sought information relating to various developmental activities of the Panchayat for the period commencing from 01.01.2014 to 31.03.2018. Sh. Ranjit Singh, Panchayat Secretary appearing on behalf of the respondents says that the appellant was asked to deposit the cost of information amounting to about Rs.1200/-. Having failed to deposit the amount he is not entitled to get the information. The appellant denies about the timely receipt of the requisition from the respondents. Be that as it is, the respondents are directed to allow the inspection of complete record to the appellant on a prefixed date and time duly communicated in writing to him and shall arrange to provide certified documents identified by him to the extent of one hundred pages only".*



-2-

**Appeal Case No.3424/2018**

The case is again being heard through Video Conferencing today i.e. 10.07.2019. The appellant is absent. Nothing has been heard from him. The respondent submits that in compliance with the aforementioned order, the appellant was allowed the inspection of record and zprovided with the information asked for by her. The Commission has no reason to dis-believe it. It is presumed that the appellant is in receipt of the information asked for.

The appeal is disposed of.

**10.07.2019**

**Sd/-  
(Yashvir Mahajan)  
State Information Commissioner**





Sh. Gurinder Singh,  
Social Revolution Front of India,  
Opp. Post Office, Tehsil-Phillaur,  
Distt. Jalandhar.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Deputy Commissioner,  
Excise and Taxation Department,  
Mini Secretariat, Ludhiana.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o Deputy Commissioner,  
Excise and Taxation Department,  
Mini Secretariat, Ludhiana.

Respondents

**Appeal Case No.394/2019**

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
06.07.2018	Nil	13.09.2018	Nil	16.01.2019

**Present:** None is present.

**ORDER**

**The case has been heard through video conferencing.**

The following order was passed on 10.04.2019:-

*"The appellant had sought information about the allocation of liquor vends and other allied information in the jurisdiction of M.C., Ludhiana, as enumerated in his original application dated 06.07.2018. Having failed to receive the information from the PIO and filing the first appeal, the Appellate Authority, the appellant has been constrained to approach the Commission with the second appeal.*

*Sh. Harjot Singh, ETO appearing on behalf of the respondents submits that available information with reference to his application has since been sent to him. There is nothing on file to substantiate his contention. The respondents are directed to file a written reply to the Commission under endorsement to the appellant who may like to react on the same if he so desires.*



**Appeal Case No.394/2019**

10.07.2019

The matter has again come up today for consideration. The respondent, in compliance with the order mentioned above, has forwarded a copy of the information sent to the appellant. As desired, it has been endorsed to the appellant also. The Commission has gone through the information sent. It seems to be in order. The appellant, the Commission feels, has been sufficiently informed. No intervention is called for.

**The appeal is disposed.**

**10.07.2019**

**Sd/-  
(Yashvir Mahajan)  
State Information Commissioner**



Sh. Kuldeep Singh,  
C/o Sh. Kamaljit Singh,  
Ward No.-1, Hayer Vihar Colony,  
Jail Road, Gurdaspur.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o District Development and Panchayat Officer,  
District-Gurdaspur.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o Additional Deputy Commissioner (Development),  
Zila Parishad, Distt. Gurdaspur.

Respondents

**Appeal Case No.422/2019**

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
21.06.2018	Nil	21.08.2018	Nil	12.01.2019

**Present:** Shri Kuldeep Singh, Appellant is present.  
Sh. Pawan Kumar, Superintendent, BDPO Office, Dhariwal and  
Ms Laxmi, Steno, O/o DDPO Gurdaspur – for Respondents.

**ORDER**

**The case has been heard through video conferencing.**

The following order was passed on 10.04.2019:-

*“The appellant had sought an information about the details of the works which had been taken up by the gram panchayat of Village Pir-Di-Sain (Hadd Basti – 373), Block Dhariwal, District Gurdaspur.*

*Sh. Pawan Kumar, Superintendent appearing on behalf of the respondents says that he has been suitably informed through a register post. A copy of the memo has also been shown to the Commission..*

*The Commission finds that it does not meet the requirement of original application. As the respondents say that the appellant is evasive and incommunicative it advises them to convey him a definite date and time to inspect the record and provide him certified copies of the documents identified by him but not beyond 100 pages so that the resources of the Public Authority are not disproportionately wasted”.*

The case has come up today. There seems communication gap between the parties. The inspection of the record, as was desired, did not mature. The Commission directs the respondents to allow him inspection on 24.07.2019 at 11.30 AM in the office of BDPO Dhariwal, District Gurdaspur and shall provide certified copies of the documents not beyond 100 pages.

To come up on **28.08.2019 at 11.30 AM through VC at Gurdaspur”.**

**10.07.2019**

**-Sd/-  
(Yashvir Mahajan)  
State Information Commissioner**

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**RED CROSS BUILDING, SECTOR-16, MADHYA MARG, CHANDIGARH**  
Tele No. 0172-2864112, FAX No. 0172-2864125, Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)  
Email:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in



Sh. Gurjit Singh,  
S/o Sh. Yadwinder Singh,  
R/o Behbal Kalan, Tehsil-Jaiton,  
Distt. Faridkot.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Block Development and Panchayat Officer,  
Kotakpura, Distt. Faridkot.

First Appellant Authority,  
O/o District Development and Panchayat Officer,  
Distt. Faridkot.

Respondents

**Appeal Case No.359/2019**

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
14.07.2018	Nil	17.10.2018	Nil	15.01.2019

**Present:** Shri Gurjit Singh, appellant is absent.  
Smt.Shinderpal Kaur, District Programme Officer,- for respondents.

**ORDER**

The case is being heard through video conferencing today. Smt. Shinderpal Kaur, District Programme Officer is present and states that the information comprising 200 plus pages has since been sent to the appellant. It has been resent on the filing of appeal before the Commission. The appellant is absent. The Commission has no reason to differ with the respondent and presumes that the appellant has been appropriately informed. No further action is called for.

**The appeal is disposed.**

**10.07.2019**

**Sd/-  
(Yashvir Mahajan)  
State Information Commissioner**



Sh. Kuldeep Jindal,  
S/o Sh. Dev Raj Jindal,  
R/o Rooop Nagar, W. No. 19,  
Gidderbaha, Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Block Development and Panchayat Officer,  
Gidderbaha, Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o Sub District Magistrate,  
Gidderbaha, Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib.

Respondents

**Appeal Case No.420/2019**

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
07.07.2018	Nil	11.09.2018	Nil	16.01.2019

**Present:** **None on behalf of the Appellant.**  
**Sh. Jaswinder Singh, Panchayat Secretary, BDPO Office, Gidderbaha – for Respondents.**

**ORDER**

**The case has been heard through video conferencing.**

The following order was passed on 10.04.2019:-

*“The appellant had sought an information pertaining to the resolutions passed, the cash book maintained, the details of the grants received and other allied information relating to the execution of various development works.*

*Sh. Jaswinder Singh, Panchayat Secretary appearing on behalf of the respondents submits that the information has been sent to the appellant under endorsement to the Commission. It has not reached the Commission. Seemingly, it should be in transit. The respondent has sent a whats up message to the Commission to testify the acknowledgement issued by the appellant. The appellant is advised to confirm the receipt of information in writing before the next date of hearing failing which it shall be presumed that he is satisfied with the information thus stated to have been sent and the appeal shall be disposed accordingly”.*

The case has come up today. Despite the express directions to the appellant, he has failed to come up personally or submit any communication to the Commission. The Commission presumes that he has been suitably informed. **Disposed.**

**10.07.2019**

**Sd/-**  
**(Yashvir Mahajan)**  
**State Information Commissioner**

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**RED CROSS BUILDING, SECTOR-16, MADHYA MARG, CHANDIGARH**  
Tele No. 0172-2864112, FAX No. 0172-2864125, Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)  
Email:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in



Sh. Jagshir Singh,  
S/o Sh. Gian Singh,  
R/o # 9/20, Mandi Mullanpur, Ludhiana.

Versus

Appellant

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Panchayat Secretary,  
Gram Panchayat, Village-Kular,  
Ludhiana.

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

Respondents

**Appeal Case No.496/2019**

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
10.03.2017	Nil	05.05.2017	Nil	24.01.2019

**ORDER**

The video conferencing could not mature as the facility was pre-occupied.

To come up at **on 11.09.2019 at 11.30 AM through video conference at Ludhiana.**

**10.07.2019**

**Sd/-**  
**(Yashvir Mahajan)**  
**State Information Commissioner**



Sh. Palwinder Singh,  
S/o Shri Narinder Singh,  
R/o Ward No.12, Near Sai Temple,  
Hari Krishan Avenue, VPO Ajnala,  
District Amritsar.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Block Development and Panchayat Officer,  
Ajnala, Distt Amritsar.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o Distt. Development & Panchayat Officer,  
Amritsar.

Respondents

**Appeal Case Nos.1089 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
07.12.2018	Nil	02.02.2019	Nil	19.03.2019

**Present:** Sh. Palwinder Singh, Appellant in person.  
Sh.Samandeep Singh, Clerk on behalf of the Respondents.

**ORDER**

The case has been heard through Video Conferencing today.

The BDPO is still absent. His proxy Sh.Samandeep Singh, Clerk is carrying an affidavit with him which is of no consequence. Nonetheless, he says that he had brought along the information which has been handed over to the appellant on the spot. The appellant may like to go through it and convey about its sufficiency to the Commission. Meanwhile, the BDPO is desired to ensure the proper transmission of information to the appellant and explain his conduct . Be it noted that he is already under Show Cause Notice and the Commission is under no obligation to afford him any other opportunity.

**To come up on 04.09.2019 at 11.30 AM through Video Conferencing facility in Deputy Commissioner Office, at Amritsar.**

**10.07.2019**

**Sd/-  
( Yashvir Mahajan )  
State Information Commissioner**