



Sh. Parmjit Singh, (9781719255)

Ward No. 3, Banta Singh Colony,
P.O Dasuya, Distt Hoshiarpur.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o District Educational Officer (SE),
Hoshiarpur.

.....Respondent

First Appellate Authority

O/o District Educational Officer (SE),
Hoshiarpur.

Complaint Case No.214 of 2021
(Cisco Webex Proceedings)

RTI application filed on : 23-12-2020

PIO replied on : -

Present: Appellant: Sh. Parmjit Singh

Respondent: Sh. Harjeet Kumar (Sr. Asst.), 9463906145

ORDER:

1. To be read in the continuity of previous order of the Commission 10.06.2021.
2. Respondent, Sh. Harjeet Kumar stated that no such application is received in his office as sought in his RTI application.
3. The complainant has approached the Commission under the provision of Section 18 of the RTI Act, 2005, no directions for providing further information can be given by the Commission.

In complaint case under Section 18 of the RTI Act , 2005, the Commissioners have no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for an access to the information which is as under:- (31. We uphold the said contention and do not find any error in the impugned judgment of the High Court whereby it has been held that the Commissioner while entertaining a complaint under Section 18 of the said Act has no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for access to the information).

4. Since there is an alternative and efficacious remedy of first appeal available to the Complainant under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, which has not been availed in the instant case and the First Appellate Authority has not had the occasion to review the decision of the PIO, as envisaged under the RTI Act by passing a detailed well reasoned speaking order.
5. If, however, the complainant does not feel satisfied with the decision of the First Appellate Authority, he will be at liberty to file a Second Appeal before the Commission under Section 19(3) of the RTI Act, 2005.
6. In view of the observations noted above, **the instant case is remanded to the concerned First Appellate Authority** along with a copy of RTI application for their ready reference. The case is disposed off accordingly, with the above observations.

Sd/-

(Maninder Singh Patti)

State Information Commissioner, Pb.

Chandigarh

Dated: 10.08.2021



Sh. Nikhil Kumar Vashisht, (9646200064)

Chamber No 88 , Punjab & Haryana High Court ,
Chandigarh.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o Directorate of Medical Education and Research, Punjab,
Sector 69 Mohali.

.....Respondent

First Appellate Authority

O/o Directorate of Medical Education and Research, Punjab,
Sector 69 Mohali.

Complaint Case No.216 of 2021
(Cisco Webex Proceedings)

RTI application filed on : 25-06-2020
PIO replied on : -

Present: None

ORDER:

1. To be read in the continuity of previous order of the Commission 10.06.2021.
2. The complainant has approached the Commission under the provision of Section 18 of the RTI Act, 2005, no directions for providing further information can be given by the Commission.

In complaint case under Section 18 of the RTI Act , 2005, the Commissioners have no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for an access to the information which is as under:- (31. We uphold the said contention and do not find any error in the impugned judgment of the High Court whereby it has been held that the Commissioner while entertaining a complaint under Section 18 of the said Act has no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for access to the information).

3. Since there is an alternative and efficacious remedy of first appeal available to the Complainant under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, which has not been availed in the instant case and the First Appellate Authority has not had the occasion to review the decision of the PIO, as envisaged under the RTI Act by passing a detailed well reasoned speaking order.
4. If, however, the complainant does not feel satisfied with the decision of the First Appellate Authority, he will be at liberty to file a Second Appeal before the Commission under Section 19(3) of the RTI Act, 2005.
5. In view of the observations noted above, **the instant case is remanded to the concerned First Appellate Authority** along with a copy of RTI application for their ready reference. The case is disposed off accordingly, with the above observations.

Sd/-

Chandigarh
Dated: 10.08.2021

(Maninder Singh Patti)
State Information Commissioner, Pb.



Sh. Jaspreet Singh, (8872277708)

S/o Sh. Ranjit Singh, S/o Sh. Nanak Singh
R/o Village Rukna Bodla, Tehsil Gurusahai,
Distt Ferozepur.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o Director of Public Instruction (SE), Punjab,
Mohali.

.....Respondent

Complaint Case No.220 of 2021
(Cisco Webex Proceedings)

RTI application filed on : 06-06-2020
PIO replied on : -

Present: Appellant: Advocate Sh. Krishan Kumar Thakur on behalf of applicant
Respondent: Sh. Rajinder Singh (Sr. Asst.), 9463181331

ORDER:

1. To be read in the continuity of previous order of the Commission 10.06.2021.
2. Respondent, Sh. Rajinder Singh stated that he has supplied the sought information/reply to the appellant on his whats app no. and via email as well.
3. The complainant has approached the Commission under the provision of Section 18 of the RTI Act, 2005, no directions for providing further information can be given by the Commission.

In complaint case under Section 18 of the RTI Act , 2005, the Commissioners have no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for an access to the information which is as under:- (31. We uphold the said contention and do not find any error in the impugned judgment of the High Court whereby it has been held that the Commissioner while entertaining a complaint under Section 18 of the said Act has no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for access to the information).

4. Since there is an alternative and efficacious remedy of first appeal available to the Complainant under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, which has not been availed in the instant case and the First Appellate Authority has not had the occasion to review the decision of the PIO, as envisaged under the RTI Act by passing a detailed well reasoned speaking order.
5. If, however, the complainant does not feel satisfied with the decision of the First Appellate Authority, he will be at liberty to file a Second Appeal before the Commission under Section 19(3) of the RTI Act, 2005.
6. In view of the observations noted above, **the instant case is remanded to the concerned First Appellate Authority** along with a copy of RTI application for their ready reference. The case is disposed off accordingly, with the above observations.

Sd/-

Chandigarh
Dated: 10.08.2021

(Maninder Singh Patti)
State Information Commissioner, Pb.



Mohammad Shakir, (9416911110)

House No 3205, II nd Floor,
Sector 40D, Chandigarh-160036.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o Registrar, Cooperative Societies, Punjab,
Chandigarh.

.....Respondent

First Appellate Authority

O/o Registrar, Cooperative Societies, Punjab,
Chandigarh.

Complaint Case No.230 of 2021
(Cisco Webex Proceedings)

RTI application filed on : 15-01-2021

PIO replied on : 10-02-2021

Present: Appellant: Absent

Respondent: Sh. Sandeep Singh (Sr. Asst.), 9041397173

ORDER:

1. To be read in the continuity of previous order of the Commission 10.06.2021.
2. Respondent, Sh. Sandeep Singh stated that he has supplied the sought information/reply to the appellant. A copy of the same is received in the commission dated vide letter dated 02.07.2021 vide diary no. 14485.
3. The complainant has approached the Commission under the provision of Section 18 of the RTI Act, 2005, no directions for providing further information can be given by the Commission.

In complaint case under Section 18 of the RTI Act , 2005, the Commissioners have no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for an access to the information which is as under:- (31. We uphold the said contention and do not find any error in the impugned judgment of the High Court whereby it has been held that the Commissioner while entertaining a complaint under Section 18 of the said Act has no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for access to the information).

4. Since there is an alternative and efficacious remedy of first appeal available to the Complainant under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, which has not been availed in the instant case and the First Appellate Authority has not had the occasion to review the decision of the PIO, as envisaged under the RTI Act by passing a detailed well reasoned speaking order.
5. If, however, the complainant does not feel satisfied with the decision of the First Appellate Authority, he will be at liberty to file a Second Appeal before the Commission under Section 19(3) of the RTI Act, 2005.
6. In view of the observations noted above, **the instant case is remanded to the concerned First Appellate Authority** along with a copy of RTI application for their ready reference. The case is disposed off accordingly, with the above observations.

Sd/-

(Maninder Singh Patti)

State Information Commissioner, Pb.

Chandigarh
Dated: 10.08.2021



Sh. Santokh Singh, (9815419676)

S/o Sh. Piyara Singh,
R/o Patti Haveli Malsian, Tehsil Shahkot,
Distt Jalandhar.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o Block Development and Panchayat Officer,
Shahkot, Distt Jalandhar.

.....Respondent

First Appellate Authority

O/o District Development and Panchayat Officer,
Shahkot, Distt Jalandhar.

Complaint Case No.235 of 2021
(Cisco Webex Proceedings)

RTI application filed on : 18-12-2020
PIO replied on : -

Present: Appellant: Sh. Santokh Singh
Respondent: Absent

ORDER:

1. To be read in the continuity of previous order of the Commission 10.06.2021.
2. The complainant has approached the Commission under the provision of Section 18 of the RTI Act, 2005, no directions for providing further information can be given by the Commission.

In complaint case under Section 18 of the RTI Act, 2005, the Commissioners have no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for an access to the information which is as under:- (31. We uphold the said contention and do not find any error in the impugned judgment of the High Court whereby it has been held that the Commissioner while entertaining a complaint under Section 18 of the said Act has no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for access to the information).

3. Since there is an alternative and efficacious remedy of first appeal available to the Complainant under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, which has not been availed in the instant case and the First Appellate Authority has not had the occasion to review the decision of the PIO, as envisaged under the RTI Act by passing a detailed well reasoned speaking order.
4. If, however, the complainant does not feel satisfied with the decision of the First Appellate Authority, he will be at liberty to file a Second Appeal before the Commission under Section 19(3) of the RTI Act, 2005.
5. In view of the observations noted above, **the instant case is remanded to the concerned First Appellate Authority** along with a copy of RTI application for their ready reference. The case is disposed off accordingly, with the above observations.

Sd/-

Chandigarh
Dated: 10.08.2021

(Maninder Singh Patti)
State Information Commissioner, Pb.



Sh. Ujjagar Singh, (9878961815)
S/o Late Sh. Bant Singh,
R/o Street No 1, Maan Colony, Daba,
Distt. Ludhiana -141014.

Versus

Public Information Officer
O/o Police Commissioner,
Ludhiana.

First Appellate Authority
O/o Police Commissioner,
Ludhiana.

.....Appellant/Complainant

.....Respondent

Complaint Case No.240 of 2021
(Cisco Webex Proceedings)

RTI application filed on : 27-11-2020
PIO replied on : 24-12-2020

Present: None

ORDER:

1. To be read in the continuity of previous order of the Commission 10.06.2021.
2. The complainant has approached the Commission under the provision of Section 18 of the RTI Act, 2005, no directions for providing further information can be given by the Commission.

In complaint case under Section 18 of the RTI Act , 2005, the Commissioners have no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for an access to the information which is as under:- (31. We uphold the said contention and do not find any error in the impugned judgment of the High Court whereby it has been held that the Commissioner while entertaining a complaint under Section 18 of the said Act has no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for access to the information).

3. Since there is an alternative and efficacious remedy of first appeal available to the Complainant under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, which has not been availed in the instant case and the First Appellate Authority has not had the occasion to review the decision of the PIO, as envisaged under the RTI Act by passing a detailed well reasoned speaking order.
4. If, however, the complainant does not feel satisfied with the decision of the First Appellate Authority, he will be at liberty to file a Second Appeal before the Commission under Section 19(3) of the RTI Act, 2005.
5. In view of the observations noted above, **the instant case is remanded to the concerned First Appellate Authority** along with a copy of RTI application for their ready reference. The case is disposed off accordingly, with the above observations.

Chandigarh
Dated: 10.08.2021

Sd/-
(Maninder Singh Patti)
State Information Commissioner, Pb.