

Sh Lajpat Rai, S/o Sh Harbans Lal, R/o Roamana Street, Tehsil Jaito, Distt Faridkot.

Versus

... Appellant

Public Information Officer,

O/o EO, MC, Jaito, Distt Faridkot.

First Appellate Authority, O/o Regional Deputy Director.

Local Govt, Ferozepur.


...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 2191 of 2021

PRESENT: None for the Appellant Sh. Naib Singh, PIO for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant, through an RTI application dated 07.03.2020, has sought the following information from the office of EO-MC Jaito :-



Appeal Case No. 2191 of 2021

The appellant was not provided with the information, after which the appellant filed a first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 16.03.2021, which did not decide on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 29.11.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. Due to a network problem in the VC, the hearing could not occur. The case was adjourned.

The case last came up for hearing on 11.04.2022 through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. As per the appellant, the PIO has not supplied the information.

The respondent PIO had brought the information.

The PIO was directed to hand over the information to the appellant.

The appellant was directed to point out the discrepancies in the information to the PO, and the PIO was directed to remove the same and send a compliance report to the Commission.

Hearing dated 10.08.2022 :

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkort. The appellant is absent nor is represented.

The respondent present pleaded that the sought for information was handed over to the appellant on the previous date of hearing in the court itself. The appellant further pleaded that no deficiency has been reported by the appellant.

Having gone through the RTI application and hearing the respondent, the Commission observes that since no deficiency has been reported by the appellant, the appellant might be satisfied with the information received from the PIO. As such, no further cause of action by the Commission is required and hence, the case is disposed of and closed.

Chandigarh Dated: 10.08.2022 Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commission



Sh Tejinder Singh, Civil Court, Tehsil Complex, Backside Sanjh Kender, Phillaur.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,

O/o Civil Surgeon, Amritsar.

First Appellate Authority,

O/o Civil Surgeon, Amritsar.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1119 of 2021

PRESENT: Sh.Tejinder Singh as the Appellant Smt.Kamaldeep Kaur, Food Safety Officer for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant, through RTI application dated 06.10.2020, has sought information regarding details of inspections conducted by Health Officers relating to food business operators from June 2020 to 06.10.2020 – improvement notice issued to food operators/manufacturers – a copy of movement register before moving for taking samples of food operators – details of vehicles used during sample collection and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of Civil Surgeon Amritsar. The appellant was not provided with the information, after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 12.12.2020, which took no decision on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 29.07.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Ludhiana. As per the appellant, he had inspected the record regarding point-5 relating to Food Safety Officer-2, but no information regarding point-5 relating to the other Food Safety officers (1,3,4 &5) as well as on other points had been provided.

The respondent was absent.

The PIO was directed to facilitate the rest of the information, as available on the record, for the RTI application and send a compliance report of the same to the Commission.

On the date of hearing on 10.11.2021 which was fixed through video conferencing at DAC Ludhiana/Amritsar, the appellant claimed that the PIO has not supplied the information.

The respondent was absent nor has complied with the order of the Commission. There has been an enormous delay of more than one year in providing the information. The Commission having taken a serious view of this issued a **show-cause notice under section 20** of the RTI Act **2005** for not supplying the information within the statutorily prescribed period and directed reply on an affidavit.

The PIO was again directed to provide complete information to the appellant within ten days of receiving the order.

On the hearing date on 21.03.2022, the appellant claimed that the PIO had not supplied the information.

The PIO was absent on the 3rd consecutive hearing nor has complied with the order of the Commission to provide the information and not appearing before the Commission.

Appeal Case No. 1119 of 2021

Since the PIO-Civil Surgeon, Amritsar was flouting the spirit of the RTI Act continuously and not appearing before the Commission, to secure an erring PIO"s presence before the commission, a bailable Warrant of the PIO-Civil Surgeon, Amritsar was issued through Senior Superintendent of Police, Amritsar under section 18(3) of the RTI Act for his presence before the Commission on **25.04.2022**.

On the date of next hearing 25.04.2022 Smt.Kamaldeep Kaur, Food Safety Officer, was present on behalf of the PIO and informed that the information has already been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 21.04.2022. The PIO has also sent a copy of the reply to the Commission, which has been taken on record.

The appellant claims that there are five food Supply Officers, but he inspected the record regarding point-5 relating to Food Safety Officer-2, but no information regarding point-5 relating to the other Food Safety officers (1,3,4 &5) and on other points has been provided.

The respondent present informed that the information relating to points 1 to 4 relates to the District Health Officer. The reply to these points has already been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 16.07.2021. The information relating to point-5 relates to Food Safety Officers, and there are five Food Safety Officers in the District. Food Safety Officer Amritsar 2 has already sent a reply vide letter dated 23.04.2022 and Food Safety Officer Amritsar (1, 3,4 & 5) has already sent a reply vide letter dated 21.04.2022. The Commission has also received a copy of the reply from the PIOs, which has been taken on record.

Having gone through the RTI application and reply of the PIO, the Commission found that the RTI has been sufficiently replied to.

Regarding the decision on show-cause notice, due to the extra burden on the medical staff during Covid time, taking a lenient view on the penalty, the show cause was dropped.

However, since the appellant has had to suffer undue inconvenience to get the information, it was a fit case for awarding compensation to the appellant u/s 19(8)(b) of the RTI Act.

Hence the PIO- Civil Surgeon, Amritsar was directed to pay an amount of **Rs.5000/-** via demand draft through Govt. Treasury as compensation to the appellant for not getting information in time and directed to submit proof of having compensated the appellant.

Hearing dated 10.08.2022:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Amritsar/Ludhiana.

The respondent present pleaded that in pursuance of the Commission's order, compensation amount of Rs.5000/- has been paid to the appellant vide Demand Draft No.588000 dated 28.07.2022.

The appellant acknowledged the receipt of compensation of Rs.5000/- from the respondent.

Since the compensation has been paid to the appellant by the PIO, no further interference of the Commission is required. The case **is disposed of and closed**.

Chandigarh Dated:10.08.2022



Sh Lajpat Rai, S/o Sh Harbans Lal, R/o Roamana Street, Tehsil Jaito, Distt Faridkot.

Versus

... Appellant

Public Information Officer,

O/o EO, MC, Jaito, Distt Faridkot.

First Appellate Authority,

O/o Regional Deputy Director, Local Govt, Ferozepur.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 2172 of 2021

PRESENT: None for the Appellant Sh. Naib Singh, Sanitary Inspector, for the Respondent ORDER:

The appellant, through an RTI application dated 07.03.2020, has sought the following information the office of EO-MC Jaito :-

करीम नुभान, सर्वम नुभान काहिर है आराष्ट्र स्त्रे मेन्ना मुनाहिर वाहनुर मॅन्न के ही सिन्न की सेर सी महा मार्गेय रहा रहे नगरनी के हि के के के मार्ग रहे कार्या के कार्या राय कीए मैंकी, स्टा हलाक्रा केंड र क्रान्ड पुल्ट करी में के काम रे क्रान Case Bank, maren from रेंड मून, महेंड कार किंग्र की मा मेंय मुंद्रम उपरीप प्रथ 3/13/220 3/1 (3) 788 28 मिटीमा 2010100 mail 2200 कियाद 300 मेर की आर्रेका 50m आहित मेरे, DC How where, Dola the ore Dira; Para, Minister mit and much storm and me ALT REAL STATE ARTA KEEP . אאגי בי אייישאייי ב של בעו ביר מוצעי בי איילביוב היא בער צ באיי ל. वायीला स्रमें किंग किंग के कि मानी मानी दिए की माने किंग माने ही मानी ही दिस् मान मिन्नी रावो रहर की रहर की राम जी मुला किनी हाविर हे हार हर हर हर हर अराजा की दिखर, सिं की की की वा की होते हो हो में कि में के माम के मिम दिस के Cash Bort Tal (Ath of माना)! E & CE RAFERTER TO 4005 With THE BIT FOR BOURDE & 05004 DE VE ANT (3) 32 321 (20 3000, 3000, mes 10,000/-217/22) EXED mints gonto 2 32 - 32 221 /20 3000, 21/2/2 1000/-217/22 EXED mints, gonto 2 32

Cons age, mear mis and the Andridon to the larger son frent and TO the start first the firm this core with knowledge time sentis fress E 150 The Brins and the event and the second freezes + Mrs and the march the Pres Accent lade 1930 Section 1718 (2) mith 200 2012 200 200 The files vous of for see from the refor the for my is low love and and and a grand 2485 Biles, The Hallet at almost or 3 and sont and all xite the E and a SE and asteric but that sand alor Actual 200 200 and and (and 2 al and) with the statut 1. Horals abory Hatto 2 6/2/202 mi stand = MAM - 22 falla 2838 312mm 引加加 212 mm 3 (201) 201 日本 201 הואביד בנולאה איים בניים לאיין והביבו ביו ביים ביולי לאיים איים איין איין איים בביבא איים איים בביל אייר איים בבילאיר

The appellant was not provided with the information, after which the appellant filed a first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 16.03.2021, which did not decide on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing 0m 29.11.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. Due to a network problem in the VC, the hearing could not occur. The case was adjourned.

The case last came up for hearing on 11.04.2022 through video conferencing g at DAC Faridkot. As per the appellant, the PIO has not supplied the information.

The respondent present informed that they did not receive the 2nd page of the RTI application.

The appellant had handed over the 2nd page of the RTI application to the PIO.

The PIO was directed to provide information to the appellant as per the RTI application and send a compliance report to the Commission.

If the appellant finds any discrepancies in the information being provided, the appellant was directed to point out the discrepancies to the PO, and the PIO was directed to remove the same.

Hearing dated 10.08.2022:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The appellant is absent nor is represented.

Sh. Naib Singh, Sanitary Inspector, O/o the MC, Jaito, present pleaded that pointwise information, as per the RTI application, has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 05.08.2022 by registered post with a copy to the Commission. The respondent further pleaded that no deficiency has been reported by the appellant.

Having gone through the RTI application and record in the file, the Commission observes that the RTI application has sufficiently been addressed by the PIO. The Commission further observes that the appellant has not pointed out any deficiency in the information supplied by the PIO. As such, no more interference in the matter by the Commission is required. Hence, the case is disposed of and closed.

Chandigarh Dated : 10.08.2022 Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commission



Sh Lajpat Rai, S/o Sh Harbans Lal, R/o Roamana Street, Tehsil Jaito, Distt Faridkot.

Versus

... Appellant

...Respondent

Public Information Officer,

O/o EO, MC, Jaito, Distt Faridkot.

First Appellate Authority,

O/o Regional Deputy Director, Local Govt, Ferozepur.

Appeal Case No. 2173 of 2021

PRESENT: None for the Appellant Sh. Naib Singh, Sanitary Inspector, for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant, through an RTI application dated 07.03.2020, has sought following information from the office of EO-MC Jaito:-

a after sure could it & it here the super a site and the state 1/4/193 and the cost we of the Brank fall and first white the see see and the लाही बराब और मात कि में र रिया के मात के मात के मात कि के कि के कि के कि कि के कि . भारत अग्वेट उत्प्राधेन के आदिस्तील के कि राज के कि माहिस्त के आहे है। mars) Story & Barryo Fer anotore martat file and end/2/2 St ap here the area of and the part the server and and A mon 2 212 + 2 400 - 2 Ame 533 20 ma to a a for a far a far a mand a far 3 Capezo 2 dan Salt 20 grow Bit 32 1 3 Nor 30 Dourant and the method and the the to a second the the the second and the 313/2/203 200 200 -68 hos 7/85,8/85, 8/86, Down fon Jan Freed storano & For I man man 173 2 341) 15/10/35 Far 00 3 For 200 10/96 Far any no zard ante (ant) matter 2 for & for A To Attendal

3 Custon how A. 636, 30-38 (95, 692, 702, 701) 2150, 28m Altrid 200 at 2 20 1000) (D and at 38 2000 (met) 16) 7/57 & For 20 20 (E) 2000 500 500 500 (South at 2000) 20 100 3(3) (D) and + and to 16) 7/57 & For 20 20 100 200 (South at 2000) 20 100 (South at 2000) 20 100 210 (South at 200 (South at 2000) (South at 2000) (South at 2000) 20 100 (South at 2000) 20 100 (South at 2000) 210 (South at 2000) (South at The appellant was not provided with the information, after which the appellant filed a first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 16.03.2021, which did not decide on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 29.11.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. Due to a network problem in the VC, the hearing could not occur. The case was adjourned.

The case last came up for hearing on 11.04.2022 through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. As per the appellant, the PIO has not supplied the information.

The respondent PIO had brought the sought information and handed it over to the appellant.

The PIO was directed to hand over the information to the appellant.

The appellant was directed to point out the discrepancies in the information to the PO, and the PIO was directed to remove the same and send a compliance report to the Commission.

Hearing dated 10.08.2022 :

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkort. The appellant is absent nor is represented.

The respondent present pleaded that the sought for information was handed over to the appellant on the previous date of hearing in the court itself. The appellant further pleaded that no deficiency has been reported by the appellant.

Having gone through the RTI application and hearing the respondent, the Commission observes that since no deficiency has been reported by the appellant, the appellant might be satisfied with the information received from the PIO. As such, no further cause of action by the Commission is required and hence, the case is **disposed of and closed**.

Chandigarh Dated: 10.08.2022 Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commission



Sh Lajpat Rai, S/o Sh Harbans Lal, R/o Roamana Street, Tehsil Jaito, Distt Faridkot.

Versus

... Appellant

Public Information Officer,

O/o EO, MC, Jaito, Distt Faridkot.

First Appellate Authority, O/o Regional Deputy Director.

Local Govt, Ferozepur.


...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 2170 of 2021

PRESENT: None for the Appellant Sh. Naib Singh, Sanitary Inspector for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through an RTI application dated 13.02.2020 has sought the following information from the office of EO-MC Jaito. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed a first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 16.03.2021 which took no decision on the appeal.



Beek Date gree also field i pto Date Semanning dest if also and semantations Entropies As Branch whee Also gree date No. 26-24% you where to Date FERDER way. Speechyster of Comparison Part Ly office from 1(1) 2014 to up to Date and Foreldy to P.10. Jun Date Carles of S1. C. Chandgent's order and also cash Book 12 Page As extensing Amount: Brue Detecapies if Allocation, elsine notings A. Application fleching one of fible of Date Agenest second a time class solution of Dates the Allocation fleching are of fible of Date Agenest second a time class solution of Dates the Allocation fleching are of fible of Date Agenest second a time class solution of Dates to Market Balance all helles + Chargebest Gry & orders of secondary Too Branch. & date States State Agenest of Astronomer and the completes of second all applies to both dates all helles + Chargebest Gry & orders of secondary Too Branch all applies to both dates State Alexander Astronomer Completes Death case from 11/1200000 to the dates who others Source on Third flexes. As he foot Date of foothing with a date The vales of another we first the Market Source Bard Date of foothing with a dates (D As a date of 12) and 11 foothing the second Source Bard Date of John and the constance of the Katerno Mark I 25 TH (CATI A) Rois 118 275-216/2020 to and apple of the apples Markets of Cares, Anothers of (Freed) under 13 The Market Way Row Rooth Richardow Act apples of Cares, Anothers of Dates of Care of Care Bard

The case first came up for hearing on 29.11.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. Due to network problem in the VC, the hearing could not take place. The case was adjourned.

The case last came up for hearing on 11.04.2022 through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. As per appellant, the PIO did not supply the information.

The respondent PIO had brought the information.

The PIO was directed to hand over the information to the appellant.

The appellant is directed to point out the discrepancies if any in the information to the PO and the PIO was directed to remove the same and send a compliance report to the Commission.

Hearing dated 10.08.2022 :

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The appellant is absent nor is represented.

The respondent present pleaded that the sought for information was handed over to the appellant on the previous date of hearing in the court itself. The appellant further pleaded that no deficiency has been reported by the appellant.

Having gone through the RTI application and hearing the respondent, the Commission observes that since no deficiency has been reported by the appellant, the appellant might be satisfied with the information received from the PIO. As such, no further cause of action by the Commission is required and hence, the case is disposed of and closed.

Chandigarh Dated: 10.08.2022 Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commission

PSIC USU

Sh Lajpat Rai, S/o Sh Harbans Lal, R/o Roamana Street, Tehsil Jaito, Distt Faridkot.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer, O/o EO. MC.

Jaito, Distt Faridkot.

First Appellate Authority,

O/o Regional Deputy Director, Local Govt, Ferozepur.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 2171 of 2021

PRESENT: None for the Appellant Sh.Naib Singh, Sanitary Inspector, for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through an RTI application dated 13.02.2020 has sought information on 10 points regarding proceedings done against Ramesh Kumar Suresh Kumar employees remained in prison and on bail – proceeding done against Ramesh Kumar, Kamal Sharma Naib Singh including copies of letters issued and answers – cash book from 01.01.2020 upto date and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of EO-MC Jaito. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed a first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 16.03.2021 which took no decision on the appeal.

O Ramest Kinnal Starsh Kinnel complexes who sentenced to 3-3 \$ prisonment and 1000-1000 fine, Survive ellergy Acro. Now they are on Ball what proceeding done against them up to Date Teb 2020 (3) As be M. Account ado 1930 US1718(2) Police and Against By Romest Kuma DE Reon Incharge Property Tax Incharge, Komal Sharma Pear AS Didy Rom + Licence Branch Sncharge, Nall Singh Semitation Incharge ASIAnder Party whote Graban Case. As Proceeding done By office Against The employees give fully Ingr matron Including Gpics of Letters 300 wet Answers. 3 The General Gen Book+ Whan mission Cesh Book from 1/1/2020 to up to Dob @ give Pan Drive loaded Data of maps 13 frees Deposited in Account Jam 1/9/2018 To up to Date and also give Information As Notice No. aples 195, AS A, 172 grened to Public, There after proceeding done accused forsons. 6 give attestidance Register of office employeest Santtation Branch from 1/1/2020-to upto Date Including Pay Bills Photo Capies Same Day. (give the oppes of All Building Planners under Welking Mc Jadu Xrconcers Certificates and Photo Gy of Letters ground to University / College for Variafilying the calificate of Return Letters and give Photo capites of Selves Scene fees I filed application for Renaul of my Species (4) 2019 Including my appeication, the dittage of (2) Reminders By me, E Letters Empetayou from SDM SAHIB, D.C. SAHIB, & Other higher officers Drichading the hia minister all Document Come to your office, all Documents

Proto GPID prested as House B' SAHIB OR dead to Renow the dirana an 18/12/19 In Knowle Darson Foundbook De office give fully anterted Record. (As Chief Secretary Ngelence Chardygach Through P.S.LG. and DLS Local Sources. Chandyash sending you Letters from 5/2018 for gring approved for Regestering the Vigitime Case, But Proceeding clark Nall Sings Know Bryly selay the 52 das of higher officers and Including DEP Vigitime, for Delaymy the forces, que Information action taken egamet procooding clerk of the 20. Regnish Seed and Ashak Kumon and give fully Latter up to Date Come office give fully Documentes Platostate Also you wrote filly detas Including deta No. 1983/15 " Send to DLG. (3) greall my appliations from 1986-to up to Dide for Roman my my drivence and <u>GB</u> cobes Fully Including Pagent Cash Book Where decence fees Deposition In M.C Account. @ give fully Informations As Proceeding done As Letter from 29.3- Chandyout memo No. 05/12/20.3553. 372 Detat 30 2020 & Jun Branning local Fund Account Crandypark Lettersta you Memoria 5(32) 21-24/208 Datal 23/1/2020-(greaty of fully file for Service of Smit Harbans Kaur W/ Jascount Smell, on Compensation Grand & you send the Letter NO. 1851/0+18/1103 to D.C. Sahit fordebot Photo State felly Ataster . .

The case first came up for hearing on 29.11.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Faridkort. Due to network problem in the VC, the hearing could not take place. The case was adjourned.

The case again came up for hearing on 11.04.2022 through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. As per appellant, the PIO had not supplied the information.

The respondent PIO had brought the information.

The PIO was directed to hand over the information to the appellant.

The appellant was directed to point out the discrepancies if any in the information to the PO and the PIO was directed to remove the same and send a compliance report to the Commission.

Hearing dated 10.08.2022 :

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkort. The appellant is absent nor is represented.

The respondent present pleaded that the sought for information was handed over to the appellant on the previous date of hearing in the court itself. The appellant further pleaded that no deficiency has been reported by the appellant.

Having gone through the RTI application and hearing the respondent, the Commission observes that since no deficiency has been reported by the appellant, the appellant might be satisfied with the information received from the PIO. As such, no further cause of action by the Commission is required and hence, the case is disposed of and closed.

Chandigarh Dated: 10.08.2022 Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commission



Sh. Lajpat Rai, S/o sh Harbans Lal, H No-B-3/287, Romana Street, Jaito, Distt Faridkot.

Versus

... Appellant

Public Information Officer,

O/o EO, MC, Jaitu, Distt Faridkot.

First Appellate Authority,

O/o Deputy Director, Urban Local Bodies, Ferozepur Cantt.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1189 of 2021

PRESENT: None for the Appellant Sh. Naib Singh, Sanitary Inspector O/o MC Jaito and Sh. HaRISH Kumar, Jr. Assistant, RTI Branch of DC, Faridkot for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through the RTI application dated 27.06.2020 has sought the following information from the office of EO-MC Jaitu:-

DLG REALS 2 RESS & AND 130 9966- 1715118, 20519, 25/11/19 \$ 18 9700 9/3/18 3 22/10/19, 30316 678 2126 (2013, 2017) स्वर्थ कर रेवा 1939 में 1939 (18744) 30 1 र्थ के किंद कर रेवा के किंदी के किंदी राष्ट्र के कि भी भीटिंग में की कर में उन्हें के रेवा 1939 (18744) 30 1 र्थ के किंद के किंदी के किंदी के किंदी राष्ट्र के किंदी किंट से 26 40/2013 चरात्रीय मिंग M.C. V.S. केंट्र जार भूमिल, को किंदी के किंदी के किंदी राष्ट्र के किंदी के कि जानी हिट दर्खर / टेकर की काभी में, राभी देखें के कि किंद के कि किंद की किंदी के किंदी के किंदी का कि का किंदी क 3) रहती किंग्स B-3-261-362 , अपमेला मेम & If 20 F 202, B-1/153, m3 शिमिया रे 260 मेक 2 [8 करी फिल्म 3 क्या 2015, 2016, 2017, आजीका राष्ट्रीय के 10 F 202, B-1/153, m3 शिमिया रे 260 मेक " 3 2000 to BJ 201, 209, B3-201-202, B-I/152 MBm Www. 2 AN 43 24 Son Jon July 2 - and 1 - 2 मार्गि 111/2020 3 कॉम उन हिटाप्रता आपटी देखा, प्राप्ता कारे, तर किमा, 3 उँडा उन्ही के दिराहटा की मिलट हिं हर कार ए प्र 29 मेरी मेरी आहे किल देखा हि राउमही प्रह रह कर राउहों हिं सार के रह कि उत्तर कि रहे कि राम कि राम हराय हा राम कि राम कि हर आदि के हि हर का कि कि राम कि र राम कि र राम के राम के र मीरीपी माने बुरुागी जाउ नामनाउन की दि जरिटा, देम जेला 8-11,708 की में 13 40, भी 803/20 34/ S यात्र मियात्र. अहिरे क्रिया रे दियाह 2012 किंग्र मना की दिवाली आदि उन्न तवार जात्री मिन्न 1, हिंद दिक अभा अक्षारी दीम, माजभा अभेड काठी दाहीर की देरेवाथी, मर्गेड कि महरू ही चारक्र ही 40 र राह की राहनी, अक्रियेक की राह के राह के राह के राह की राह की राह की राह की राह की रहे रहे रहे रहे रहे रहे र (1)7/2000 3 min 3 30 2100 अहि कामा 3 की का का की मुराग) () 2 रहे का मेर के मेर के मेर के मार के मार के मार के मार के मार कर कर कर के मार के के मार के के के मार के के क () अन्य आप र रहा राज्य के कि से क्या राजा र का राजा र का राज्य र का राज्य राज्य र का राज्य राज्य र का राज भिकार जेव हरू हरीमा, उज्यासका ही करा + नवरा विप्रम दी करने | हेन्द्र अधिवर्गमा रू खोरेट नज नी सारकारी मने रूप क्रिय का प्रमाय मिन्छ भिकार जेव हिसार बीडी नाहारी नी स्वरण के उनिंद सेन क्रिय का मिन्छ भिकार जेव हिसार बीडी नाहारी नी स्वरण के उनिंद सेन क्रिय का प्रमाय

The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed a first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 11.01.2021 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 18.11.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. As per the appellant, the PIO had not provided the information.

The respondent was absent. The notice issued by the Commission was returned with the remarks 'refused due to strike'.

A fresh notice was sent to the PIO along with the order. The PIO was directed to look at the RTI application and provide whatever information is available on the record to the appellant.

On the date of the hearing on **18.11.2021**, due to a technical problem in the VC at DAC Faridkot, the hearing could not take place.

The case last came up for hearing on 22.03.2022 through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The appellant claimed that the PIO did not supply the information.

The respondent present pleaded that they have not received the RTI application/notice of the Commission. The appellant was directed to hand over a copy of the RTI application to the Respondent. The PIO is directed to provide information to the appellant.

Having gone through the record, the Commission observes that the notice issued by the Commission on 03.06.2020 was received back on 15.06.2021 with the remarks of the postal authority "Refused". Now again the order of the Commission dated 18.11.2021 has been returned with the remarks of the postal authority "Refused.

Since the notice of the Commission has been refused by the PIO, under the powers vested under section 18(2) of the RTI Act, the case was marked to the Deputy Commissioner, Faridkot to enquire into the matter that why disciplinary action 20(2) of the RTI Act 2005 be not taken against the PIO. Section 20(2) reads as under-

"Where the Central Information Commission or the State Information Commission, as the case may be, at the time of deciding any complaint or appeal is of the opinion that the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, has, without any reasonable cause and persistently, failed to receive an application for information or has not furnished information within the time specified under sub-section (1) of section 7 or malafidely denied the request for information or knowingly given incorrect, incomplete or misleading information or destroyed information which was the subject of the request or obstructed in any manner in furnishing the information, it shall recommend for disciplinary action against the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, under the service rules applicable to him."

Hearing dated 10.08.2022:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The appellant is absent nor is represented.

Sh. Naib Singh, Sanitary Inspector, O/o the MC, Jaito, present pleaded that pointwise information, as per the RTI application, has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 02.08.2022 by registered post with a copy to the Commission. The respondent further pleaded that no deficiency in the information supplied has been received from the appellant.

Having gone through the RTI application and record in the file, the Commission observes that the RTI application has sufficiently been addressed by the PIO. The Commission further observes that the DC, Faridkot has complied with the Commission's earlier order and vide letter dated 10.08.2022, received in the Commission through email, Additional Deputy Commissioner(UD), Faridkot has been directed to take appropriate action against the erring official of MC, Jaito. A copy of letter dated 10.08.2022 received by an email from DC, Faridkot is taken on record. The Commission further observes the appellant has not pointed out any deficiency in the information supplied by the PIO. As such, no more interference in the matter by the Commission is required. Hence, the case is disposed of and closed.

Chandigarh Dated: 10.08.2022 Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commission



Sh. Lajpat Rai, S/o sh Harbans Lal, H No-B-3/287, Romana Street, Jaito, Distt Faridkot.

Versus

... Appellant

...Respondent

Public Information Officer,

O/o EO, MC, Jaitu, Distt Faridkot.

First Appellate Authority,

O/o Deputy Director, Urban Local Bodies, Ferozepur Cantt.

Appeal Case No. 1190 of 2021

PRESENT: None for the Appellant Sh. Naib Singh, Sanitary Inspector O/o MC Jaito and Sh. HaRISH Kumar, Jr. Assistant, RTI Branch of DC, Faridkot for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 27.06.2020 has sought the following information from the office of EO-MC Jaitu :-

2 2m 123 T.S. I Am Bran 2003 (2012) 1346, 965.100 (Bat 16 19-20 (2010) 1 3 36, 853 100, Bat No 0013,0014,0015,0016) TT 2003,2004,2005, 201 And And And Star 13 56,904,100, 42 \$ 400 0017-206-1310,53100, €2808,-1326,553100, Joht \$ 618. €2 2004, fep 1335,853100 € £1237/2008, 1345,92100, an the 373/2010 mit 1325, 50 390, 42 troats 2 /2014, mit 13 20, 50 390, home for 501, onthe tra 1310, 50 3 100 32 (The 13 to, 903100, Boo to 501/2012) Bor for 602 anter for 1315, 20345, 75280, 903 100 32 (2) ग्रह्मिय प्र किय ही अभी हॅंड (But Parts (2)) राष्ट्र की मी 10015 (200 2) ही ही पर किय ही उम्म 200 341-15 /3) मारेड कर ह (' 2140 मेक B-459) की कि E/11/2012 है '21/202 3 रवरीन की ?; 310 दार्थन हर कार्य रामे रामेड '21/202 (र्वम्गाल B-4]-20000 2012-14 3 (2618) & B. 2 200 ES 20 אוטיד בי איזאר אול אול איז אויאראאיז שאיי בי איז גע אוייני בי איזאר איז איזאי (A) रेहेक काल मित्राह किराहा कीरी DDILL हिलेमार दे wife रहेत , उसे काला क, खरे कारी हाहीर से हरे कारी. (3 has 11/12022 3 Will 3 मुग्रा रशिमत उद्योगत उद्योह रहाकी के रिभेम के रहाही की मुग्रा 1, रम भाषेपी आहे मेंछ दिए उम्म और ("V-2015/83P ही कार्य म्येड येंडव आहिट ज हाय जिसे" अक्षाया 2538ी हेटिंग म (हिन्द्राह) आई मात्रीआ हो देंटे कार्या आग मानेड येंडव में 835/6-1-2016 मीदेपी मिखरड स्वीरा ही बीडी र्यामेंट री खरमा , अभेउ मारे विषां ही साहवर्षी ' को मा। 22 3 में अंतर के मरे Rom कि की बरी कर का की स्वरा (Dato 210 210 And 213 Sarat & Lao 2130 101-28/9/18, 330-1/11/19, 06-21510, 159-29/10/18 से <u>8</u> <u>8001-2002</u> चिक्र मेंडे तगर केल रिस्ट महारी मेरन <u>303</u> टिल्ल <u>म</u> रिमडी कर <u>क</u> राजनाइग टीला हुन्दे कार्या लगफ के केल रिस्ट महारी मेरन <u>303</u> टिल्ल <u>म</u> रिमडी करी <u>-</u> <u>-</u> (6 लियी <u>31171</u>7 ट्रे म्त्रीक स्टेरी रंटे स्त्र कार्य केली रहा दीला <u>म्र</u> <u>म्र</u> हेन्यू राजी खेन्द्र टिल्ल <u>कार्य</u> हेरे स्त्र कार्य केली रहा दीला <u>म्र</u> <u>म्र</u> हेन्यू राजी खेन्द्र <u>हे</u> कार्य केली रहा ने कार्य <u>कार्य</u> केली <u>कार्य</u> <u>कार्य</u> <u>कार्य</u> हेन्यू राजी खेन्द्र <u>हो</u> <u>रं</u>टे स्त्र केली रहा कार्य केली <u>कार्य</u> <u>कार्य</u> <u>कार्य</u> हेन्यू राजी खेन्द्र <u>हो</u> <u>रं</u>टे स्त्र केली रही <u>कार्य</u> <u>कार्य</u> <u>कार्य</u> <u>कार्य</u> हेन्यू राजी खेन्द्र <u>कार्य</u> <u>रं</u> <u>रं</u> <u>कार्य</u> कार्य केली <u>कार्य</u> <u>कार्य</u> <u>कार्य</u> <u>कार्य</u> <u>कार्य</u> हेन्यू राजी खेन्द्र <u>कार्य</u> <u>रं</u> <u>कार्य</u> <u>का</u> <u>का</u>

The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed a first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 11.01.2021 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case last came up for hearing on 18.11.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. As per the appellant, the PIO had not provided the information.

The respondent was absent. The notice issued by the Commission was returned with the remarks 'refused due to strike'.

A fresh notice was sent to the PIO along with the order. The PIO was directed to look at the RTI application and provide whatever information is available on the record to the appellant.

On the date of the last hearing on **18.11.2021**, due to a technical problem in the VC at DAC Faridkot, the hearing could not take place.

The case last came up for hearing 22.03.2022 through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The appellant claimed that the PIO did not supplied the information.

The respondent present pleaded that they have not received the RTI application/notice of the Commission. The appellant was directed to hand over a copy of the RTI application to the Respondent. The PIO was directed to provide information to the appellant.

Having gone through the record, the Commission observes that the notice issued by the Commission on 03.06.2020 was returned on 15.06.2021 with the remarks of the postal authority "Refused". Now again the order of the Commission dated 18.11.2021 has been returned with the remarks of the postal authority "Refused.

Since the notice of the Commission has been refused by the PIO, under the powers vested under section 18(2) of the RTI Act, the case was marked to the Deputy Commissioner, Faridkot to enquire into the matter that why disciplinary action 20(2) of the RTI Act 2005 be not taken against the PIO. Section 20(2) reads as under:-

"Where the Central Information Commission or the State Information Commission, as the case may be, at the time of deciding any complaint or appeal is of the opinion that the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, has, without any reasonable cause and persistently, failed to receive an application for information or has not furnished information within the time specified under sub-section (1) of section 7 or malafidely denied the request for information or knowingly given incorrect, incomplete or misleading information or destroyed information which was the subject of the request or obstructed in any manner in furnishing the information, it shall recommend for disciplinary action against the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, under the service rules applicable to him."

Hearing dated 10.08.2022:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The appellant is absent nor is represented.

Sh. Naib Singh, Sanitary Inspector, O/o the MC, Jaito, present pleaded that pointwise information, as per the RTI application, has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 02.08.2022 by registered post with a copy to the Commission. The respondent further pleaded that no deficiency in the information supplied has been received from the appellant.

Having gone through the RTI application and record in the file, the Commission observes that the RTI application has sufficiently been addressed by the PIO. The Commission further observes that the DC, Faridkot has complied with the Commission's earlier order and vide letter dated 10.08.2022, received in the Commission through email, Additional Deputy Commissioner(UD), Faridkot has been directed to take appropriate action against the erring official of MC, Jaito. A copy of letter dated 10.08.2022 received by an email from DC, Faridkot is taken on record. The Commission further observes the appellant has not pointed out any deficiency in the information supplied by the PIO. As such, no more interference in the matter by the Commission is required. Hence, the case is disposed of and closed.

Chandigarh Dated: 10.08.2022 Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commission



Sh Baljinder Singh, S/o Sh Gian Singh, Village Surghuri, Tehsil Jaito, Distt Faridkot.

Versus

... Appellant

Public Information Officer,

O/o EO, MC, Jaito, Distt Faridkot.

First Appellate Authority,

O/o Deputy Director, Local Govt, Ferozepur.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1200 of 2021

PRESENT: None for the Appellant Sh. Naib Singh, Sanitary Inspector O/o MC Jaito and Sh. Harish Kumar, Jr. Assistant, RTI Branch of DC, Faridkot for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through an RTI application dated 28.07.2020 has sought following information the office of EO-MC Jaito :-

CONTRACTOR OF THE OWNER		
	_	4. Fee Detail: IPO No.49F866552 Rs.10/- only, attached (Dated 28-07-2020)
/	1.	ਮਾਰਚ, 2011 ਤੋਂ ਲੈ ਕੇ 31 ਜੁਲਾਈ, 2020 ਤੱਕ ਰਮੇਸ਼ ਕੁਮਾਰ ਪੁੱਤਰ ਜਗਦੀਸ਼ ਰਾਏ ਅਤੇ ਸੁਰੇਸ਼ ਕੁਮਾਰ ਪੁੱਤਰ ਇੰਦਰ ਰਾਮ ਦੀ ਦਫਤਰੀ ਹਾਜ਼ਰੀ ਦਾ ਰਜਿਸਟਰ ਅਤੇ ਮੁਕੈਂਦਮਾ ਨੰਬਰ 21 ਮਿਤੀ 21-03-2011 ਧਾਰਾ 326, 323, 324, ਵਗੈਰਾ ਥਾਣਾ ਜੈਤੋ ਦਰਜ਼ ਸੀ ਅਤੇ 26-08-2019 ਨੂੰ ਜੱਜ ਸਾਹਿਬ, ਜੈਤੋ ਦੀ ਅਦਾਲਤ ਨੇ ਤਿੰਨ-ਤਿੰਨ ਸਾਲ ਦੀ ਕੈਦ ਅਤੇ ਇੱਕ ਹਜ਼ਾਰ ਇੱਕ ਹਜ਼ਾਰ ਜੁਰਮਾਨਾ ਕੀਤਾ ਹੈ। ਦਫਤਰ ਵਲੋਂ ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਦੇ ਖਿਲਾਫ ਅੱਜ ਤੱਕ ਕੀਤੀ ਗਈ ਕਾਰਵਾਈ ਅਤੇ ਪੇਸ਼ੀ ਦੋਰਾਨ ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਵਲੋਂ ਲੈਈਆਂ ਗਈਆਂ ਛੁੱਟੀਆਂ ਦੀ ਨਕਲ ਅਤੇ ਜਾਰੀ ਕੀਤੀ ਗਈ ਤਨਖ਼ਾਹ ਦੀ ਸੂਚਨਾ।
•	2.	ਰੂਚੀ ਬਾਲਾ ਨੂੰ ਤਰਸ਼ ਦੇ ਅਧਾਰ ਤੇ 2006 ਵਿੱਚ ਕਲਰਕ ਦੀ ਨੋਕਰੀ ਸੁਸੈਨ ਗੋਇਲ ਦੀ ਜਗਾਂ ਤੀਜੀ ਜਗਾਂ ਨੋਕਰੀ ਦਿੱਤੀ ਸੀ। ਇਸ ਨਾਲ ਸਬੰਧਿਤ ਸਾਰੀ ਫਾਈਲ ਅਤੇ ਸੁਸੈਨ ਗੋਇਲ ਦੀ ਨੋਕਰੀ ਸਬੰਧੀ ਫਾਈਲ, ਇਸ ਵਲੋਂ ਜੋ ਦੋ ਮੰਜਿਲ ਖ਼ੁਬਸੂਰਤ ਕੋਠੀ 2016 ਤੋਂ 2019 ਤੱਕ ਬਣਾਈ ਹੈ। ਇਸ ਵਲੋਂ ਭਰੀ ਫੀਸ ਨਕਸ਼ਾ,
		ਸਾਰੀ ਫਾਈਲ ਦੀ ਸੂਚਨਾ, ਇਹ ਵੀ ਸੂਚਨਾ ਦਿੱਤੀ ਜਾਵੇ, ਫੀਸ ਨਾ ਭਰਨ ਕਾਰਨ ਇਸਦੇ ਖਿਲਾਫ ਜੋ ਵੀ ਕਾਰਵਾਈ ਕੀਤੀ ਹੈ, ਉਸਦੀ ਸੂਚਨਾ, ਜਿਸ ਵੀ ਮੁਲਾਜ਼ਮ ਦੀ ਮਿਲੀ-ਭੁਗਤ ਨਾਲ ਉਸਾਰੀ ਹੋਈ ਹੈ, ਉਸ ਅਫਸਰ ਦਾ ਨਾਮ ਆਹੁਦਾ ਅਤੇ ਮੋਬਾਇਲ ਨੰਬਰ, 2006 ਤੋਂ ਅੱਜ ਤੱਕ ਜਾਰੀ ਕੀਤੀ ਤਨਖਾਹ ਦੀ ਸੂਚਨਾ ਅਤੇ ਮੁਖ-ਦਫਤਰ ਤੋਂ ਕੋਠੀ ਪਾਉਣ ਦੀ ਮਨਜੂਰੀ ਦੇ ਖੇਂਤਰਾਂ ਦੀ ਸੂਚਨਾ, 2006 ਤੋਂ ਅੱਜ ਤੱਕ, 28-07-2020 ਤੱਕ ਜਿਸ ਜਿਸ ਵੀ ਬ੍ਰਾਂਚ ਵਿੱਚ ਕੰਮ ਕੀਤਾ ਹੈ ਦਫਤਰੀ ਹੁਕਮਾਂ ਦੀ ਸੂਚਨਾ।
	3.	ਮੁਨਸ਼ੀ ਰਾਮ ਸਫਾਈ ਸੇਵਕ ਨੂੰ 2008-09 ਵਿੱਚ ਮੇਟ ਦੀ ਤਰੱਕੀ ਦਿੱਤੀ ਹੈ। ਜਦ ਕਿ ਇਸ ਤੋ ਕਈ ਮੁਲਾਜ਼ਮ ਸੀਨੀਅਰ ਸਨ। ਜਿਸ ਵੀ ਨਿਯਮਾਂ ਮੁਤਾਬਿਕ ਤਰੱਕੀ ਕੀਤੀ ਹੈ। ਪ੍ਰੋਸੀਡਿੰਗ ਬੁੱਕ ਦੀ ਫੋਟੋ ਕਾਪੀ ਦਫਤਰੀ ਹੁਕਮ ਰਿਜਨਲ ਦਫਤਰ, ਫਿਰੋਜ਼ਪੁਰ ਭੇਜੇ ਪੱਤਰ, ਆਏ ਜਵਾਬ ਸਾਰੀ ਸੂਚਨਾ।
	4.	ਸਰਕਾਰ ਦੀ ਹਦਾਇਤਾਂ ਮੁਤਾਬਿਕ ਸੇਵਾਦਾਰਾਂ ਤੋਂ ਕਲਰਕ 10 ਪ੍ਰਤੀਸ਼ਤ ਸਟਾਫ ਵਿੱਚੋ ਅਤੇ ਬਾਕੀ ਸਿੱਧੀ ਭਰਤੀ ਕਰਨੀ ਹੁੰਦੀ ਹੈ, ਜੁਲਾਈ 2019 ਵਿੱਚ ਜੋ ਨਿਯਮਾਂ ਦੇ ਉਲਟ 60 ਪ੍ਰਤੀਸ਼ਤ ਤਰੱਕੀ ਕੀਤੀ ਹੈ। ਇਸ ਸਬੰਧੀ ਸਾਰੇ ਕਾਗਜ਼ਾਤ, ਭੇਜੇ ਪੱਤਰ, ਆਏ ਜਵਾਬ, ਸਮੇਤ ਕਾਰਵਾਈ ਰਜਿਸਟਰ ਅਤੇ ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਵਲੋਂ ਤਰੱਕੀ ਲੈਣ ਲਈ ਦਿੱਤੀਆਂ ਦਰਖਾਸ਼ਤਾਂ ਦੀ ਨਕਲਾਂ।
	5.	ਨਗਰ ਕੋਸ਼ਲ ਵਿੱਚ ਜੂਨ-ਜੁਲਾਈ 2020 ਵਿੱਚ ਇਕੱਠੇ ਹੋਏ ਦੁਕਾਨਾਂ ਦੇ ਕਿਰਾਏ ਦੀ, ਜਾਇਦਾਾਦ ਟੈਕਸ ਦੀ ਸੂਚਨਾਂ ਪੈਨ-ਡਰਾਈਵ ਵਿੱਚ ਪਾ ਕੇ ਦਿੱਤੀ ਜਾਵੇ ਜੀ।

The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed a first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 12.11.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 19.07.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. As per the appellant, the PIO had not provided the information.

The respondent was absent. The notice issued by the Commission was returned with the remarks 'refused due to strike'.

A fresh notice was sent to the PIO along with the order.

The case again came up for hearing on 22.03.2022 through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The appellant claimed that the PIO did not supply the information.

The respondent present pleaded that they have not received the RTI application/notice of the Commission. The appellant was directed to hand over a copy of the RTI application to the Respondent. The PIO was directed to provide information to the appellant.

Having gone through the record, the Commission observed that the notice issued by the Commission on 03.06.2020 was returned back on 16.06.2021 with the remarks of the postal authority "Refused". The notice was again sent to the PIO on 22.06.2021 which was also returned back by the postal authority with the same remarks on 01.07.2021. Now again, the order of the Commission dated 18.11.2021 has been returned with the remarks of postal authority "Refused.

Since the notice of the Commission had been refused by the PIO, under the powers vested under section 18(2) of the RTI Act, the case was marked to the Deputy Commissioner, Faridkot to enquire into the matter that why disciplinary action 20(2) of the RTI Act 2005 be not taken against the PIO. Section 20(2) reads as under:-

"Where the Central Information Commission or the State Information Commission, as the case may be, at the time of deciding any complaint or appeal is of the opinion that the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, has, without any reasonable cause and persistently, failed to receive an application for information or has not furnished information within the time specified under sub-section (1) of section 7 or malafidely denied the request for information or knowingly given incorrect, incomplete or misleading information or destroyed information which was the subject of the request or obstructed in any manner in furnishing the information, it shall recommend for disciplinary action against the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, under the service rules applicable to him."

Hearing dated 10.08.2022:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The appellant is absent nor is represented.

Sh. Naib Singh, Sanitary Inspector, O/o the MC, Jaito, present pleaded that pointwise information, as per the RTI application, has been provided to the appellant vide their letter dated 26.04.2021 again on 02.08.2022 by registered post with a copy to the Commission. The respondent further pleaded that no deficiency in the information supplied has been received from the appellant.

Appeal Case No. 1200 of 2021

Having gone through the RTI application and record in the file, the Commission observes that the RTI application has sufficiently been addressed by the PIO. The Commission further observes that the DC, Faridkot has complied with the Commission's earlier order and vide letter dated 10.08.2022, received in the Commission through email, Additional Deputy Commissioner(UD), Faridkot has been directed to take appropriate action against the erring official of MC, Jaito. A copy of letter dated 10.08.2022 received by an email from DC, Faridkot is taken on record. The Commission further observes the appellant has not pointed out any deficiency in the information supplied by the PIO. As such, no more interference in the matter by the Commission is required. Hence, the case is **disposed of and closed**.

Chandigarh Dated: 10.08.2022 Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commission



Sh Baljinder Singh, S/o Sh Gian Singh, Village Surghuri, Tehsil Jaito, Distt Faridkot.

Versus

... Appellant

...Respondent

Public Information Officer,

O/o EO, MC, Jaito, Distt Faridkot.

First Appellate Authority,

O/o Deputy Director, Local Govt, Ferozepur.

Appeal Case No. 1201 of 2021

PRESENT: None for the Appellant Sh. Naib Singh, Sanitary Inspector O/o MC Jaito and Sh. Harish Kumar, Jr. Assistant, RTI Branch of DC, Faridkot for the Respondent

ORDER:

appeal

The appellant through RTI application dated 28.07.2020 has sought the following information from the office of EO MC Jaito:-

		4. Fee Detail: IPO No.49F866553 Rs.10/- only, attached (Dated 28-07-2020)
	1,	ਸਾਲ 2009, 2013, 2010 ਵਿੱਚ ਦਫਤਰ ਵਿੱਚ ਜੋ ਵੀ ਮੁਲਾਜ਼ਮ ਭਰਡੀ ਕੀਤੇ ਗਏ ਹਨ, ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਸਬੰਧੀ ਅਖਬਾਰਾਂ ਦੇ ਇਸਤਿਹਾਰ, ਆਏ ਦਰਖਾਸ਼ਤਾਂ, ਮੋਰਿਟ ਲਿਸਟ, ਨਿਯੁਕਤੀ ਬੋਰਡ ਦੀ ਸੂਚਨਾ, ਕਾਰਵਾਈ ਰਜਿਸਟਰ ਦੀ ਸੂਚਨਾ, ਉੱਚ-ਅਧਿਕਾਰੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਭੇਜੇ ਪੱਤਰ, ਆਈਆਂ ਮਨਜੂਰੀਆਂ ਪੱਤਰ, ਦਫਤਰੀ ਹੁਕਮ, ਹਾਜ਼ਰੀ ਰਜਿਸਟਰ, ਇੱਕ-ਇੱਕ ਸਾਲ ਦੀ ਫੋਟੋ ਸਟੇਟ, ਨਿਯੁਕਤੀ ਦੀ ਮਿਤੀ ਤੋ ਲੈ ਕੇ ਅੱਜ ਤੱਕ ਜਿਸ ਵਿੱਚ ਬ੍ਰਾਂਚ ਵਿੱਚ ਕੰਮ ਕੀਤਾ ਹੈ, ਉਸਦੇ ਦਫਤਰੀ ਹੁਕਮ ਅਤੇ ਇੱਕ-ਇੱਕ 2019 ਤੋਂ 28-07-2020 ਤੱਕ ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਜਾਰੀ ਕੀਤੀ ਤਨਖਾਹ ਦੀ ਸੂਚਨਾਂ ਸਮੇਤ ਫਾਰਮ 16, ਸਾਰੀ ਸੂਚਨਾਂ ਫੋਟੋ ਸਟੇਟ।
	2.	ਨੈਂਬ ਸਿੰਘ ਕਰਮਚਾਰੀ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਪਿਤਾ ਮੁਖ਼ਤਿਆਰ ਸਿੰਘ ਦੇ ਨਾਮ 2009 ਵਿੱਚ ਬਾਜਾ ਰੋਡ ਤੇ ਕਮੇਟੀ ਤੋਂ ਜੋ ਪਲਾਟ ਖ਼ੁਦ ਬੋਲੀ ਕਲਰਕ ਹੋਣ ਕਰਕੇ ਅਲਾਟ ਕਰ ਲਿਆ, ਸਮੇਤ ਵਾਟਰ ਵਰਕਸ਼ ਤੇ ਜੋ ਵੀ ਦੁਕਾਨਾਂ ਅਲਾਟ ਕਰਾਈਆਂ ਹਨ, ਸਾਰੀ ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਦੀ ਵੋਟੋ ਸਟੇਟ ਦਿੱਤੀ ਜਾਵੇ ਸਮੇਤ ਅਫਸਰਾਂ ਦੇ ਨਾਮ ਆਹੁਦਾ ਤੇ ਵੋਨ ਨੰਬਰ।
	3.	ਨੈਂਬ ਸਿੰਘ ਨੇ 2011 ਤੋਂ ਲੈ ਕੇ 28-07-2020 ਤੱਕ ਜੋ ਵੀ ਜਮੀਨ, ਪਲਾਟ, ਕਾਰਾਂ, ਸਕੂਟਰ, ਅਤੇ ਦੋ ਬੱਚੇ ਵਿਵੇਸ਼ 'ਭੇਜਣ ਸਬੰਧੀ, ਜੋ ਵੀ ਮਨਜੂਰੀਆਂ ਲੈਈਆਂ ਹਨ, ਇਸ ਸਬੰਧੀ ਸਾਰੇ ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਦੀ ਫੋਟੋ ਸਟੇਟ।ਇਸ ਦੀ ਡਿਊਟੀ ਕੋਟਕਪੂਰਾ ਕਮੇਟੀ ਵਿੱਚ ਸੀ, ਜੈਤੋ ਆਉਣ ਸਬੰਧੀ ਸਾਰੀ ਜਾਣਕਾਰੀ ਦਾ ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਅਤੇ ਇਸਨੂੰ ਜਾਰੀ ਕੀਤੇ ਫਾਰਮ 16 ਮਿਡੀ 01-01-2017 ਤੋਂ 28-07-2020 ਤੱਕ ਸਾਰੀ ਸੂਚਨਾ ਦਿੱਤੀ ਜਾਵੇ। ਇਸ ਦੀ 01-01-2001 ਤੋਂ 28-07-2020 ਤੱਕ ਜਿਸ ਜਿਸ ਵੀ ਬ੍ਰਾਂਚ ਵਿੱਚ ਕੰਮ ਕੀਤਾ ਹੈ ਉਸਦੀ ਸੂਚਨਾ।
	4.	01-01-2001 ਤੋਂ 28-07-2020 ਡੱਕ ਜਿਸ ਜਿਸ ਵੀ ਸਮੇਂ ਉਪ-ਪ੍ਰਧਾਨ ਦੀ ਚੋਣ ਹੋਈ ਹੈ, ਉਸ ਸਮੇਂ ਦੇ ਕਾਰਵਾਈ ਰਜਿਸਟਰ ਦੀ ਵੋਟੋ ਕਾਪੀ, ਉਚ-ਅਧਿਕਾਰੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਗਏ ਪੱਤਰ ਅਤੇ ਆਏ ਜਵਾਬ, ਦਫਤਰੀ ਹੁਕਮ ਅਤੇ ਉਪ-ਪ੍ਰਧਾਨ ਨੂੰ ਜਾਰੀ ਕੀਤੀ ਤਨਖ਼ਾਹ ਦੀ ਸੂਚਨਾ, ਉਕਤ ਤਰੀਖ ਤੋਂ ਹੀ ਜੋ ਵੀ ਐਮ ਸੀ ਬਣੇ ਹਨ, ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਦਾ ਨਾਮ, ਵਾਰਡ ਨੰਬਰ, ਕੈਟੋਗਰੀ, ਮੋਬਾਇਲ ਨੰਬਰ ਦੀ ਸੂਚਨਾ।
	5.	ਮਿਤੀ 01–06–2020 ਤੋਂ 28–07–2020 ਤੱਕ ਆਰ ਟੀ ਆਈ ਰਜਿਸਟਰ, ਰਸੀਦ, ਡਿਸਪੈਚ, ਜਰਨਲ ਰਸੀਟ ਡਿਸਪੈਚ, ਮੂਵਮਿੰਟ ਰਜਿਸਟਰ, ਕੈਸ਼–ਬੁੱਕ ਜਰਨਲ, ਅਰਬਨ, ਅਤੇ ਇਸ ਸਮੇ ਦਫਤਰ ਵਿੱਚ ਕੰਮ ਰਿਹੇ ਕਰਮਚਾਰੀਆਂ ਦਾ ਨਾਮ, ਆਹੁਦਾ, ਮੋਬਾਇਲ ਨੰਬਰ।
	6	ਮਿਡੀ 01–01–2017 ਤੋਂ 28–07–2020 ਡੱਕ ਜੋ ਵੀ ਦਫਤਰ ਦਾ ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਖੁਰਦ-ਖੁਰਦ ਹੋਇਆ ਹੈ ਉਸਦੀ ਸੂਚਨਾ, ਸੂਚਨਾ ਕਮਿਸ਼ਨ, ਚੰਡੀਗੜ੍ਹ ਵਿਖੇ ਦਿੱਤੇ ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਨਹੀ ਸਬੰਧੀ ਹਲਫੀਆ ਬਿਆਨ, ਘੋਸ਼ਣਾ-ਪੱਤਰ ਦੀਆਂ ਕਾਪੀਆਂ, ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਵਲੋਂ ਕੀਤੇ ਜ਼ੁਰਮਾਨੇ, ਮੁਆਵਜ਼ੇ ਦੇ ਹੁਕਮਾਂ ਦੇ ਵੱਖ-ਵੱਖ ਕੇਸਾਂ ਦੀਆਂ ਕਾਪੀਆਂ।
		ant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed a first First Appellate Authority on 12.11.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 19.07.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. As per the appellant, the PIO had not provided the information.

The respondent was absent. The notice issued by the Commission was returned with the remarks 'refused due to strike'.

A fresh notice was sent to the PIO along with the order. The PIO was directed to look at the RTI application and provide whatever information is available on the record to the appellant.

On the date of hearing on 22.03.2022, the appellant claimed that the PIO has not supplied the information.

The respondent present pleaded that they did not receive the RTI application/notice of the Commission. The appellant was directed to hand over a copy of the RTI application to the Respondent. The PIO was directed to provide information to the appellant.

Having gone through the record, the Commission observed that the notice issued by the Commission on 03.06.2020 was returned on 16.06.2021 with the remarks of the postal authority "Refused". The notice was again sent to the PIO on 22.06.2021 which was also returned back by the postal authority with the same remarks on 01.07.2021. Now again the order of the Commission dated 18.11.2021 has been returned with the remarks of postal authority "Refused.

Since the notice of the Commission had been refused by the PIO, under the powers vested under section 18(2) of the RTI Act, the case was marked to the Deputy Commissioner, Faridkot to enquire into the matter that why disciplinary action 20(2) of the RTI Act 2005 be not taken against the PIO. Section 20(2) reads as under:-

"Where the Central Information Commission or the State Information Commission, as the case may be, at the time of deciding any complaint or appeal is of the opinion that the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, has, without any reasonable cause and persistently, failed to receive an application for information or has not furnished information within the time specified under sub-section (1) of section 7 or malafidely denied the request for information or knowingly given incorrect, incomplete or misleading information or destroyed information which was the subject of the request or obstructed in any manner in furnishing the information, it shall recommend for disciplinary action against the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, under the service rules applicable to him."

Hearing dated 10.08.2022:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The appellant is absent nor is represented.

Sh. Naib Singh, Sanitary Inspector, O/o the MC, Jaito, present pleaded that pointwise information, as per the RTI application, has been provided to the appellant vide their letter dated 26.04.2021 again on 02.08.2022 by registered post with a copy to the Commission. The respondent further pleaded that no deficiency in the information supplied has been received from the appellant.

Appeal Case No. 1201 of 2021

Having gone through the RTI application and record in the file, the Commission observes that the RTI application has sufficiently been addressed by the PIO. The Commission further observes that the DC, Faridkot has complied with the Commission's earlier order and vide letter dated 10.08.2022, received in the Commission through email, Additional Deputy Commissioner(UD), Faridkot has been directed to take appropriate action against the erring official of MC, Jaito. A copy of letter dated 10.08.2022 received by an email from DC, Faridkot is taken on record. The Commission further observes the appellant has not pointed out any deficiency in the information supplied by the PIO. As such, no more interference in the matter by the Commission is required. Hence, the case is **disposed of and closed**.

Chandigarh Dated: 10.08.2022 Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commission



Sh. Lajpat Rai, S/o sh Harbans Lal, H No-B-3/287, Romana Street, Jaito, Distt Faridkot.

Versus

... Appellant

Public Information Officer,

O/EO, MC, Jaito, Distt Faridkot.

First Appellate Authority,

O/o Deputy Director, Local Govt, Ferozepur.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 775 of 2021

PRESENT: None for the Appellant Sh. Naib Singh, Sanitary Inspector O/o MC Jaito and Sh. HaRISH Kumar, Jr. Assistant, RTI Branch of DC, Faridkot for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 25.11.2020 has sought the following information the office of EO-MC Jaito, Distt.Faridkot :-

		Information :
	1.	Matta No.296, 297, 298 dt. 07-04-2017, Ramesh Kumar, Prem Chand, Komal Sharma gave application for permotions, give applications given by them, all certificates, letters of verification of certificates from board/university, appointment orders, service books and their suspension orders during service, encloding proceeding done by you as criminal case, Fir No.21, dt. 21-03-2011, Fir No.80 dt.30-05-2019 cross case at Police station, Jaitu, all documents photo copies attested.
	2.	Give proceeding and enquiry report against Davinder Kumar, clerk my letter diary No.332 dt.15-11- 2016 and letter issued me No.459 460 dt. 13-12-2017, letters copies encloding receipts dispatch registers photo copies and 110 objections of property tax encloding my and general public you demanded from me Rs.220, I am ready to pay the payment. Give all documents photo copies.
	. 3.	Letters written by you to DC Sahib, Faridkot No.2790 dt.03-02-2020 letter No.3963 dt. 18-02-2020 and DC Sahib letters No.181 dt.28-01-2020, 230 dt.04-02-2020, letter No.365 dt.24-06-20 for NOC, letter No.SPL 1,2,3 dt.10-07-20 regarding sehri vatavarn sudhar programe and other ralated documents with me from dt.01-01-2020 to 30-06-2020 all enquiry reports encloding letters come from DC Sahib all copies attested.
	4.	DDLG, Ferozepur send you letter, employees passed diploma university letter No.398 to 418 dt. 23-09- 2020, to providing information to audit party letter No.603 to 622 dt. 09-09-2020, Punjab Legislative Council's local 21's report letter No.681 to 700 dt. 28-09-2020 and letter No.911 to 930 dt. October 2020 and pending Matta's report letter No.644 to 660 dt. 25-09-2020 and report send for working as A.M.E. in Municipal council reports copies, local government notification dated 16-10-2017 about electric cess, letter No.657 to 676 dt. 27-08-2020 (letter No.2569 dt.11-02-20, 4305 dt.09-03-20, 12774 dt.01-09-20, 13812 dt.11-09-20 all leters applications, enquiry reports) and letter issued to you by the office DDLG, FZR for not sending the answers with in time (copy of warring letter), all documents photo copies.
11	5.	Copies of receipts/dispatch registers of general from dated 01-04-2005 to 31-10-2005 encloding building notice register from same date.
	. 6.	My property file in ward No.12 and in year 2005 and my other file diary No.691 dt.26-10-2004 and my answers related with this diary No.81 dt. 03-02-2005, 108 dt.21-02-05 and other letters upto 31-10-05 all files photo copies encloding G8 copies as my property connected letter No.416 dt.19-07-16 copy and office noting all documents.
	7.	The letters from information commission to you letter No.3061 dt.06-12-16, 23940 dt.30-06-17, 11897 dt.10-04-17, 15352 dt.05-05-17 and letter No.44098, 41364, 35567 dt. July, august, semtember, october of 2017.
	8.	Appointment of 8 teachers and advertisement dated 30-09-06 and merit list dt.04-10-06 and one teacher advertisement paper 14-05-12 and merit list 20-05-12 encloding all documents newspaper advertisement, public applications, merit list, appointment orders and appointment place location all copies (30/ 27011) 2701.

The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed a first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 21.12.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 14.07.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. As per the appellant, the PIO had not provided the information.

The respondent was absent. The notice issued by the Commission had been returned with the remarks 'refused due to strike'.

A fresh notice was sent to the PIO along with the order. The PIO was directed to look at the RTI application and provide whatever information is available on the record to the appellant.

On the date of the hearing on **18.11.2021**, due to a technical problem in the VC at DAC Faridkot, the hearing could not take place.

The case again came up for hearing on 22.03.2022 through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The appellant claimed that the PIO did not supply the information.

The respondent present pleaded that they did not receive the RTI application/notice of the Commission. The appellant had been directed to hand over a copy of the RTI application to the Respondent. The PIO was directed to provide information to the appellant.

Having gone through the record, the Commission observes that the notice issued by the Commission on 02.06.2020 was returned on 15.06.2021 with the remarks of the postal authority "Refused". Now again, the order of the Commission dated 18.11.2021 has been returned with the remarks of postal authority "Refused.

Since the notice of the Commission had been refused by the PIO, under the powers vested under section 18(2) of the RTI Act, the case was marked to the Deputy Commissioner, Faridkot to enquire into the matter that why disciplinary action 20(2) of the RTI Act 2005 be not taken against the PIO. Section 20(2) reads as under:-

"Where the Central Information Commission or the State Information Commission, as the case may be, at the time of deciding any complaint or appeal is of the opinion that the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, has, without any reasonable cause and persistently, failed to receive an application for information or has not furnished information within the time specified under sub-section (1) of section 7 or malafidely denied the request for information or knowingly given incorrect, incomplete or misleading information or destroyed information which was the subject of the request or obstructed in any manner in furnishing the information, it shall recommend for disciplinary action against the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, under the service rules applicable to him."

Hearing dated 10.08.2022:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The appellant is absent nor is represented.

Sh. Naib Singh, Sanitary Inspector, O/o the MC, Jaito, present pleaded that pointwise information, as per the RTI application, has been provided to the appellant vide their letter dated 19.03.2021 by registered post. The respondent further pleaded that no deficiency in the information supplied has been received from the appellant.

Appeal Case No. 775 of 2021

Having gone through the RTI application and record in the file, the Commission observes that the RTI application has sufficiently been addressed by the PIO. The Commission further observes that the DC, Faridkot has complied with the Commission's earlier order and vide letter dated 10.08.2022, received in the Commission through email, Additional Deputy Commissioner(UD), Faridkot has been directed to take appropriate action against the erring official of MC, Jaito. A copy of letter dated 10.08.2022 received by an email from DC, Faridkot is taken on record. The Commission further observes the appellant has not pointed out any deficiency in the information supplied by the PIO. As such, no more interference in the matter by the Commission is required. Hence, the case is **disposed of and closed**.

Chandigarh Dated: 10.08.2022 Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commission



Sh Naval Jain, S/o Sh Nand Lal Jain, Romana Street, Jaito, Distt Faridkot.

Versus

Public Information Officer,

O/o EO, MC, Jaito, Distt Faridkot.

First Appellate Authority,

O/o Deputy Director, Local Govt, Ferozepur.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 779 of 2021

PRESENT: None for the Appellant Sh. Naib Singh, Sanitary Inspector O/o MC Jaito and Sh. HaRISH Kumar, Jr. Assistant, RTI Branch of DC, Faridkot for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 21.03.2020 has sought the following information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of EO-MC Jaito, Distt.Faridkot:-

- Deputy Director Ferozpur visit MC Jaitu on Sep. 2018 and send report to MC Jaitu on Oct. 2018 give photo copy of report and action taken.
- As per rule action taken against employes who khurd burd record of property tax, maps actions photo copy attested 01-01-2016 to till date.
- 3. Give fully file, photo state, dully attested as inquiry no 29/18 by vigilance bureau Punjab Chandigarh/Faridkot and all letters from directorate local govt. head office Chandigarh, Deputy Director Ferozpur, DC sahib Faridkot, SDM/Administrator MC Jaitu and you wrote letter all officers and approval of inquiry case all copies attested. I am also witness in this case.
- 4. Give tax details of property number B3/281 from 2013 to 2017 and also photocopy of register
 Block 3 year 2008-2009, survey register 2014, 2018 all registers left side only name sides
 paper photocopies attested.
- 5. Give Block 1 to 13 pen drive of property data 2014-2020 as feed in computer.
- Give photo copy of rule and regulation for promoting class 4 to class 3 in MC and give details from 01-01-2001 to till date promoted employs names and their working seats names and pay slips from 01-01-2020 to till date.
- All diary dispatch registers of office including RTI and movement register, attendance register of all employs of office and sanitization branch from date 01-09-2018 to Oct. 2018.
- 8. List of employs of MC Jaitu, their rank, their working post and date of doing duty on present seat and all employs mobile number and list of employs working as on contract basis or through contractor supply including name of the employs and date of contract start and end

The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed a first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 29.09.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 14.07.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information.

The respondent was absent. The notice issued by the Commission had been returned with the remarks 'refused due to strike'.

... Appellant

A fresh notice was sent to the PIO along with the order. The PIO was directed to look at the RTI application and provide whatever information is available on the record to the appellant.

On the date of the hearing on **18.11.2021**, due to a technical problem in the VC at DAC Faridkot, the hearing could not take place.

The case again came up for hearing on 22.03.2022 through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The appellant claimed that the PIO did not supply the information.

The respondent present pleaded that they have not received the RTI application/notice of the Commission. The appellant was directed to hand over a copy of the RTI application to the Respondent. The PIO was directed to provide information to the appellant.

Having gone through the record, the Commission observed that the notice issued by the Commission on 02.06.2020 was received back on 16.06.2021 with the remarks of the postal authority "Refused". The notice was again sent to the PIO on 22.06.2021 which was also returned back by the postal authority with the same remarks on 01.07.2021. Now again the order of the Commission dated 18.11.2021 has been returned with the remarks of postal authority "Refused.

Since the notice of the Commission had been refused by the PIO, under the powers vested under section 18(2) of the RTI Act, the case was marked to the Deputy Commissioner, Faridkot to enquire into the matter that why disciplinary action 20(2) of the RTI Act 2005 be not taken against the PIO. Section 20(2) reads as under-

"Where the Central Information Commission or the State Information Commission, as the case may be, at the time of deciding any complaint or appeal is of the opinion that the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, has, without any reasonable cause and persistently, failed to receive an application for information or has not furnished information within the time specified under sub-section (1) of section 7 or malafidely denied the request for information or knowingly given incorrect, incomplete or misleading information or destroyed information which was the subject of the request or obstructed in any manner in furnishing the information, it shall recommend for disciplinary action against the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, under the service rules applicable to him."

Hearing dated 10.08.2022:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot.

Sh. Naib Singh, Sanitary Inspector, O/o the MC, Jaito, has brought the information containing about 100 pages of information to be handed over to the appellant in the court but the appellant is absent nor is represented.

The respondent is directed to send the information (92 pages) to the appellant by registered post and send a copy of the postal receipt to the Commission in confirmation of having sent the information to the appellant.

Appeal Case No. 779 of 2021

Having gone through the RTI application and record in the file, the Commission observes that the RTI application has sufficiently been addressed by the PIO. The Commission further observes that the DC, Faridkot has complied with the Commission's earlier order and vide letter dated 10.08.2022, received in the Commission through email, Additional Deputy Commissioner(UD), Faridkot has been directed to take appropriate action against the erring official of MC, Jaito. A copy of letter dated 10.08.2022 received by an email from DC, Faridkot is taken on record.

As such, no more interference in the matter by the Commission is required. Hence, the case is **disposed of and closed**.

Chandigarh Dated: 10.08.2022 Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commission



Sh. Lajpat Rai, S/o sh Harbans Lal, H No-B-3/287, Romana Street, Jaito, Distt Faridkot.

Versus

... Appellant

Public Information Officer,

O/o EO, MC, Jaito, Distt Faridkot.

First Appellate Authority, O/o Deputy Director, Local Govt, Ferozepur.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 777 of 2021

PRESENT: None for the Appellant Sh. Naib Singh, Sanitary Inspector O/o MC Jaito and Sh. HaRISH Kumar, Jr. Assistant, RTI Branch of DC, Faridkot for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 25.11.2020 has sought the following information from the office of EO-MC Jaito, Distt.Faridkot :-

Note: The information related with MC Office and be ordered to delivering the information from E.O. to me.

1. M.C. clerk Davinder Kumar gave mercy application 08/05/19 for reinstate in Election Code of Lok Sabha and DDLG Ferozepur send order No.10408 dt.12/06/19 as against this for not writing the cashbook.Fir No.29/18 he gone away by locking the room with record and esacping from Jaitu Police 42 days, EO wrote to state information commission letter No.66 dt. 27/04/18 and also vedio graphy for distroying the lockroom and found misplacing of concerned record, and proceeding done against this about above matter upto date give all record and vedio graphy given in pan drive.

2. Give record in pan drive collecting the property tax, MC shops rent from 01/11/20 to 30/11/20 and also give list of defaulter renter persons register.

3. Manjit Singh retd.Pump-Operator filed writ petition P.H. Court, Chandigarh October,2020 give fully fite of writ, advocate appointed, give payment to advocate, gave answer and upto date retirement dues given to Manjit Singh all documents attested.

4. L.F.A. department send reports on dated 01/02/02, 15/06/07, 31/03/09, 13/05/11, 22/08/12, 04/06/14, 04/01/16, 24/08/16, 22/02/18, 02/04/19, after this any report come from all reports and fund deficiencies or short cash and now upto date filling short cash and other deficencies, deposti amount's, receipts, letters, and punished the employees all documents photo copies.

5. According to diary register from dt.01/03/2020 to 30/11/2020, the orders/letters received from state information commission, Chandigarh and DDLG Ferozepur all letters phto copies/office notings, and incompensation cases the responsibility fixed the on whom employees also give information name, orders of RTI dealing clerks from 01/01/16 to upto date Ruchi Bala RTI Incharge given information leaves obtained by her from dated 01/01/2020 to 30/11/2020 all records photocopies.

6. Give photo copies of G8 No.120/2006, 1 to 100, office's dispatch registers letter No.6500 to 6600, 6800 to 6830, 6920 to 6950 and 7200 to 7300 and also give letter No.6/45/2018/4, SSN/2606 dt.07/10/2020 related with Gursewak Singh also give pan drive of type test on computer/manual papers organised by you on 27/06/19 with details of supervision staff and orders released from higher authorities all documents.

7. Map file ready by me dated 13/05/14 G8 No.32/809 in name of Darshan Kumar all file photo copies.

8. Matta No.546/2020 you wrote that Matta's write, but Davinder Kumar, clerk you know realised the payment to the contractor of property tax survey with his consent and 31420/- excess payment, and misplacing of records done. Copy of rule you wrote to the irresponsible employees is right, not receiving the record by Davinder Kumar and not handover record by Komal Sharma rent clerk the proceeding done all records photo copies the survey with a survey with the survey of the survey with his consent and 31420/- excess payment, and misplacing done all records photo copies the survey of the

The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed a first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 21.12.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 14.07.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information.

The respondent was absent. The notice issued by the Commission was returned with the remarks 'refused due to strike'.

A fresh notice was sent to the PIO along with the order. The PIO was directed to look at the RTI application and provide whatever information is available on the record to the appellant.

On the date of the hearing on **18.11.2021**, due to a technical problem in the VC at DAC Faridkot, the hearing could not take place. The case was adjourned.

On the date of hearing on 22.03.2022, the appellant claimed that the PIO had not supplied the information.

The respondent present pleaded that they have not received the RTI application/notice of the Commission. The appellant was directed to hand over a copy of the RTI application to the Respondent. The PIO was directed to provide information to the appellant.

Having gone through the record, the Commission observed that the notice issued by the Commission on 02.06.2020 was received back on 17.06.2021 with the remarks of the postal authority "Refused". The notice was again sent to the PIO on 22.06.2021 which was also returned back by the postal authority with the same remarks on 01.07.2021. Now again, the order of the Commission dated 18.11.2021 has been returned with the remarks of postal authority "Refused.

Since the notice of the Commission was refused by the PIO, under the powers vested under section 18(2) of the RTI Act, the case was marked to the Deputy Commissioner, Faridkot to enquire into the matter that why disciplinary action 20(2) of the RTI Act 2005 be not taken against the PIO. Section 20(2) reads as under-

"Where the Central Information Commission or the State Information Commission, as the case may be, at the time of deciding any complaint or appeal is of the opinion that the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, has, without any reasonable cause and persistently, failed to receive an application for information or has not furnished information within the time specified under sub-section (1) of section 7 or malafidely denied the request for information or knowingly given incorrect, incomplete or misleading information or destroyed information which was the subject of the request or obstructed in any manner in furnishing the information, it shall recommend for disciplinary action against the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, under the service rules applicable to him."

Hearing dated 10.08.2022:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The appellant is absent nor is represented.

Sh. Naib Singh, Sanitary Inspector, O/o the MC, Jaito, present pleaded that pointwise information, as per the RTI application, has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 02.08.2022 by registered post with a copy to the Commission. The respondent further pleaded that no deficiency in the information supplied has been received from the appellant.

Appeal Case No. 777 of 2021

Having gone through the RTI application and record in the file, the Commission observes that the RTI application has sufficiently been addressed by the PIO. The Commission further observes that the DC, Faridkot has complied with the Commission's earlier order and vide letter dated 10.08.2022, received in the Commission through email, Additional Deputy Commissioner(UD), Faridkot has been directed to take appropriate action against the erring official of MC, Jaito. A copy of letter dated 10.08.2022 received by an email from DC, Faridkot is taken on record. The Commission further observes the appellant has not pointed out any deficiency in the information supplied by the PIO. As such, no more interference in the matter by the Commission is required. Hence, the case is **disposed of and closed**.

Chandigarh Dated: 10.08.2022 Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commission