

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 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



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

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

To

(1) ...
 (2) ...
 (3) ...
 (4) ...
 (5) ...
 (6) ...
 (7) ...
 (8) ...
 (9) ...
 (10) ...
 (11) ...
 (12) ...
 (13) ...
 (14) ...
 (15) ...
 (16) ...
 (17) ...
 (18) ...
 (19) ...
 (20) ...
 (21) ...
 (22) ...
 (23) ...
 (24) ...
 (25) ...
 (26) ...
 (27) ...
 (28) ...
 (29) ...
 (30) ...
 (31) ...
 (32) ...
 (33) ...
 (34) ...
 (35) ...
 (36) ...
 (37) ...
 (38) ...
 (39) ...
 (40) ...
 (41) ...
 (42) ...
 (43) ...
 (44) ...
 (45) ...
 (46) ...
 (47) ...
 (48) ...
 (49) ...
 (50) ...
 (51) ...
 (52) ...
 (53) ...
 (54) ...
 (55) ...
 (56) ...
 (57) ...
 (58) ...
 (59) ...
 (60) ...
 (61) ...
 (62) ...
 (63) ...
 (64) ...
 (65) ...
 (66) ...
 (67) ...
 (68) ...
 (69) ...
 (70) ...
 (71) ...
 (72) ...
 (73) ...
 (74) ...
 (75) ...
 (76) ...
 (77) ...
 (78) ...
 (79) ...
 (80) ...
 (81) ...
 (82) ...
 (83) ...
 (84) ...
 (85) ...
 (86) ...
 (87) ...
 (88) ...
 (89) ...
 (90) ...
 (91) ...
 (92) ...
 (93) ...
 (94) ...
 (95) ...
 (96) ...
 (97) ...
 (98) ...
 (99) ...
 (100) ...

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 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

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 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

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.**

Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Sh 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. 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.



Book Date give also fully up to date 3 months list of office and employees
Employees As Branch where also give letter No. 526-24/15 you write to SDA P.R. D.R. Chel.
(8) Give Information of Compensation Paid by office from 1/1/2015 to up to date and
Remedy to P.O. Give details Copies of S.I.C Chandigarh's order and also Cash
Book's Page As drawing Amount.
(9) Give Photocopies of Application, office notings As Application filed by me of Public of
Jatin Agast against remuneration Clerk dated 16/5/15, 21/5/15, 16/5/19, 26/11/15, & also
MC despatch letter No 1341-9/15, application of Dhanraj Kumar for reinstatement (Baba)
all letter + Charge sheet Copy & orders of reinstatement of Duty Branch, & also SDM Jatin
Sanyal letter No 451/SDC(2)-21/11/15 Against Property Tax Branch all Copies & decisions copies.
(10) Give Name of Employees under MC employees Death Case from 1/1/2000 to up to date
who obtain Same on Third place, As per Govt Instruction the Service can
be provided on time give list, office orders and date of joining with office orders
(11) As Order 21/3/16 matter No 175 The Naxos Subk filed (RTI) give Photo Copies of RTI,
Letter No 175 I-3/11/15 (RTI A) 2015/15 278-316/2015 and copies of (C) Case Matter No.
164/21/3/16 filed (Filed) under 13/5/15 Punjab Urban Rent Regulation Act copies
of Cases, Answers & Decision of Court.

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

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.**

Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Sh 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.




Photo copy is attached as HONBLE DC SIAHIB ORDERED TO RENEW THE LICENCE ON 18/12/19 IN Khusla Darsal Faridkot DC OFFICE, GIVE FULLY ANNOTATED RECORD.

⑦ As Chief Secretary Vigilance Chandigarh Through P.S.I.G. and DLS Local Govt. Chandigarh sending you letters from 5/2019 for giving approve for Registrar the Vigilance Case, But Proceeding Clerk Nalb Singh Knowingly delay the orders of higher officers and including O.A.P. Vigilance, for delaying the process, give information action taken against proceeding clerk of Ex. SO. Rajnish Seed and Ashok Kumar and give fully letter up to date. Come office give fully documents Photo state also you write fully letters including letter No. 1983/15-19 send to L.C. Chandigarh

⑧ Give all my applications from 1986 to up to date for Renewing my licence and GR cards fully including Pass of Cash Book where licence fees deposited in M.C. Account.

⑨ Give fully information as proceeding done as letter from L.C. 3 - Chandigarh memo No. 08/12/2015 5583. Dated 23/11/2020 & from Examiners Local Fund Account Chandigarh letter to you memo No 5(32) 01-24/208

⑩ Give copy of fully file for Service of Smt. Harbans Kaur w/o Jaswant Singh, on Compensation Ground & you send the letter No. 1851/01+18/11/23 to A.C. Sahib Faridkot. Photo state fully annotated.

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 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 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

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,

Sector 16, Chandigarh.

Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



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

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o EO, MC,
Jaitu, Distt Faridkot.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Deputy Director,
Urban Local Bodies,
Ferozpur 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:-



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.

Sh. Harish Kumar, Jr. Assistant, RTI Branch, DC Office, Faridkot, present informed that in pursuance of the Commission's order dated 22.03.2022, enquiry was conducted and vide letter dated 10.08.2022, 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 has also been emailed to the Commission.

Appeal Case No. 1189 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**

**Copy to: The Deputy Commissioner,
Faridkot.**



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

... Appellant

Versus

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. 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 :-



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.

Sh. Harish Kumar, Jr. Assistant, RTI Branch, DC Office, Faridkiot, present informed that in pursuance of the Commission's order dated 22.03.2022, enquiry was conducted and vide letter dated 10.08.2022, 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 has also been emailed to the Commission.

Appeal Case No. 1190 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**

**Copy to: The Deputy Commissioner,
Faridkot.**



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

... Appellant

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. 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 :-



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.

Sh. Harish Kumar, Jr. Assistant, RTI Branch, DC Office, Faridkot, present informed that in pursuance of the Commission's order dated 22.03.2022, enquiry was conducted and vide letter dated 10.08.2022, 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 has also been emailed to the Commission.

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

Copy to: The Deputy Commissioner,
Faridkot.



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

... Appellant

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. 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:

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



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 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.

Sh. Harish Kumar, Jr. Assistant, RTI Branch, DC Office, Faridkot, present informed that in pursuance of the Commission's order dated 22.03.2022, enquiry was conducted and vide letter dated 10.08.2022, 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 has also been emailed to the Commission.

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

Copy to: The Deputy Commissioner,
Faridkot.



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

... Appellant

Versus

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 :-



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.

Sh. Harish Kumar, Jr. Assistant, RTI Branch, DC Office, Faridkot, present informed that in pursuance of the Commission's order dated 22.03.2022, enquiry was conducted and vide letter dated 10.08.2022, 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 has also been emailed to the Commission.

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

Copy to: The Deputy Commissioner,
Faridkot.



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

... Appellant

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:-

1. 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.
2. 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 2019 and also photocopy of register Block 3 year 2008-2009, survey register 2014, 2018 all registers left side only name sides paper photocopies attested. *Recd. Photo etc*
5. Give Block 1 to 13 pen drive of property data 2014-2020 as feed in computer.
6. 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 employes names and their working seats names and pay slips from 01-01-2020 to till date.
7. All diary dispatch registers of office including RTI and movement register, attendance register of all employes of office and sanitization branch from date 01-09-2018 to Oct. 2018.
8. List of employes of MC Jaitu, their rank, their working post and date of doing duty on present seat and all employes mobile number and list of employes working as on contract basis or through contractor supply including name of the employes 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'.

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.

Sh. Harish Kumar, Jr. Assistant, RTI Branch, DC Office, Faridkot, present informed that in pursuance of the Commission's order dated 22.03.2022, enquiry was conducted and vide letter dated 10.08.2022, 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 has also been emailed to the Commission.

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

Copy to: The Deputy Commissioner,
Faridkot.



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

... Appellant

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. 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 cash-book.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 destroying 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 file 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 deficiencies, 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 incensation 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 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.

Sh. Harish Kumar, Jr. Assistant, RTI Branch, DC Office, Faridkot, present informed that in pursuance of the Commission's order dated 22.03.2022, enquiry was conducted and vide letter dated 10.08.2022, 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 has also been emailed to the Commission.

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**

**Copy to: The Deputy Commissioner,
Faridkot.**