Sh Goldi Kumar, S/o Sh Jagdish Rai Grover, R/o Street NO-10-11, Choti Pauri, Abohar, Tehsil Fazilka.

Public Information Officer,

O/o EO, MC, Abohar.

First Appellate Authority,

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

#### Appeal Case No. 1014 of 2019

Versus

# PRESENT: Sh.Goldy Kumar as the appellant None for the Respondent

The case was first heard on 25.06.2019. The representative appeared on behalf ORDER: of the appellant did not know about the information and was without authority letter. The RTI application was also not legible. The appellant was directed to provide legible copy of the RTI application. The respondent was also absent. The PIO was directed to look at the RTI application and provide the information to the appellant as per the RTI Act.

The case was last heard on **16.10.2019.** Both the parties were absent. The appellant had not submitted legible copy of the RTI application. The Commission received an email from the PIO which was a copy of reply sent to the appellant. In the reply, the PIO had denied the information on the ground that the information sought is in question form.

## Hearing dated 10.12.2019:

The appellant claims that the PIO has not provided the information. The commission has received a copy of letter from the PIO diary No.20873 on 30.10.2019 vide which the PIO has denied the information stating that the information sought is in question form. The Commission makes it clear that the information that exists, even if sought in question form, it be provided.

The respondent is absent on 3<sup>rd</sup> consecutive hearing nor has complied with the order of the Commission. There has been an enormous delay of one year in provided the information. The Commission has taken a serious note of this and hereby directs the PIO to show cause why penalty be not imposed on him under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 for not supplying the information within the statutorily prescribed period of time. He/she should file an affidavit in this regard. If there are other persons responsible for the delay in providing the information, the PIO is directed to inform such persons of the show cause and direct them to appear before the Commission along with the written replies.

The PIO is again directed to provide the information to the appellant within 10 days.

To come up for further hearing on 24.02.2020 at 11.00 AM.

Chandigarh Dated 10.12.2019

Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner

Note:Sh.Raj Kumar, clerk O/o EO-MC Abohar visited late and he was informed the status the hearing.

... Appellant

...Respondent



Paris State Information

Sh.Gurbax Ram, S/o Sh Ram Dya, R/o Village Nadha, P.O NayaGaon, Tehsil Kharar, Distt Mohali.

Versus

## Public Information Officer,

O/o Addl, XEN, Distribution, Sub Division, PSPCL, Mullanpur Garib Dass, Kharar.

**First Appellate Authority,** O/oSE, PSPCL, Phase-1,

Industrial Area, Pb, Mohali.

...Respondent

# Appeal Case No. 1102 of 2019

## PRESENT: Sh.Gurbax Ram as the Appellant Sh.Nishant Bansal,SDO-PSPCL,Mullanpur for the Respondent

#### ORDER:

The case was first heard on 27.06.2019. The Commission observed that the information has been denied by the PIO vide letter dated 28.09.2018 stating that the information is 3<sup>rd</sup> party. The First Appellate Authority disposed off the appeal and informed the appellant vide letter dated 25.01.2019 that at the time of installation of poles, there was no public way and no-one had raised objection. Further, if anybody has objection and wants to shift the poles, they can apply as per procedure alongwith the processing fee.

The Commission observed that it appeared to be a dispute about an electric pole which as per appellant has been installed wrongly while providing an electric connection. The appellant said that it was marked as Rasta in the record. The appellant was directed to submit proof that this was marked a Rasta and the electricity department has wrongly installed the poles.

The case was last heard on **16.10.2019.** The appellant submitted a copy of map as a proof of Rasta marked in the record which was taken on the file of the Commission. The respondent was absent. The PIO was directed to provide the information before the next date of hearing.

#### Hearing dated 10.12.2019:

The appellant claims that despite order of the Commission, the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent pleaded that since the information is 3<sup>rd</sup> party information, it cannot be provided.

Hearing both the parties, the Commission directs the PIO to provide copy of estimate and diagram.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on 24.02.2020 at 11.00 AM.

Chandigarh Dated 10.12.2019 Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner

... Appellant



Sh. Tejinder Singh, R/o Village Bholapur, P.O Ramgarh, Chandigarh Road, Ludhiana.

....Appellant.

...Respondent

Versus

**Public Information Officer,** SDM, Licensing Authority & Registering, Malerkotla.

**First Appellate Authority,** DC, Sangrur

#### Appeal Case No. 1328 of 2018

## Present: None for the Appellant Sh.Karanbir Singh, PIO-RTA for the Respondent

ORDER:

This order should be considered in continuation to the earlier order.

On the date of hearing on **01.07.2019** the appellant pleaded that though he has received the information but with a delay of one year and four months. The appellant claimed that he has been harassed a lot for not providing the information by the PIO in time and hence the PIO be penalized and he be compensated.

This was the 6<sup>th</sup> consecutive hearing that the PIO-RTA was absent despite many orders of the Commission, nor sent any reply to the show cause. Showing utter disregard for the Commission's repeated orders to provide the information as well as not replying to the show cause and not appearing before the Commission, a penalty of Rs.25000/- was imposed upon the PIO-RTA Sangrur which was to be deposited in the Govt Treasury.

The PIO-RTA Sangrur was also directed to pay an amount of Rs.2500/- via demand draft as compensation to the appellant for the loss and detriment suffered by him of having to file the appeals and not getting the information in time. The PIO was directed to duly inform the Commission of the compliance of the order and submit proof of having compensated the appellant.

Further the PIO was also rendered liable under section 20(2) of the RTI Act and it was recommended to the Disciplinary Authority to issue a charge sheet to the PIO-RTA Sangrur for violation of the provisions of the RTI Act and send a copy to the Commission.

The case was last heard on **16.10.2019.** The PIO-RTA was present. The respondent pleaded that the delay in providing the information has occurred at the level of the clerk who did not put up the files on time. The PIO was directed to file an affidavit in this regard on the next date of hearing.

#### Hearing dated 10.12.2019:

The appellant is absent and vide email has sought exemption. The appellant in the same email has informed that the PIO has not provided the compensation amount as per order of the Commission.

At the last hearing, the respondent pleaded that the delay in providing the information had occurred at the level of the clerk who did not put up the files on time. The PIO was directed to file an affidavit in this regard.

The respondent has submitted an affidavit which is taken on the file of the Commission. Having gone through the merits of the affidavit, the action under section 20(2) recommended to the Disciplinary Authority to issue a charge sheet to the PIO-RTA Sangrur is withdrawn. However, the action under section 20 remains the same to realize the penalty amount of Rs.25000/-. The PIO is directed to duly inform the Commission of the compliance of the order by producing a copy of the challan justifying the deposit of penalty in the Govt Treasury. The PIO is also directed to submit proof of having compensated the appellant.

To come up for compliance on 03.03.2020 at 11.00 AM.

Chandigarh Dated: 10.12.2019 Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner

CC to PIO- RTA Sangrur

2. PIO-STC, Punjab, Chandigarh



ShJatinder Singh, S/o ShBakhsish Singh, R/o 5777-B, Sector-38 (West), Chandigarh.

... Appellant

...Respondent

Versus

**Public Information Officer,** O/o GMADA, Sector-62, Mohali.

# First Appellate Authority,

O/o GMADA, Sector-62, Mohali.

## Appeal Case No. 1504 of 2019

## PRESENT: Sh.Jatinder Singh as the Appellant None for the Respondent

**ORDER:** The case was first heard on 09.07.2019. The respondent present pleaded that this case came to his knowledge a day before the hearing only and asked for a copy of the RTI application. The respondent further assured to supply the information within 15 days. A copy of the RTI application was provided to the respondent. The PIO was directed to look at the RTI application and provide the information within 15 days.

The case was last heard on **11.09.2019.** The appellant informed that the PIO has not provided the complete information. The respondent was absent. The PIO was given one more opportunity to relook at the RTI application and provide the complete information as per the RTI application and explain the reasons for not complying with the order of the Commission.

## Hearing dated 10.12.2019:

The appellant claims that the PIO has not provided the information. The appellant is interested to inspect the record.

The respondent is absent. The appellant is directed to visit the office of PIO on **23.12.2019 at 11.00 AM** to inspect the record and get the relevant information. The PIO is directed to allow inspection of the record to the appellant on the given date and time and provide the relevant information as per the RTI application.

The Commission however, observes that there has been an enormous delay of one year in providing the information. The Commission has taken a serious note of this and hereby directs the PIO to **show cause why penalty be not imposed on him under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 for not supplying the information within the statutorily prescribed period of time.** He/she should file an affidavit in this regard. If there are other persons responsible for the delay in providing the information, the PIO is directed to inform such persons of the show cause and direct them to appear before the Commission along with the written replies.

To come up for further hearing on 15.04.2020 at 11.00 AM.

Chandigarh Dated:10.12.2019 Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner



Sh Jatinder Singh, S/o Sh Bakhsish Singh, R/o 5777-B, Sector-38 (West), Chandigarh.

... Appellant

...Respondent

Versus

Public Information Officer,

O/o GMADA, Sector-62, Mohali.

First Appellate Authority,

O/o GMADA, Sector-62, Mohali.

# Appeal Case No. 1505 of 2019

# PRESENT: Sh.Jatinder Singh as the Appellant None for the Respondent

## ORDER:

The case was last heard on 11.09.2019. The appellant claims that the PIO has given misleading and incorrect information. The respondent was absent.

The PIO was directed to relook at the RTI application and provide whatever the document is available as per RTI application. If there is any file that exists, the PIO was directed to bring the entire record at the next date of hearing.

# Hearing dated 10.12.2019:

The appellant claims that the PIO has not provided the complete information. The respondent is absent. The appellant is interested to inspect the record. The appellant is directed to visit the office of PIO on **23.12.2019 at 11.00 AM** to inspect the record and get the relevant information. The PIO is directed to allow inspection of the record to the appellant and provide the information as per the RTI application.

The Commission however, observes that there has been an enormous delay of one year in providing the information. The Commission has taken a serious note of this and hereby directs the PIO to **show cause why penalty be not imposed on him under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 for not supplying the information within the statutorily prescribed period of time.** He/she should file an affidavit in this regard. If there are other persons responsible for the delay in providing the information, the PIO is directed to inform such persons of the show cause and direct them to appear before the Commission along with the written replies.

To come up for further hearing on 15.04.2020 at 11.00 AM.

Chandigarh Dated:10.12.2019 Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner



Sh Jatinder Singh, S/o Sh Bakhsish Singh, R/o 5777-B, Sector-38 (West), Chandigarh.

... Appellant

...Respondent

Versus

Public Information Officer,

O/o GMADA, Sector-62, Mohali.

First Appellate Authority,

O/o GMADA, Sector-62, Mohali.

## Appeal Case No. 1506 of 2019

## PRESENT: Sh.Jatinder Singh as the Appellant None for the Respondent

## ORDER:

The case was last heard on **11.09.2019**. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent was absent.

The PIO was directed to provide the information ad explain the reasons for not attending to the RTI application within the time prescribed under the RTI Act. The PIO was also directed to bring entire record at the next date of hearing to the Commission.

## Hearing dated 10.12.2019:

The appellant claims that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent is absent. The appellant is interested to inspect the record. The appellant is directed to visit the office of PIO on **23.12.2019 at 11.00 AM** to inspect the record and get the relevant information. The PIO is directed to allow inspection of the record to the appellant and provide the information as per the RTI application.

The Commission however, observes that there has been an enormous delay of one year in providing the information. The Commission has taken a serious note of this and hereby directs the PIO to **show cause why penalty be not imposed on him under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 for not supplying the information within the statutorily prescribed period of time.** He/she should file an affidavit in this regard. If there are other persons responsible for the delay in providing the information, the PIO is directed to inform such persons of the show cause and direct them to appear before the Commission along with the written replies.

To come up for further hearing on 15.04.2020 at 11.00 AM.

Chandigarh Dated:10.12.2019 Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner



... Appellant

Sh Jatinder Singh, S/o Sh Bakhsish Singh, R/o 5777-B, Sector-38 (West), Chandigarh.

Versus

Public Information Officer,

O/o GMADA, Sector-62, Mohali.

**First Appellate Authority,** O/o GMADA, Sector-62, Mohali.

...Respondent

# Appeal Case No. 1507 of 2019

# PRESENT: Sh.Jatinder Singh as the Appellant None for the Respondent

#### ORDER:

The case was last heard on **11.09.2019**. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent was absent.

The PIO was directed to provide the information and explain the reasons for not attending to the RTI application within the time prescribed under the RTI Act. The PIO was also directed to bring entire record at the next date of hearing to the Commission.

#### Hearing dated 10.12.2019:

The appellant informed that the PIO has provided the partial information. The respondent is absent. The appellant is interested to inspect the record. The appellant is directed to visit the office of PIO on **23.12.2019 at 11.00 AM** to inspect the record and get the relevant information. The PIO is directed to allow inspection of the record to the appellant and provide the information as per the RTI application.

The Commission however, observes that there has been an enormous delay of one year in providing the information. The Commission has taken a serious note of this and hereby directs the PIO to **show cause why penalty be not imposed on him under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 for not supplying the information within the statutorily prescribed period of time.** He/she should file an affidavit in this regard. If there are other persons responsible for the delay in providing the information, the PIO is directed to inform such persons of the show cause and direct them to appear before the Commission along with the written replies.

To come up for further hearing on **15.04.2020 at 11.00 AM**.

Chandigarh Dated:10.12.2019 Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner



Sh Jatinder Singh, S/o Sh Bakhsish Singh, R/o 5777-B, Sector-38 (West), Chandigarh.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,

O/o GMADA, Sector-62, Mohali.

First Appellate Authority,

O/o GMADA, Sector-62, Mohali.

## Appeal Case No. 1508 of 2019

...Respondent

## PRESENT: Sh.Jatinder Singh as the Appellant None for the Respondent

## ORDER:

The case was last heard on 11.09.2019. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information. The appellant further informed that the PIO sought consent of 3<sup>rd</sup> party and the 3<sup>rd</sup> party has already given its consent for disclosure of information, but the PIO had not supplied the information.

The respondent was absent. The PIO was directed to provide the information and explain the reasons for not providing the information within the time prescribed as per the RTI Act. The PIO was also directed to bring entire record at the next date of hearing to the Commission.

## Hearing dated 10.12.2019:

The appellant informed that the PIO has provided the partial information. The respondent is absent. The appellant is interested to inspect the record. The appellant is directed to visit the office of PIO on **23.12.2019 at 11.00 AM** to inspect the record and get the relevant information. The PIO is directed to allow inspection of the record to the appellant and provide the information as per the RTI application.

The Commission however, observes that there has been an enormous delay of one year in providing the information. The Commission has taken a serious note of this and hereby directs the PIO to **show cause why penalty be not imposed on him under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 for not supplying the information within the statutorily prescribed period of time.** He/she should file an affidavit in this regard. If there are other persons responsible for the delay in providing the information, the PIO is directed to inform such persons of the show cause and direct them to appear before the Commission along with the written replies.

To come up for further hearing on 15.04.2020 at 11.00 AM.

Chandigarh Dated:10.12.2019 Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner



Sh. Sucha Singh, S/o Lt Sh Nasib Singh, VPO Mauli Baidwan, Sector-80, Mohali.

... Appellant

Versus

#### Public Information Officer,

O/o E.O, GMADA, Sector-62, Mohali.

**First Appellate Authority,** O/o GMADA, Sector-62, Mohali.

...Respondent

#### Appeal Case No. 1777 of 2019

#### PRESENT: Sh.Himmat Singh for the appellant None for the Respondent

#### ORDER:

The case was last heard on 18.09.2019. The appellant through RTI application dated 26.11.2018 has sought information regarding status of applications dated 28.06.2011, 15.07.2013 and 19.08.2013 regarding allotment of plot under oustee category from office of GMADA Mohali.

The respondent pleaded that the appellant to inspect the record and get the relevant information. The appellant was directed to visit the office of the PIO on the date fixed i.e. on 04.10.2019 at 11.00 AM and inspect the record. The PIO was directed to allow inspection of the record and provide the relevant information to the appellant.

#### Hearing dated 10.12.2019:

The appellant is present and informed that he has inspected the record but the information has not been provided. The respondent is absent.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on 03.03.2020 at 11.00 AM.

Chandigarh Dated 10.12.2019 Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner



Sh H.S Hundal, # 1, Dutt Road, Moga.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,** O/o SDM,

Moga.

First Appellate Authority,

O/o SDM, Moga.

...Respondent

# Appeal Case No. 3680 of 2018

## PRESENT: Sh.H.S.Hundal as the Appellant Sukhkiran,Supervisor O/s SDM Moga for the Respondent

# ORDER:

The case was first heard by Sh.A.S.Chanduraian, State Information Commissioner on 29.01.2019. Sh.Prince Kumar, RTI Clerk was present. A copy of the RTI application was handed over to him for forwarding the same to the respondent PIO concerned and the PIO was directed to provide the information as per RTI application.

The case was again heard on 26.02.2019 by Sh.A.S.Chanduraian, State Information Commissioner. Sh.Manveer Singh Bath, advocate appeared and submitted a reply dated 21.02.2019, a copy of which was handed over to the appellant and the appellant was asked to express his grievances in writing to the PIO. The PIO was directed to remove the same. On the next date of hearing which was heard on 20.03.2019, the appellant was absent and sought adjournment.

The case was last heard by this bench on 07.08.2019. The respondent was absent. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information.

Having gone through the reply, The Commission observed that the appellant has asked for information that what action has been taken on the observations of the State Information Commissioner in the said appeal cases. The PIO was directed to look at the RTI application and provide the action taken, if any, on the observations of the State Information Commissioner. Regarding point-5, if there is any information, it be provided. The Point-6 was ambiguous.

## Hearing dated 10.12.2019:

The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant is not satisfied and stated that he wants the action taken on his representations.

Hearing both the parties, the PIO is directed to provide status of the complaint to the appellant.

With the above order, the case is **disposed off and closed**.

Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner

Chandigarh Dated:10.12.2019



Sh H.S Hundal, # 1, Dutt Road, Moga.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,** O/o DC,

Moga.

First Appellate Authority,

O/o DC, Moga. ...Respondent

# Appeal Case No. 3692 of 2018

## PRESENT: Sh.H.S.Hundal as the Appellant Sh.Varinder Singh,Clerk O/o BDPO Moga for the Respondent

## ORDER:

The case was first heard by Sh.A.S.Chanduraian, State Information Commissioner on 29.01.2019. Sh.Davinder Kumar, RTI Clerk and Sh.Jagsir Singh, Panchayat Secretary were present. After hearin the parties concerned, it was considered that an official of DDPO Moga be called to represent the case and accordingly, a copy of the order was sent to the DDPO MOga to be present on the next date of hearing.

The case was again heard on 26.02.2019 by Sh.A.S.Chanduraian, State Information Commissioner. The respondent Sh.Avtar Singh Panchayat Secretary appeared and sought adjournment. On the next date of hearing which was held on 20.03.2019, Sh.Avtar Singh Panchayat Secretary brought a reply of the PIO-BDPO dated 19.03.2019 to be handed over to the appellant. The appellant was absent and sought adjournment. The PIO was directed to send the reply to the appellant through registered post. The appellant was given one more opportunity to express his grievances and the PIO was directed to remove the same.

The case was last heard on 07.08.2019 by this bench. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information. Having gone through the RTI application, the Commission observed that the appellant wants to know the action taken on his complaint and other documents. The PIO-BDPO was impleaded in the case and directed to provide the information as per the RTI application. The Point-5 was ambiguous.

## Hearing dated 10.12.2019:

The respondent present informed that a Committee has been constituted to take necessary action and the appellant has been informed of the same.

Hearing both the parties, the PIO is directed to provide current status of the enquiry. The PIO is also directed to provide the complete information once the enquiry is finalized.

With the above order, the case is disposed off and closed.

Sd/-(Khushwant Singh)

Chandigarh Dated:10.12.2019

State Information Commissioner



Sh Daljit Singh, S/o Sh Bachittar Singh, R/o 201/100, Block-J, BRS Nagar, Ludhiana.

... Appellant

Versus

# **Public Information Officer,**

O/o Chief Director, Vigilance Bureau, Sec-68, SAS Nagar.

First Appellate Authority,

O/o Chief Director, Vigilance Bureau, Sec-68, SAS Nagar.

...Respondent

# Appeal Case No. 4302 of 2018

#### PRESENT: Sh.Daljit Singh as the Appellant Sh.Rajesh Kumar, Inspector O/o Director Vigilance, Pb, Sh.Krishan Lal, Superintendent O/o Vigilance, Mohali and Sh.Raja Singh, HC O/o Vigilance Ludhiana for the Respondent

## ORDER:

The case was first heard on 23.01.2019 by Sh.A.S.Chanduraian, State Information Commissioner. Sh.Avtar Singh Inspector was present. After examining the record, it was found that the PIO sent a reply to the appellant vide letter dated 17.01.2019 stating that the information cannot be supplied and is exempt u/s 8(1)(h) of the RTI Act. After hearing both the parties, the investigating officer of SSP Vigilance Bureau Pb Ludhiana was impleaded and directed to be present on the next date of hearing.

On the next date of hearing which was held on 27.02.2019. Sh.Anil Kumar, ASI O/o SSP Vigilance Bureau Ludhiana appeared. The appellant claimed that the information has not been provided by the PIO. The PIO was directed to file a fresh reply in wiring on the queries raised by the appellant. On the hearing of 20.03.2019, Sh.Jaswant Singh, ASI Vigilance Bureau Mohali and Sh.Manmohan Singh, ASI O/o SSP Vigilance Bureau, Ludhiana appeared. On examining the record, it was found that the PIO vide letter dated 13.03.2019 has sent a reply to the appellant stating that the case No.38 dated 18.05.2002 was registered on the basis of source report and the information on source report is exempt u/s 8(1)(h) of the RTI Act.

The case was last heard by this bench on 07.08.2019. The respondent present pleaded that the reply has been sent to the appellant. The appellant was not satisfied and wanted preliminary report before registration of the FIR.

#### Hearing dated 10.12.2019:

The respondent present from the office of Director Vigilance pleaded that as per order of the High Court, reinvestigation is going on and is still pending. The respondent further pleaded that since the source report is confidential to the investigating agency it cannot be provided .

Hearing both the parties, The PIO is directed to appropriately address point-2 and provide relevant manual/instructions of the State Govt. to be followed before filing the FIR. The point-1 to be adjudicated on the next date of hearing.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on 03.03.2020 at 11.00AM.

Chandigarh Dated:10.12.2019 Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner



Sh Raj Singh, S/o Sh Ishar Singh, Village Todarwal, P.O Babarpur, Tehsil Nabha, Distt Patiala.

... Appellant

Versus

#### **Public Information Officer,**

O/o SSP, Patiala.

# **First Appellate Authority,** O/o IGP, Patiala Range,

Patiala.

# ...Respondent

# Appeal Case No. 1764 of 2019

# PRESENT: None for the Appellant Sh.Sukhbahal Singh, HC for the Respondent

## ORDER:

The case was last heard on 18.09.2019. The appellant through RTI application dated 26.11.2018 sought information regarding FIR No.34/2017 PS - enquiry report alongwith copies of zimnies from the office of SSP Patiala.

The respondent present submitted a letter dated 16.09.2019 from the PIO stating that since as per report of concerned police station, the challan has been presented in the court, thus information cannot be provided and the reply has been sent to the appellant. The appellant was absent. The case was adjourned.

## Hearing dated 10.12.2019:

The respondent present pleaded that since the investigation is complete and the challan alongwith the case file has been presented in the court, the information cannot be provided.

The appellant is absent and vide email has sought adjournment.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **17.02.2020 at 11.00 AM**.

Chandigarh Dated 10.12.2019 Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner