



Smt. Sunita Bakshi,  
W/o Sh. K.K Bakshi,  
H.No. 74/8, Shiv Mandir Street,  
New Swaraj Nagar, Mundi Kharar, Distt Mohali.

Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Senior Superintendent of Police,  
Mohali.

Respondent

**Complaint Case No.1147/2018**

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA	Date of Second Appeal
02.07.2018	Nil	Nil	Nil	24.10.2018

**Present:** Smt. Sunita Bakshi, Complainant in person.  
HC Lakhwinder Singh, PS: City, Kharar – for Respondent.

**ORDER**

The following order was made by this forum on 12.02.2019:

*“The complainant is aggrieved with the inaction of the police on complaint filed by her against one Master Manoj for having thieved her mobile phone, which according to her is highly priced. The respondents are absent and no written reply has been filed by them. The Commission takes serious note of their absence. They are directed to provide the information to the complainant immediately under intimation to the Commission, failing which the Commission shall be constrained to take penal action against them.”*

*“The case has come up today. The respondent represented by Constable Sunil Kumar submits that original complaint was marked to one Sh. Raj Kumar, ASI who has yet to apprise the police station authorities of the action having been taken on the same. The respondent seeks sometime to inform the complainant.*

*The request is acceded. The matter shall be heard on 14.03.2019 at 11.30 AM. Before that the complainant should be informed about the status of enquiry into her complaint.”*

Contd...page...2



-2-

**Complaint Case No.1147/2018**

It is a long standing case. Despite having been afforded opportunities the respondents have failed to file a written reply to the notice of the Commission. The Commission takes a strong exception to the lackadaisical attitude of the respondents. They are once again advised to do the needful failing which it shall be presumed that they are willfully sitting over the information and penal consequences shall follow.

To come up on **30.05.2019 at 11.30 AM.**

**Sd/-**

**11.04.2019**

**(Yashvir Mahajan)  
State Information Commissioner**



Sh. Devi Singh,  
S/o Sh. Milkhi Ram,  
R/o Village-Manku Majra,  
Tehsil-Anandpur Sahib,  
Distt. Ropar.

Sh. Roop Chand,  
S/o Sh. Pooran Chand,  
R/o Village- Manku Majra,  
Tehsil – Anandpur Sahib,  
District Ropar

Complainants

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Block Development and Panchayat Officer,  
Nurpur Bedi, Distt. Ropar.

Respondent

**Complaint Case Nos.77 and 78 of 2019**

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA	Date of Second Appeal
23.05.2018/25.01.2018	Nil	Nil	Nil	16.01.2019

**Present: None.**

**ORDER**

The complainant has sent a request through e.mail to defer the matter. His request is accepted. Meanwhile, the respondent shall ensure that the admissible information is provided.

To come up **30.05.2019 at 11.30 AM.**

Sd/-

**11.04.2019**

**(Yashvir Mahajan)  
State Information Commissioner**



Sh. Kuldip Singh Walia,  
S/o Sh. Harjit Singh,  
R/o Flat No. 1506/2<sup>nd</sup> floor,  
Housefed Complex, Banur,  
Mohalli.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Deputy Commissioner,  
District Complex, SAS Nagar.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o Deputy Commissioner,  
District Complex, SAS Nagar.

Respondents

**Appeal Case No.486/2019**

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA	Date of Second Appeal
13.10.2018	Nil	01.12.2018	Nil	23.01.2019

**Present:** Sh. Kuldip Singh Walia, Appellant in person.  
Smt. Jaswant Kaur, Superintendent, SDM Office, SAS Nagar – for Respondents.

**ORDER**

The following order was made by this forum on 14.03.2019:

*“Essentially, the appellant is aggrieved with the lack of vital infrastructural facilities in the residential complex of Housefed in Banur. He had made a complaint with the Deputy Commissioner, Mohali. Having not received the appropriate response he has been constrained to file an appeal with the Commission to learn the outcome of his complaint.*

*Smt. Jaswant Kaur appearing on behalf of the respondents says that a couple of issues about vandalism created by students of nearby colleges have been redressed. However, his concern about the fire safety system in the complex is yet to be resolved. The respondent assures that they shall duly inform the Commission after taking up the appropriate action.”*

The case has come up for hearing today. In compliance with the order of the Commission the SDM had desired the Assistant Registrar (Cooperative Societies), Phase I, Mohali to



-2-

**Appeal Case No.486/2019**

apprise the appellant of the status of the fire safety apparatus in the Society and the action being taken to address the infirmity, if any.

None is present on behalf of the Assistant Registrar (Cooperative Societies), Mohali. He is impleaded as a necessary party and is desired to file a written reply to the Commission before the next date of hearing positively. Any laxity shall be viewed seriously.

To come up on **30.05.2019 at 11.30 AM.**

**Sd/-**

**11.04.2019**

**(Yashvir Mahajan)  
State Information Commissioner**

**CC The Assistant Registrar (Cooperative Societies), Milk Plant, Phase 1, SAS  
Nagar, for n/a.**



Sh. Mukhtiar Singh,  
S/o Sh. Sewa Singh,  
R/o Village Jionpura (Dugal),  
Tehsil-Patran, Distt. Patiala.

Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Block Development and Panchayat Officer,  
Patran, Distt. Patiala.

Respondent

**Complaint Case No.70/2019**

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA	Date of Second Appeal
26.07.2018	Nil	Nil	Nil	15.01.2019

**Present:** Sh. Mukhtiar Singh, Complainant in person.  
None on behalf of the Respondent.

**ORDER**

The following order was passed by this forum on 14.03.2019:

*"The appellant vide an application dated 26.07.2018 had sought an information about the grants received by the gram panchayat of Village Jeunpura Duggal, Tehsil Patran and the development works having been undertaken by them.*

*The respondents are absent. No written reply has also been filed to the notice of the Commission. The Commission takes a serious view of the same. Another opportunity is afforded to the respondent to provide him the information and explain their conduct having failed to provide the information within the stipulated time."*

The respondent is absent consecutively. Neither information has been supplied nor a written reply has been filed to the notice of the Commission. The Commission believes that the respondent is willfully denying the information to the complainant.



-2-

**Complaint Case No.70/2019**

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

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

To come up on **30.05.2019 at 11.30 AM.**

**Sd/-**

**11.04.2019**

**(Yashvir Mahajan)  
State Information Commissioner**



Sh. Ashwani Kumar Prashar,  
R/o 704, Green Valley Towers,  
Opposite DPS School,  
Old Ambala Kalka Road,  
P.O Dhakoli, Zirakpur, Mohali.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Municipal Council,  
Zirakpur, Mohali.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o Municipal Council,  
Zirakpur, Mohali.

Respondents

**Appeal Case No.507/2019**

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA	Date of Second Appeal
29.10.2018	Nil	04.12.2018	Nil	08.01.2019

**Present:** None is present on behalf of the Appellant.  
Sh. Lakhvir Singh, Building Inspector, MC Office, Zirakpur – for Respondents.

**ORDER**

The appellant seemingly is aggrieved with the lack of facilities for the persons with disabilities in a Group Housing Project namely; Green Valley Towers, Zirakpur. He has put some posers and questions to the respondents and sought information about the issue of completion certificate to the builders without fulfilling the requisite obligations.

The Commission feels that the complaint is more of a grievance rather than an application under the RTI Act. Such a redressal is not within the domain of this forum. Nonetheless, the Commission advises the E.O., MC, Zirakpur to look into it and remove the deficiencies pointed out in the application.

**Disposed.**

**Sd/-**

**11.04.2019**

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





Sh. Gian Singh Bajwa,  
House no. 39, Sector 18 A,  
Chandigarh.

Appellant

Versus

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

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o Director of Rural and Development Panchayat,  
Department of Rural & Development Panchayat,  
Sector-62, S.A.S Nagar.

Respondents

**Appeal Case No.3039/2018**

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA
23.03.2018	Nil	04.05.2018	Nil

**Present:** Sh. Gian Singh Bajwa, Appellant in person.  
Sh. Balkar Singh, Panchayat Secretary, BDPO Office, Gurdaspur – for Respondents.

**ORDER**

The following order was passed by the Commission on 12.03.2019:

*“The respondents are absent. The Commission understands that the polling for the panchayat elections in the State of Punjab is being held shortly. Their absence may be attributed to their occupation with the same.*

*The appellant submits that the information sent by respondents is deficient. Even the one sent is uncertified. The appellant is directed to specify the deficiency and intimate it to the respondents with a copy to the Commission. The respondents shall ensure that they make good the deficiency positively and inform the Commission before the next date of hearing.”*

*“The case has come up for hearing today. The respondents are still absent. Nothing has been heard from them also. According to the appellant the status quo remains despite a communication sent by the appellant to the respondents on 11.01.2019. The Commission takes a serious note of the apathy shown by the respondents. Apparently they have rendered themselves liable for imposition of penalty.*

Contd....page...2



-2-

**Appeal Case No.3039/2018**

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

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

*“The case has come up today for hearing. Sh. Balkar Singh, Panchayat Secretary has come present on behalf of the respondents. He has provided the certified copies of the resolutions passed on 25.04.1993 and 05.09.2013 to the proxy of the appellant on spot. However, this does not meet the complete requisition made in the original application. The respondents are once again advised to give point-wise reply to the appellant without further loss of time. Be it noted that they are already under show cause notice. Any laxity shall follow penal consequences.”*

The matter has again been taken up today. The deficiencies have been made good by the

Contd....page...3



-3-

**Appeal Case No.3039/2018**

Respondents. A copy of the application on the basis of which the resolution in contention had been passed, is not available on the record as per the respondents. The Commission feels that sufficient information has been given. No further intervention is called for.

**Disposed.**

**Sd/-**

**11.04.2019**

**(Yashvir Mahajan)  
State Information Commissioner**



Sh. Sohan Singh,  
S/o Sh. Sucha Singh,  
Village-Bara, PO-Pathreri Jattan,  
Tehsil & Distt. Roopnagar.

Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Block Development & Panchayat Officer,  
Roopnagar.

Respondent

**Complaint Case No.958/2018**

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA
18.07.2018	Nil	Nil	Nil

**Present:** None on behalf of the Complainant.  
Sh. Ranjit Singh, Panchayat Secretary, BDPO Office, Roopnagar – for Respondent.

**ORDER**

The following order was made by this forum on 12.03.2019:

*“The appellant is seeking a copy of the proceedings book of the gram panchayat of village Bara, Tehsil and District Ropar entailing the record of the meetings held during the period from 01.01.2013 to 17.07.2018 onwards. The details of various grants received and the expenditure incurred with their supporting bills etc. have also been sought.*

*Sh. Ranjit Singh, Panchayat Secretary appearing on behalf of the respondent says that they have provided him the entire information. The perusal of the reply sent suggests that the requisition has been dismissed as unsustainable for the reason of its being in question form.*

*The Commission feels that the provision of record for five years shall be an onerous affair and certainly consume a massive stationery. It shall be in the fitness of things that an inspection of the record is allowed and the complainant is provided with certified copies of the documents he is looking for. The Commission feels that one hundred fifty pages at the most should suffice to serve the public cause. The respondent shall convey him the specific time after mutually arriving at a convenient date and clinch the aforesaid directions.”*

*“The case has come up today. The complainant is absent. Sh. Ranjit Singh,*

Contd....page...2



-2-

**Complaint Case No.958/2018**

*Panchayat Secretary, appearing on behalf of the respondent says that the appellant did not report despite having been asked on numerous occasions. The respondent is directed to convey him a definite date and time in writing for the inspection of record and provide him the certified copies as already mentioned in the aforesaid order.”*

*“The case has again come up today for hearing. There is a communication gap between the Parties. Resultantly, the inspection has not matured. The Commission desires that the complainant shall visit the office of the BDPO, Roopnagar on 19.03.2019 at 11.00 AM. The Panchayat Secretary shall make him the record available for inspection and comply with the instructions already issued above.”*

The matter has again been taken up today. Sh. Ranjit Singh, Panchayat Secretary appearing on behalf of the respondents has produced an acknowledgement issued by the wife of Sh. Sohan Singh, Complainant. As he is absent the Commission feels that he is satisfied with the information thus provided to him.

**Disposed.**

**Sd/-**

**11.04.2019**

**(Yashvir Mahajan)  
State Information Commissioner**



Ms Priti Puri,  
R/o # 1803, Ground Floor, Housefed Complex,  
Phase-X, Mohali.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Director,  
Rural Dev. & Panchayats, Punjab,  
Phase-8 S.A.S Nagar.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o Director of Rural and Development Panchayats,  
Punjab, Phase-8, S.A.S Nagar.

Respondents

**Appeal Case No.3032/2018**

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA
21.03.2018	Nil	28.04.2018	Nil

**Present:** **Ms. Priti Puri, Appellant in person.**  
**Sh. Sukhminder Singh, Sr. Assistant, O/o DPI (EE), Punjab – for Respondents.**

**ORDER**

The following order was passed by this forum on 12.03.2019:

*“The appellant had sought to know the information about vacancy position in the year 2007 for the recruitment of teachers in the office of Zila Parishad, Amritsar.*

*The respondents state that the entire record has been transferred to the Department of Education and this information is likely to be available in the office of the District Education Officer (EE), Amritsar. They were required to immediately transfer her application to the concerned Public Authority under Section 6(3) of the RTI Act. Nonetheless, they are directed to locate the source of information and transfer the application to the Public Authority within three days from today. The concerned Authority shall provide the information within thirty days of receipt of the communication.”*

*“The case has come up today. Sh. Jasbir Singh, Sr. Assistant appearing on behalf of the respondents submits that in compliance with the order of the Commission her application was transferred to the ADC (Dev.), Amritsar.*

*The Additional Deputy Commissioner ( Dev.), Amritsar is required to file a reply besides arranging to provide the information before the next date of hearing positively.”*

Contd...page...2



-2-

**Appeal Case No.3032/2018**

*“Sh. Jasbir Singh, Senior Assistant appearing on behalf of the respondents submits that the entire record has been transferred to the Director of Public Instructions (EE), Punjab, Phase - VIII, SAS Nagar (Mohali). The appeal is directed to the Director of Public Instructions (EE), Punjab, with the direction to do the needful quickly. The Commission understands that the Rural Development and Panchayats Department has provided the information available with them. Accordingly, they are exempt from further appearance in the proceedings.”*

The matter has again been taken up today. Vide aforesaid order the DPI (EE) was directed to provide the information as the Director of Rural Development & Panchayats, Pb., had conveyed in writing that the entire record from scratch was transferred to the DPI (EE).

The proxy of the DPI (EE) today appeared and has submitted a memo wherein they have denied the receipt of record in contention. They have desired to know the relevant memo under which the record in contention was transferred. Their contention seems logical. The Director of Rural Dev. & Panchayats, Punjab, vide order dated 12.03.2019 were exempt from hearing. As the DPI (EE) denies their contention they are once again directed to communicate to the Commission the letter or memo vide which the record as claimed by them, was transferred to the DPI (EE).

It is an important issue. About more than 1500 teachers were recruited in the year 2007. The contention that advertisement in the newspapers vide which the applications were sought, is not traceable does not cut ice. The respondents in both the departments are directed to put down their head in locating the advertisement in question failing which the Commission shall take adverse cognizance of the same and proceed to impose penalty for the default.

To come up on **30.05.2019 at 11.30 AM.**

**11.04.2019**

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

**CC: The Director of Public Instructions (EE), Punjab, Phase VIII, SAS Nagar (Mohali) for n/a.**



Sh. Lakhveer Singh,  
S/o Sh. Jeet Ram,  
Vice President, Dr. Ambedkar Sewa Societies,  
Village Lakhawal Kalan,  
Tehsil-Samrala, Ludhiana.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Block Development and Panchayat Officer,  
Block Sri Machhiwara Sahib, Distt. Ludhiana.

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

Respondents

**Appeal Case No.2651/2018**

Date of RTI application: 19.04.2018  
Date of First Appeal : 16.02.2018  
Date of Order of FAA or Reply: Nil  
Date of 2<sup>nd</sup> Appeal/complaint: 03.08.2018

**Present:** **None on behalf of the Appellant.**  
**Sh. Raghbir Singh, Panchayat Secretary, BDPO office, Sri Machhiwara Sahib –**  
**for Respondents.**

**ORDER**

The following order was passed by this forum on 12.03.2019:

*“The appellant has sought information pertaining to various activities of the gram panchayat of village Lakhawal Kalan, Block Machhiwara.*

*Sh. Raghbir Singh, Panchayat Secretary, who is the custodian of the record, in question says that his predecessor has not handed over the record. He further says that the senior functionaries of the Department are in picture. At their behest a criminal case for the loss/malafidely withholding of the official record has been lodged against him. The Commission would like to see a copy of the FIR thus lodged to proceed further in the matter. The respondent Panchayat Secretary is directed to send it across to the Commission before the next date of hearing. Meanwhile, he shall ensure to recast the record to the extent possible and arrange to provide it to the appellant to the extent possible.”*

*“The case has come up today. Sh. Raghbir Singh, Panchayat Secretary maintains that the charge has not been handed over to him and as such the information could not be provided.*

Contd.....page...2





-2-

**Appeal Case No.2651/2018**

*He further says that the BDPO, Sri Machhiwara Sahib was to attend the Court in person to explain the case. However, due to a bereavement in the family, she has not been able to join the proceedings.”*

*“Sh. Raghbir Singh, Panchayat Secretary appearing on behalf of the respondents says that the department is holding an enquiry into the matter. He has brought along information to the extent of 300 plus pages which has been handed over on spot to the appellant. The appellant finds it to be deficient. He should point-out the deficiency in writing to the respondents who shall make it good by providing the rest of the information before the next date of hearing.”*

*“The case has again come up for hearing today. The appellant says that the copies of the record supplied to him does not reveal the complete details as some of the information has been camouflaged and concealed in making the photo stat copies. He again alleges that there has been embezzlement of the funds. In the scenario the Commission feels that the appellant should be allowed inspection of the record. The BDPO, Sri Machhiwara Sahib shall arrange to get the needful done on 25.03.2019 at 11.00 AM and the respondents shall provide him certified copies of the documents to the extent of 150 pages only besides the ones already provided.”*

The matter has again been taken up today. Sh. Raghbir Singh, Panchayat Secretary appearing on behalf of the respondents submits that in compliance with the aforementioned order an inspection was got clinched and the documents identified by him were provided to him.

The appellant is absent. The Commission has no reason to differ with the submissions of the Panchayat Secretary. As the information has been provided no action seems called for.

**Disposed.**

**Sd/-**

**11.04.2019**

**(Yashvir Mahajan)  
State Information Commissioner**



Sh. Wassan Singh Goraya,  
 S/o Sh. Ajit Singh,  
 R/o 120 D, Sector-79,  
 Airport Road, Mohali.

Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
 O/o Director,  
 Technical Education and Industrial Training,  
 Plot No. 1 – A, Sector-36, Chandigarh.

Respondent

**Complaint Case No.1007/2018**

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA	Date of Second Appeal/ Complaint
25.07.2018	07.08.2018	Nil	Nil	21.09.2018

**Present:** Sh. Wassan Singh Goraya, Complainant in person.  
 Sh. Baldev Singh, Sr. Assistant, O/o DTE (Tech. Wing) – for Respondent.

**ORDER**

This case has been allocated to this bench on the request of Sh. Sanjeev Garg, Ld. SIC, who had observed that the conduct of the complainant is non-cooperative and he was unable to successfully clinch the matter. This bench has gone through the original application of the complainant. Essentially, he is seeking information about the appointment of Sh. Sandeep Singh Kaura, Joint. M.D., Rayat Bahra Group of Institutions as Honorary Adviser to the Punjab Skill Development Mission and the various issues concerned about him.

Sh. Baldev Singh, Sr. Assistant appearing on behalf of the respondent says that the entire record pertaining to the application lying with them, has been supplied and the one concerned with the Maharaja Ranjit Singh Punjab Technical University, Bathinda and the Punjab Skill Development Mission were referred to them under 6(3) of the RTI Act for appropriate action. The complainant is not satisfied with the information provided to him by the Maharaja Ranjit Singh Punjab Technical University, Bathinda. The PIO, O/o Maharaja Ranjit Singh Punjab Technical University, Bathinda is directed to send across to him the documents relating to his foreign visit and file a written



-2-

**Complaint Case No.1007/2018**

reply to the Commission as well.

The PIO, Punjab Skill Development Mission, SCO No. 149-52, Sector 17 C, Chandigarh is also directed to file their contention on the points of application from Sr. No. 1 to 4.

To come up on **04.06.2019 at 11.30 AM.**

**Sd/-**

**11.04.2019**

**(Yashvir Mahajan)  
State Information Commissioner**

**CC: The PIO, O/o Maharaja Ranjit Singh Punjab Technical University, Dabwali Road, Batinda for n/a.**

**CC: The PIO, O/o Punjab Skill Development Mission, Sector 17 C, Chandigarh, for n/a.**