

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,**

**Sector 16, Chandigarh.**

**Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100**

**Email: - [psic22@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in)**

**Visit us: - [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)**



**Sh. Navneet Singhania (8837867784)**

# 1609/2, Ram Gali,  
Katra Ahluwalia, Amritsar

Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**

O/o Distt. Transport Officer, Amritsar

**First Appellate Authority**

O/o Distt. Transport Officer, Amritsar

Respondent

**Appeal Case No.: 2535 of 2021**

**Heard through CISCO WEBEX**

**Present:** None present.

**Order**

1. Refer to earlier order dated: 10.11.2021 where both the parties were absent without any intimation to the Commission despite being aware about the date of hearing. A final opportunity was awarded to both the parties to represent their case on the next date of hearing failing which; appropriate order in their absence shall be passed. The case was adjourned for 11.5.2022.
2. In today's hearing, both the parties are again absent without any intimation to the Commission.
3. In view of non-availability of both the parties second time, the court does not see any further course of action required as the appellant does not follow up the case for information, therefore, the present case stands **disposed of & closed**. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

**Dated: 11.05.2022 (11:00 A.M.)**

**(Anumit Singh Sodhi)**  
**State Information Commissioner**  
**Punjab**

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

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

Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100

Email: - [psic22@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in)

Visit us: - [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)



**Sh. Ravinder Kataria (9463133590/8544848300)**

# New Sant Fateh Singh Nagar,  
Dugri Road,  
Ludhiana 141002.

Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**

O/o Regional Transport Authority, Hoshiarpur

**First Appellate Authority**

O/o Regional Transport Authority, Hoshiarpur

Respondent

**Appeal Case No.: 3836 of 2021**  
**Hearing through CISCO WEBEX**

Present: **(i) Sh. Ravinder Kataria - appellant**

**(ii) For the respondent: Sh. Surinder Bandari, (JA-cum-PIO ) (9877661361)**

Order

1. The RTI application is dated 5.3.2021 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter FAA) on 9.4.2021 and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 26.8.2021 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act). Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for hearing through CISCO WEBEX on 11.5.2022 i.e. today
2. In today's hearing, both the parties are present. The respondent states that the deficiencies pointed by the appellant have been removed.
3. The appellant states that he has received complete information and states that he has no objection to close this case.
4. In view of the observations noted above, the instant case is **disposed of**. Copies of this decision be sent to the parties.

**Dated: 11.05.2022 (11:00 A.M.)**

**(Anumit Singh Sodhi)**  
**State Information Commissioner**  
**Punjab**

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,**

**Sector 16, Chandigarh.**

**Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100**

**Email: - [psic22@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in)**

**Visit us: - [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)**



**Sh. Ravinder Kataria (9463133590/8544848300)**

# New Sant Fateh Singh Nagar,  
Dugri Road,  
Ludhiana 141002.

Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**

O/o Regional Transport Authority, Hoshiarpur

**First Appellate Authority**

O/o Regional Transport Authority, Hoshiarpur

Respondent

**Appeal Case No.: 3837 of 2021**  
**Hearing through CISCO WEBEX**

**Present:**

**(i) Sh. Ravinder Kataria - appellant**

**(ii) For the respondent: Sh. Surinder Bandari (JA-cum- PIO) (9877661361)**

**ORDER**

1. The RTI application is dated 5.3.2021 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter FAA) on 9.4.2021 and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 26.8.2021 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act). Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for hearing through CISCO WEBEX on 11.5.2022 i.e. today
2. In today's hearing, both the parties are present.
3. The appellant states that he has received most of the information but some information is still left out to be supplied.
4. The respondent requests the court that inspection of record may be fixed and the rest of information shall also be supplied after the inspection of record.
5. In view of request and assurance of the respondent, Sh. Surinder Bhandari, the court advises the appellant to go for inspection of record and collect the pending information. On the assurance of the respondent, no further cause of action is required. Therefore, the instant case is **disposed of**. Copies of this decision be sent to the parties.

**Dated: 11.05.2022 (11:00 A.M.)**

**(Anumit Singh Sodhi)**  
**State Information Commissioner**  
**Punjab**

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,**  
**Sector 16, Chandigarh.**  
Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100  
Email: - [psic22@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in)  
Visit us: - [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)



**Sh. Ravinder Kataria (9463133590/8544848300)**  
# New Sant Fateh Singh Nagar,  
Dugri Road,  
Ludhiana 141002.

Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**  
O/o Regional Transport Authority, Hoshiarpur

**First Appellate Authority**  
O/o Regional Transport Authority, Hoshiarpur

Respondent

**Appeal Case No.: 3838 of 2021**  
**Hearing through CISCO WEBEX**

**Present:** (i) Sh. Ravinder Kataria - appellant  
(ii) For the respondent: Sh. Surinder Bandari (JA-cum- PIO) (9877661361)

**ORDER**

1. The RTI application is dated 5.3.2021 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter FAA) on 9.4.2021 and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 26.8.2021 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act). Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for hearing through CISCO WEBEX on 11.5.2022 i.e. today
2. In today's hearing, both the parties are present.
3. The appellant states that he has received most of the information but some information is still left out to be supplied.
4. The respondent requests the court that inspection of record may be fixed and the rest of information shall also be supplied after the inspection of record.
5. In view of request and assurance of the respondent, Sh. Surinder Bhandari, the court advises the appellant to go for inspection of record and collect the pending information. On the assurance of the respondent, no further cause of action is required. Therefore, the instant case is **disposed of**. Copies of this decision be sent to the parties.

**Dated: 11.05.2022 (11:00 A.M.)**

**(Anumit Singh Sodhi)**  
**State Information Commissioner**  
**Punjab**

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,**

**Sector 16, Chandigarh.**

**Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100**

**Email: - [psic22@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in)**

**Visit us: - [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)**



Appellant

**Sh. Gurpreet Singh(7009057122)**

s/o Sh. Gurmukh Singh,  
# 1351, Phase-II,  
Urban Estate, Patiala

Versus

**Public Information Officer**

O/o Maharaja Ranjit Singh Pb. Technical  
University, Bathinda

**First Appellate Authority**

O/o Maharaja Ranjit Singh Pb. Technical  
University, Bathinda

Respondent

**Appeal Case No.: 3884 of 2021**  
**Hearing through CISCO WEBEX**

**Present:**

**(i) Sh. Gurpreet Singh - appellant**

**(ii) For the respondent: Sh. Arshwinder Singh (SA-Legal) (9417940065)**

**ORDER**

1. The RTI application is dated 13.5.2021 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter FAA) on 22.6.2021 and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 26.8.2021 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act). Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for hearing through CISCO WEBEX on 11.5.2022 i.e. today
2. In today's hearing, both the parties are present.
3. The respondent states that information has already been provided to the appellant vide letter 1520 dated 16.06.2021 with regard to RTI application demanding information in connection with Sh. Harbans Singh who is working as Sr. Assistant on a pay scale of 10300-34800/- ( grade pay 4400/-) of on various occasions but the appellant denies the same. A copy of the supplied information is received in the Commission vide letter no. 1302 dated 05.05.2022 along with supporting documents, which are taken on record.
4. In view of the above observations, I am of the considered view supplied reply is satisfactory. Respondent PIO is directed to send a copy of the supplied information again to the appellant under intimation to the Commission immediately.
5. In view of the observations noted above, the instant case is **disposed of**. Copies of this decision be sent to the parties.

**Dated: 11.05.2022 (11:00 A.M.)**

**(Anumit Singh Sodhi)**  
**State Information Commissioner**  
**Punjab**

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,**

**Sector 16, Chandigarh.**

**Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100**

**Email: - [psic22@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in)**

**Visit us: - [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)**



**Sh. Bhola Singh(7009057122)**

s/o Sh. Sukhdev Singh,  
R/o Swach (Kamalo), Tehsil Maur,  
Distt. Bathinda

Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**

O/o SHO, Rama, Distt. Bathinda

**Remanded Back:**

**First Appellate Authority (By Name)**

**(Regd. Post)** O/o SHO, Rama, Distt. Bathinda

Encl. RTI application

Respondent

**Complaint case No.: 1079 of 2021**

**Hearing through CISCO WEBEX**

**Present:**

(i) Complainant- Sh. Bhola Singh

(ii) For the respondent: Sh. Harjit Singh, (7508018117)

**ORDER**

1. The RTI application is dated 19.7.2021 vide which the complainant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. A complaint was filed in the Commission on 26.8.2021 under Section 18 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act). Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for hearing through CISCO WEBEX on 11.5.2022 i.e. today.
2. In today's hearing, the complainant is absent. The respondent Sh. Harjit Singh states that the department has already provided the information to the complainant but till date ambiguity has not been pointed out by the complainant.
3. After hearing the respondent and going through the file, it is observed that this is the complaint case. The attention of the Complainant is drawn to the decision of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India rendered on 12.12.2011 in Civil Appeal Nos. Nos.10787 – 10788 of 2011 (arising out of SLP © No.32768-32769/2010)- Chief Information Commissioner and another Vs. State of Manipur and another, in Para 31 whereof, it has been held that while entertaining a complaint case under Section 18 of the RTI Act, 2005, the Commissioners have no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for an access to the information which is as under:-  
(31. We uphold the said contention and do not find any error in the impugned judgment of the High Court whereby it has been held that the Commissioner while entertaining a complaint under Section 18 of the said Act has no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for access to the information).
4. As such, since the complainant has approached the Commission under the provision of Section 18 of the RTI Act, 2005, no directions for providing further information can be given by the Commission.
5. Since there is an alternative and efficacious remedy of first appeal available to the Complainant under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, which has not been availed in the instant case and the First Appellate Authority has not had the occasion to review the decision of the PIO, as envisaged under the RTI Act by passing a detailed well reasoned speaking order. In case the complainant has any grouse, he is advised to challenge the response of the PIO before the designated First Appellate Authority, as envisaged under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, who will decide the matter in accordance with the provisions of the RTI Act within the prescribed time limit, after giving an opportunity of hearing to all concerned, by passing a speaking order.
6. If, however, the complainant does not feel satisfied with the decision of the First Appellate Authority, he will be at liberty to file a Second Appeal before the Commission under Section 19(3) of the RTI Act, 2005.
7. In view of the observations noted above, the instant case is **disposed of**. Copies of this decision be sent to the parties **through registered post**.

**Dated: 11.05.2022 (11:00 A.M.)**

**(Anumit Singh Sodhi)**  
**State Information Commissioner**  
**Punjab**

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,**

**Sector 16, Chandigarh.**

**Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100**

**Email: - [psic22@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in)**

**Visit us: - [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)**



**Sh. Gurdeep Singh(9464423174)**  
Late s/o Sh. Mulkha Singh,  
Gobind Nagar, Phase-2,  
Opp. Gurudwara Kalgidhar, Kahnuwan Road,  
Batala, Distt. Gurdaspur

Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**  
O/o Director, State Transport Pb.,  
Chandigarh

**Remanded Back:**

**(Regd. Post) First Appellate Authority (By Name)**  
O/o Director, State Transport Pb.,  
Chandigarh

Encl. RTI application

Respondent

**Complaint case No.: 1084 of 2021**  
**Hearing through CISCO WEBEX**

**Present:** (i) Sh. Gurdeep Singh – Complainant – not present.  
(ii) For the respondent: Sh. Darshan Singh (SA) (7508018117)

**ORDER**

1. The RTI application is dated 18.3.2021 vide which the complainant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. A complaint was filed in the Commission on 25.8.2021 under Section 18 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act). Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for hearing through CISCO WEBEX on 11.5.2022 i.e. today.
2. In today's hearing, complainant is not present but a letter dated 11.03.2022 is received in the Commission vide diary no. 5524 dated 16.03.2022 requesting therein to adjourn this case after 14.09.2022. This letter is taken on record.
3. The respondent states that they have sent the information to the complainant yesterday.
4. After hearing the respondent and going through the file, it is observed that this is the complaint case. The attention of the Complainant is drawn to the decision of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India rendered on 12.12.2011 in Civil Appeal Nos. Nos.10787 – 10788 of 2011 (arising out of SLP © No.32768-32769/2010)- Chief Information Commissioner and another Vs. State of Manipur and another, in Para 31 whereof, it has been held that while entertaining a complaint case under Section 18 of the RTI Act , 2005, the Commissioners have no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for an access to the information which is as under:-  
(31. We uphold the said contention and do not find any error in the impugned judgment of the High Court whereby it has been held that the Commissioner while entertaining a complaint under Section 18 of the said Act has no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for access to the information).
5. As such, since the complainant has approached the Commission under the provision of Section 18 of the RTI Act, 2005, no directions for providing further information can be given by the Commission.
6. Since there is an alternative and efficacious remedy of first appeal available to the Complainant under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, which has not been availed in the instant case and the First Appellate Authority has not had the occasion to review the decision of the PIO, as envisaged under the RTI Act by passing a detailed well reasoned speaking order. In case the complainant has any grouse, he is advised to challenge the response of the PIO before the designated First Appellate Authority, as envisaged under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, who will decide the matter in accordance with the provisions of the RTI Act within the prescribed time limit, after giving an opportunity of hearing to all concerned, by passing a speaking order.
7. If, however, the complainant does not feel satisfied with the decision of the First Appellate Authority, he will be at liberty to file a Second Appeal before the Commission under Section 19(3) of the RTI Act, 2005.
8. In view of the observations noted above, the instant case is **disposed of**. Copies of this decision be sent to the parties **through registered post**.

**Dated: 11.05.2022 (11:00 A.M.)**

**(Anumit Singh Sodhi)**  
**State Information Commissioner**  
**Punjab**



**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,**

**Sector 16, Chandigarh.**

**Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100**

**Email: - [psic22@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in)**

**Visit us: - [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)**



Complainant

**Sh. Gurdeep Singh (9464423174)**

S/o Sh. Mulkha Singh  
Gobind Nagar, Phase-2,  
Opp. Gurudwara Kalgidhar, Kahnuwan Road,  
Batala, Distt. Gurdaspur

Versus

**Public Information Officer**

O/o Director, State Transport Pb,  
Chandigarh

**Remanded Back:**

**(Regd. Post) First Appellate Authority (By Name)**  
O/o Director, State Transport Pb.,  
Chandigarh

Encl. RTI application

Respondent

**Complaint case No.: 1090 of 2021**  
**Heard through CISCO WEBEX**

**Present:** (i) Sh. Gurdeep Singh – Complainant – not present.  
(ii) For the respondent: Sh. Darshan Singh (SA) (7508018117)

**ORDER**

1. The RTI application is dated 26.3.2021 vide which the complainant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. A complaint was filed in the Commission on 26.08.2021 under Section 18 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act). Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for hearing through CISCO WEBEX on 11.5.2022 i.e. today.
2. In today's hearing, complainant is not present but a letter dated 11.03.2022 is received in the Commission vide diary no. 5535 dated 16.03.2022 requesting therein to adjourn this case after 14.09.2022. This letter is taken on record.
3. The respondent states that they have sent the information to the complainant yesterday.
4. After hearing the respondent and going through the file, it is observed that this is the complaint case. The attention of the Complainant is drawn to the decision of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India rendered on 12.12.2011 in Civil Appeal Nos. Nos.10787 – 10788 of 2011 (arising out of SLP © No.32768-32769/2010)- Chief Information Commissioner and another Vs. State of Manipur and another, in Para 31 whereof, it has been held that while entertaining a complaint case under Section 18 of the RTI Act , 2005, the Commissioners have no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for an access to the information which is as under:-  
*(31. We uphold the said contention and do not find any error in the impugned judgment of the High Court whereby it has been held that the Commissioner while entertaining a complaint under Section 18 of the said Act has no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for access to the information).*
5. As such, since the complainant has approached the Commission under the provision of Section 18 of the RTI Act, 2005, no directions for providing further information can be given by the Commission.
6. Since there is an alternative and efficacious remedy of first appeal available to the Complainant under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, which has not been availed in the instant case and the First Appellate Authority has not had the occasion to review the decision of the PIO, as envisaged under the RTI Act by passing a detailed well reasoned speaking order. In case the complainant has any grouse, he is advised to challenge the response of the PIO before the designated First Appellate Authority, as envisaged under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, who will decide the matter in accordance with the provisions of the RTI Act within the prescribed time limit, after giving an opportunity of hearing to all concerned, by passing a speaking order.
7. If, however, the complainant does not feel satisfied with the decision of the First Appellate Authority, he will be at liberty to file a Second Appeal before the Commission under Section 19(3) of the RTI Act, 2005.
8. In view of the observations noted above, the instant case is **disposed of**. Copies of this decision be sent to the parties **through registered post**.

**Dated: 11.05.2022 (11:00 A.M.)**

**(Anumit Singh Sodhi)**  
**State Information Commissioner**  
**Punjab**



**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,**

**Sector 16, Chandigarh.**

**Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100**

**Email: - [psic22@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in)**

**Visit us: - [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)**



**Ms. Amandeep Kaur (8595977082)**

D/o Sh. Palwinder Singh,  
# 6, Subhash Market,  
Mall Road,  
Bathinda

Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**

O/o M.C., Bathinda

**First Appellate Authority**

O/o Commissioner, MC, Chandigarh

Respondent

**Appeal Case No.: 3873 of 2021**  
**Hearing through CISCO WEBEX**

**Present:** (i) Sh. Sahil Kumar Advocate on behalf of the appellant

(ii) For the respondent:

Sh. Davinder Jaura (XEN)

Sh. Amardeep (point no. 9 and 10)

Sh. Pargat Singh (point no. 8)

**ORDER**

1. The RTI application is dated 1.3.2021 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter FAA) on 22.4.2021 and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 27.8.2021 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act). Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for hearing through CISCO WEBEX on 11.5.2022 i.e. today
2. In today's hearing, both the parties are present. Representative of the appellant states that incomplete information has been received from the respondent department.
3. On this, respondents' present for today's hearing state that whatever information relate with their branch had already been supplied to the appellant
4. The Bench, as per observations made above, is of the view that the appellant cannot seek information on single RTI application from multiple public authorities. A Full Bench of State Information Commission, Punjab in Complaint Case No.2903 of 2011 has decided on 13.01.2012, ruled as under:-  
"We hold that under Section (3) of the Act ibid, the legal obligation of a PIO who receives a request for information under Section 6(1) of the Act is limited to transfer this request to only one public authority that holds the information. This obligation does not extend to transfer the request to multiple authorities.
5. The Bench further observes that the PIO O/o MC, Bathinda has made efforts to supply information to the appellant by forwarding RTI application to different PIOs and three PIOs are present for today's hearing and they have already supplied the information relate with their branches.

**Appeal Case No.: 3873 of 2021**  
**Hearing through CISCO WEBEX**

The Hon'ble Supreme Court in matter of CBSE vs. Aditya Bandopadhyay, (2011) 8 SCC 497, held as under:-

- “67. Indiscriminate and impractical demands or directions under the RTI Act for disclosure of all and sundry information (unrelated to transparency and accountability in the functioning of public authorities and eradication of corruption) would be counterproductive as it will adversely affect the efficiency of the administration and result in the executive getting bogged down with the non-productive work of collecting and furnishing information. The Act should not be allowed to be misused or abused, to become a tool to obstruct the national development and integration, or to destroy the peace, tranquility and harmony among its citizens. Nor should it be converted into a tool of oppression or intimidation of honest officials striving to do their duty. The nation does not want a scenario where 75% of the staff of public authorities spends 75% of their time in collecting and furnishing information to applicants instead of discharging their regular duties. The threat of penalties under the RTI Act and the pressure of the authorities under the RTI Act should not lead to employees of a public authorities prioritizing “information furnishing”, at the cost of their normal and regular duties.
6. In view of the above, it does not seem to be appropriate for the appellant to seek information which may entail engaging 75% of the employees of a public authority to collect and compile the information for furnishing the same to the appellant. The Bench advises the appellant to go for seeking information by filing separate RTI application before a specific public authority who has its separate PIO.
  7. In view of the observations noted above, the instant case is **disposed of & closed**. Copies of this decision be sent to the parties.

**Dated: 11.05.2022 (11:00 A.M.)**

**(Anumit Singh Sodhi)**  
**State Information Commissioner**  
**Punjab**

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,**

**Sector 16, Chandigarh.**

**Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100**

**Email: - [psic22@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in)**

**Visit us: - [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)**



**Sh. Gurbax Singh (7528950026)**

s/o late Sh. Narinder Singh

**R/o Vill. Bholapur, PO Ramgarh,**

Distt. Ludhiana-141123.

Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**

O/o Principal Secretary Transport

Pb., Chandigarh

**First Appellate Authority**

O/o Principal Secretary Transport

Pb., Chandigarh

Respondent

**Appeal Case No.: 3042 of 2021**

**Heard through CISCO WEBEX**

Present: Appellant- Absent

Respondent – Sh. Gurbax Singh (APIO)

**ORDER:**

1. Refer earlier dated: 15.3.2022 where the appellant was absent. On request of respondent the case was adjourned for 11.5.2022.
2. In today's hearing, the appellant is again absent despite being aware about the date of hearing.
3. Respondent, Sh. Gurbax Singh, APIO states that the sought information has already been sent to the appellant on 15.3.2022.
4. In view of the above, the court is of the view that the information has been supplied to the appellant and appellant has neither pointed out any deficiencies in the supplied information not appears for the hearing, therefore, the present case needs no further course of action and the present case stands **disposed of/closed**. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

**Dated: 11.05.2022 (11:00 A.M.)**

**(Anumit Singh Sodhi)  
State Information Commissioner  
Punjab**

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,**

**Sector 16, Chandigarh.**

**Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100**

**Email: - [psic22@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in)**

**Visit us: - [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)**



**Sh. Gurinder Kumar Mangla, Advocate (9872111268)**

S/o Sh. Darshan Kumar,  
Chamber No.24, New Court Complex,  
Budhlada, Tehsil Budladha  
Distt. Mansa 151502

Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**

O/o EO, MC, Mansa

Respondent

**Complaint Case No.: 186 of 2021**  
**Through CISCO WEBEX**

**Present:** None present.

**ORDER**

1. Refer earlier order dated: 9.9.2021 where last and final opportunity was given to them to represent their case on the next date of hearing positively, failing which case will be decided in their absence. The case was adjourned to 11.5.2022.
2. In today's hearing, both the parties are again absent without any intimation to the Commission.
3. In wake of above, it is observed that complainant is not serious about this case and no communication is received from him in this regard. Therefore, the present case needs no further course of action and the present case stands **disposed of/closed**. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

**Dated: 11.05.2022 (11:00 A.M.)**

**(Anumit Singh Sodhi)**  
**State Information Commissioner**  
**Punjab**

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,**

**Sector 16, Chandigarh.**

**Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864130**

**Email: - [psic22@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in)**

**Visit us: - [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)**



**Sh. Pankaj Kumar s/o(9988241285)**

Sh. Nabh Singh, MCB Zone-6,  
H.No.3225, Gali No.1-B,  
Sukhpeer Road, Bathinda-151301.

Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**

O/o M.C., Bathinda

**First Appellate Authority**

O/o Commissioner, M.C., Bathinda

Respondent

**Appeal Case No.: 2718 of 2021**

**Heard through CISCO WEBEX**

Present: Appellant: Sh. Sanjiv Goyal on behalf of the appellant.

Respondents –

Sh. Sandip Kataria, Chief Sanitary Inspector

Sh Neeraj Garg (9872310253)

Sh. Mintu (Superintendent) (9256488900)

Sh. Amardeep (9988100087)

Order

1. Refer earlier order dated: 8.3.2002 where Sh. Sandeep Kataria states that demanded information had already been sent to the appellant. Appellant was also advised to remove the deficiency as per RTI application within ten days after receipt of the deficiency letter. The case was adjourned for 11.5.2002.
2. In today's hearing both the parties are present the court directs to all the PIOs to supply point-wise affidavit to the appellant and copy of the same to the Commission. On submission of affidavit the case will automatically be disposed of/closed.
3. The respondent states that the information relates to various PIOs and at present four PIOs are here and supplied information to the appellant.
4. After discussing with both the parties and examining the case file, the Bench, as per observations made above, is of the view that the appellant cannot seek information on single RTI application from multiple authorities. A full Bench of State Information Commission, Punjab in Complaint Case No. 2903 of 2011 has decided on 13.01.2012, which is as under:-  
*"We hold that under Section (3) of the Act *ibid*, the legal obligation of a PIO who receives a request for information under Section 6(1) of the Act is limited to transfer this request to only one public authority that holds the information. This obligation does not extend to transfer to multiple authorities.*
5. The Bench advises the appellant to go for seeking information by filing RTI application before a specific public authority that has separate PIO.
6. Respondents' present for today are directed to supply an affidavit in original to the appellant in connection with points of RTI application relate with them with a copy to the Commission.
7. In view of the observations noted above, the instant case is **disposed of**. Copies of this decision be sent to the parties.

**Dated: 11.05.2022 (11:00 A.M.)**

**(Anumit Singh Sodhi)**  
**State Information Commissioner**  
**Punjab**

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,**  
**Sector 16, Chandigarh.**  
Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100  
Email: - [psic22@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in)  
Visit us: - [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)



Appellant

**Sh. Jasbir Singh (9888296107)**  
Guru Nanak Nagar,  
Village Jhabewal, PO Ramgarh,  
Distt. Ludhiana 141123.

Versus

**Public Information Officer**  
O/o Secy., Regional Transport,  
Ludhiana

**First Appellate Authority**  
O/o Secy., Regional Transport,  
Ludhiana

Respondent

**Appeal Case No.: 2716 of 2021**  
**Heard through CISCO WEBEX**

**Present:** Appellant- Sh. Jasbir Singh.  
Respondent – Sh. Sukhjinder Singh, RTA, Ludhiana

**ORDER**

1. Refer earlier order dated: 8.3.2002 where Sh. Amardeep Singh, stated that the requisite information had already been sent to the appellant but the appellant denied. The Commission directed the respondent to supply the information again to the appellant. The case was adjourned for 11.5.2002.
2. In today's hearing both the parties are present.
3. The respondent states that information has already been supplied to the appellant on 1.11.2021 against receipt which is on record in the case file vide letter no. 5707 dated 01.11.2021.
4. Appellant is advised to point out ambiguity, if any, within seven days to the respondent PIO with a copy to the Commission from today, failing which it will be presumed that he has nothing to say in this regard.
5. In view of the observations noted above, the instant case is **disposed of**. Copies of this decision be sent to the parties.

**Dated: 11.05.2022 (11:00 A.M.)**

**(Anumit Singh Sodhi)**  
**State Information Commissioner**  
**Punjab**

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,**

**Sector 16, Chandigarh.**

**Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100**

**Email: - [psic22@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in)**

**Visit us: - [www.infocompunjab.com](http://www.infocompunjab.com)**



**Sh. Gurbax Singh, (7528950026)**

Editor India's Justice,

Vill. Bholapur, PO Ramgarh

Chandigarh Road, Ludhiana 141123.

Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**

O/O Secy, Regional Transport Commissioner, Pb.,

Amritsar

**First Appellate Authority**

O/O Secy, Regional Transport Commissioner, Pb.,

Amritsar

Respondent

**Appeal Case No.: 1560 of 2021**

**Through CISCO WEBEX**

**Present:** None present.

**ORDER**

1. Refer to earlier order dated: 29.3.2022 wherein respondent PIO was absent and it was observed that appellant pointed out deficiency after the lapse of one year. Another opportunity was given to both the parties to represent this case on the next date of hearing. The case was adjourned to 11.5.2022.
2. In today's hearing both the parties are absent without intimation to the Commission.
3. On scrutiny of record the sought for information as per RTI application had already been supplied to the appellant on 6.9.2021, which had earlier been supplied on 27.11.2020. It is presumed that appellant has nothing to say in this regard.
4. In view of the observations noted above, no further cause of action is required. Therefore, the instant case is **disposed of**. Copies of this decision be sent to the parties.

**Dated: 11.05.2022 (11:00 A.M.)**

**(Anumit Singh Sodhi)  
State Information Commissioner  
Punjab**



