

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com

E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh. Surinder Singh, C/o Sh.Chandan Singh,
286, Gali No-6, Backside TV Center,
Avtar Nagar, Jalandhar.

... Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o PSPCL,
Patiala.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Chief Er., HRD,
PSPCL, Patiala.

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 1079 of 2018

Present: **Sh.Surinder Singh as Complainant**
 Sh.Kamalpreet Singh,Dy.Manager (Service Branch) PSPCL Patiala for the
 Respondent

ORDER:

The case was last heard **on 09.01.2019**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The complainant through RTI application dated 11.12.2017 has sought information regarding instructions/circulars for promotion/upgradation of post on completion of 16 years of service, general criteria of promotion and other information concerning the office of PSPCL Patiala. The complainant was not satisfied with the information provided by the PIO vide letter dated 23.01.2018 after which he filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 18.04.2018 which disposed off the appeal on 27.06.2018.

The respondent present pleaded that the available information has been provided to the complainant. The appellant is absent and vide letter received in the Commission on 03.01.2019, has asked to provide the regulations/instructions w.e.t calculations of benchmarks in decimal digits from the concerned Chief Engineer/HRD, PSPCL Patiala.

The PIO is directed to relook at the RTI application and provide the information as available, alongwith the clarification on the procedure adopted for evaluation of benchmarks. The appellant is also directed to be present at the next date of hearing otherwise the case will be decided ex-parte.”

Hearing dated 12.02.2019:

The respondent present pleaded that the available information has been provided to the appellant and there is no circular or notification for evaluation of benchmarks. However, the guidelines followed while calculating the benchmarks will be provided to the appellant. The PIO is directed to provide whatever the available information is there to the appellant and send a compliance report to the Commission within 10 days.

No further course of action is required. The case is disposed off and closed.

Chandigarh
Dated: 12.02.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com
E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh.Tejinder Singh,
R/o Village Bholapura,
PO Ramgarh, Chandigarh Road,
Ludhiana.

... Appellant

Vs

Public Information Officer,
SDM, Licensing Authority & Registering,
Samrala, District Ludhiana.

First Appellate Authority,
DC. Ludhiana.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1264 of 2018

Present **Sh. Tejinder Singh as Appellant**
Mrs.Sarabjit Kaur, Superintendent O/o SDM Samrala and Ms.Lovjeet Kalso,
SRTA Ludhiana for the Respondent

Hearing dated 12.02.2019:

Facts of the Case-

- 1) That the appellant Sh.Tejinder Singh filed an RTI application on 22.11.2017 seeking 9 points information regarding licenses issued from August 2017 to Nov.2017 concerning the office of SDM(Licensing & Registering) Samrala.
- 2) That the information was not provided within the stipulated time under section 7 of the RTI Act, after which the appellant filed the first appeal on 07.01.2018 with the First Appellant Authority which took no decision on the appeal.
- 3) That on not getting the information, the appellant filed a second appeal with the State Information Commission, which first came up for hearing on 18.06.2018.
- 4) That on the date of the hearing (**18.06.2018**), Smt.Sarabjit Kaur, PIO was present who informed that the information has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 19.12.2017. However, it was observed that the PIO in the reply mentioned that points 2&5 do not relate to their department but had not forwarded the RTI application to the concerned department. The PO was directed to forward the same to the concerned department and the PIO of that department was directed to provide the information immediately and be present on the next date of hearing which was fixed for 25.07.2018.
- 5) That on the date of hearing (**25.07.2018**), the respondent was absent. The appellant informed that he has received the information regarding points No.1,7& 8 vide letter dated 25.6.2018. However, as mentioned by the PIO in the letter that the remaining information relates to the department of SRTA Ludhiana and STC, Punjab Chandigarh, but the PIO has not forwarded the RTI application to the concerned departments.

The PIO was directed to provide the complete information relating to them and forward the RTI application to the concerned department for remaining information. The PIO was also directed to be present on the next date of hearing with solid reasons for not complying with the orders of the Commission The PIO of STA Ludhiana and PIO of STC Punjab, Chandigarh were also directed to provide the information to the appellant and be present on the next date of hearing.

- 6) That on the next date of hearing, which was held on **24.09.2018**, the PIO was present and informed that the RTI application has been transferred to the concerned departments on 13.08.2018 but the information is still awaited from them. The PIO, however, did not file explanation regarding delay in transferring the RTI application to the concerned departments. The appellant also did not receive the information from SRTA Ludhiana and STC Punjab, Chandigarh. The PIO, SDM(Licensing & Registering), Samrala, PIO-SRTA Ludhiana and PIO-STC Punjab, Chandigarh were directed to be present at the next date of hearing with reasons for delay in providing the information.
- 7) That the case came up for hearing again on **05.11.2018**. The PIO-SDM Samrala was present. Sh.Ravinder Singh Clerk, from the office of SRTA Ludhiana was present who informed that the information for which the application was forwarded to them by the PIO-cum-SDM Samrala vide letter dated 20.08.2018 does not pertain to them and they have already written a letter to the PIO-SDM Samrala that the same be collected from the office of State Transport Commissioner, Punjab, Chandigarh.

The Commission observed that the application was being transferred from one desk to the other and not being attended. The PIO-SDM Samrala was asked to explain the reasons for delay in transferring the RTI application since reply vide letter dated 13.08.2018 was not appropriate to justify the enormous delay of 8 months. The PIO was directed to collect all the information from the concerned departments and send it to the appellant.

The PIO was also directed to be present personally on the next date of hearing which was fixed for 19.12.2018 and explain the reasons for such enormous delay of 8 months in transferring the RTI application.

- 8) That at the hearing on **19.12.2018**, the respondent PIO-SDM Samrala pleaded that, the information regarding points 2,3,4&5 concerning the office of STC Punjab Chandigarh has been provided to the appellant by collecting the same from them. Regarding information relating to point 9, the SRTA Ludhiana has asked for the deposit of a fee of Rs.16318/- for total 8154 driving tests conducted from 01.08.2017 to 22.11.2017. Regarding delay in transferring the RTI application, the PIO pleaded that the delay has occurred on the part of the concerned clerk since it was not clear to him, from which department the information has to be supplied but it was not intentional. The plea of the PIO-SDM Samrala was taken on the record.

It was observed that during the hearing on 05.11.2018, the representative present from the office of SRTA Ludhiana had denied having the information but now, in its report dated 15.11.2018, the SRTA has asked for deposit of fee which clearly indicates that the SRTA has misled the Commission about the information in its possession. The Commission directed that an enquiry be conducted into the matter and the official responsible for giving misleading statement be identified. The SRTA Ludhiana was directed to provide the information free of cost and the information be provided via CD within 10 days. Further because of the dilly dallying of all the public authorities involved in this particular case, the PIO-SDM Samrala was made deemed PIO and was asked to collect the information from the concerned departments and send it to the appellant.

- 9) That the case has come up for hearing today (**12.02.2019**). The PIO-SDM Samrala is present. The PIO-SRTA is also present. The SRTA has brought the information regarding point 9 in a CD and handed over to the appellant. The SRTA further stated that after conducting driving tests, the entire report including track record is sent to the concerned SDM. In this case, the SDM Samrala is the custodian of the record.

Having gone through the entire sequence of the events, it has been established that the final custodian of the information is SDM Samrala and the SDM Samrala has unnecessarily been dilly dallying the information. It has also been observed that the PIO-SDM Samrala has not handled the RTI application in time as well as with appropriate due diligence and has misled the Commission.

Order.

Keeping the above facts of the case in mind and its close scrutiny, this is a fit case to invoke section 20 of the RTI Act. The PIO-SDM Samrala is directed to **show cause why penalty be not imposed on the PIO under section 20 of the RTI Act 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 alongwith the written replies.

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

The PIO-SDM Samrala is directed to pay an amount of **Rs.3000/-** via demand draft drawn through Govt. Treasury as compensation to the appellant for the loss and detriment suffered by him of having to file the appeals and not getting information in time. The PIO is directed to duly inform the Commission of the compliance of the order and submit proof of having compensated the appellant.

To come up on **02.04.2019 at 11.00 AM** for further hearing.

Chandigarh
Dated: 12.02.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

CC to : Regional Transport Authority,
Ludhiana.

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com

E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh. Harminder Singh,
Chamber No-329, New District Courts,
Jalandhar

... Appellant

Versus

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

First Appellate Authority,
Add Chief Administrator,
GMADA, Sector-62,
Mohali.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3270 of 2018

Present: None for the Appellant
Sh.Gulshan Kumar, PIO for the Respondent

Order:

The case was last heard **on 07.01.2019**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The appellant through RTI application dated 01.08.2018 has sought information regarding allotment of plot No.40, Block- D, Gali No.1, measuring 400 sq.yds in the name of Sh.Gurdev Singh s/o Sh.PayaraSingh and other information concerning the office of GMADA Mohali. The appellant was not provided the information after which he filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority 09.08.2018 which took no decision on the appeal.

Since both the parties are absent, in the interest of justice, one more opportunity is granted and the case is adjourned.”

Hearing dated 12.02.2019:

The respondent present pleaded that the information has been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 01.01.2019 and a copy of the same is submitted to the Commission. The appellant is absent to point out the discrepancies, if any.

I have gone through the RTI application and the information provided and found that the information has been provided as per the RTI application.

Since the information has been provided, no further course of action is required. The case is **disposed off and closed**.

Chandigarh
Dated: 12.02.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com

E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh. Manjit Singh, S/o Sh.Sohan Singh,
H No-388/3, Bahera Road, Patiala.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o DGP,
Punjab, Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority,
DGP,
Punjab, Chandigarh.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3325 of 2018

Present: Sh.Manjit Singh as Appellant
Sh.Prem Singh, ASI O/o ADGP Punjab, Chandigarh for the Respondent

Order:

The case was last heard on **07.01.2019**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The appellant through RTI application dated 22.06.2018 has sought information regarding method of enquiry on the complaints received from different districts against the police officials and the rule under which re-enquiry was conducted by the concerned districts alongwith other information concerning the office of DGP Punjab, Chandigarh. The appellant was not provided the information after which he filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority 30.07.2018 which took no decision on the appeal.

The appellant is absent and vide letter received in the Commission on 01.01.2019 has sought adjournment. The respondent is also absent without intimation to the Commission.

Since both the parties are absent, in the interest of justice, one more opportunity is granted and the case is adjourned.”

Hearing dated 12.02.2019:

The respondent present pleaded that the reply has been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 13.07.2018 and again on 30.08.2018. The appellant is not satisfied with the reply of the PIO.

I have seen the RTI application and the reply of the PIO and found that the information sought by the appellant is ambiguous and in question form. The RTI application has been replied adequately by the PIO.

No further course of action is required. The case is **disposed off and closed**.

Chandigarh
Dated: 12.02.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com

E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

ShTejinder Singh,
Village Bholapur, P.O Ramgarh, Chandigarh Road,
Ludhiana .

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/oGLADA,
Ludhiana.

First Appellate Authority,
O/oAddl Chief Administrator,
GLADA, Ludhiana

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3285 of 2018

Present: **Sh.Tejinder Singh as Appellant**
 Sh.Santosh Kumar Bains O/o GLADA Ludhiana for the Respondent

ORDER: The case was last heard **on 18.12.2018**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The appellant through RTI application dated 27.06.2018 has sought information regarding status of the policy framed/to be framed by the Principal Secretary, Housing Development on the instructions of the Chief Administrator GLADA dated 18.02.12016 on unauthorized advertisement structures, hoardings outside the MC limits and other information concerning the office of GLADA Ludhiana. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 28.07.2018.

The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant stated that the information has been received but it has been provided after a lapse of 5 months & 25 days, for which the respondent pleaded that they did not receive any RTI application nor any email from the appellant and after receipt of the notice from the State Information Commission about the RTI, it came to their notice after which they sent the reply to the appellant.

The appellant has produced track record of the Post Office which clearly states that the letter was received by the PIO on 28.06.2018. So merely stating that the PIO did not receive the application, does not absolve the public authority of the delay in providing the information to the information seeker. The PIO is directed to probe into the matter and produce a thorough enquiry report. If in the enquiry, any loopholes are found that need to be plugged, and if any official is involved in non-handling of such RTI application, the matter should be brought to the notice of the higher authorities as well as to the Commission on the next date of hearing.”

Hearing dated 12.02.2019:

The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant. Regarding delay in attending to the RTI application, the respondent has submitted written reply which is accepted.

Since the information has been provided, no further course of action is required. The case is **disposed off and closed**.

Chandigarh
Dated: 12.02.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com

E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh.Vijay Hans,
H No-3, SatyaNiwas, Silver City,
Zirakpur

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Superintendent of Personnel (IAS Branch),
Govt of Punjab, Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority,
Under Secretary,
Department of Personnel (IAS Branch),
Govt of Punjab, Chandigarh.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3287 of 2018

Present: **None for the Appellant**
 Sh.Saneev Sachdeva, Sr.Assistant, (IAS Branch) O/o Superintendent of
 Personnel for the Respondent

ORDER: The case was last heard on **18.12.2018**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The appellant through RTI application dated 28.03.2018 has sought information regarding procedure adopted for promotion of Dr.BhupinderpalSingh,IAS presently posted as ADC Jalandhar from non-SCS cadre to IAS Cadre in 2011, recommendations of different personalities and other information. The RTI application was filed by the appellant with the Department of Personnel & Training, Government of India which vide letter dated 28.04.2018, informed the appellant that the information regarding point No.1 i.e. the procedure adopted for selection from Non-SCS cadre to IAS cadre is in accordance with the IAS(Appointment by Selection) Regulations, 1997, a copy of which available on the website of DoP&T. For the information regarding points 2 to 4, they forwarded the application to the UPSC and the Chief Secretary, Government of Punjab, Chandigarh.

The appellant was not satisfied with the reply of the PIO, Department of Personnel(IAS Branch), Punjab vide letters dated 21.05.2018 & 11.06.2018 after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 20.07.2018 which disposed off the appeal upholding the order dated 11.06.2018 of the PIO.

The appellant is present and informed that he has received the information regarding point No.4 from the UPSC. Regarding information relating to points 2 & 3, the PIO, Department of Personnel, Punjab has rejected the information on the basis of the section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act and that there is no larger public interest involved. The appellant in his appeal has stated that there is larger public interest involved and the information has been willfully denied. The appellant also stated that if the UPSC could provide the information, then there was no harm in providing him the information on points 2 & 3.

Since the information regarding points 1 & 4 has been provided, the matter regarding information relating to points 2 & 3 shall be adjudicated on the next date of hearing.”

Hearing dated 12.02.2019:

The respondent present reiterated the PIO's earlier stand on the basis of which the information was rejected. The appellant is absent to plead the case.

The case is adjourned. To come up on **01.04.2019 at 11.00 AM** for further hearing.

Sd/-

Chandigarh
Dated: 12.02.2019

(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com

E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh.ManjitSingh,S/o Sh.Sohan Singh,
H no-388/3, Bahera Road,
Patiala.

Appellant.

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o DIG,
Patiala.

First Appellate Authority,

O/o DGP,
Pb,Chandigarh.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3314 of 2018

Present: **Sh.Manjit Singh as Appellant**
 Sh.Sukhbahal Singh, HC, O/o SSP Patiala for the Respondent

ORDER: The case was last heard on **18.12.2018**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The appellant through RTI application dated 15.01.2018 has sought information regarding action taken report on his complaints dated 19.11.2016, 17.12.2017, 7.08.2017, 25.09.2017, 27.09.2017, 13.11.2-017 filed against the officers and employees of Transport Department and other information concerning the office of DIG Patiala. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 02.03.2018.

The respondent present has submitted a letter dated 17.12.2018 of the PIO stating therein that the information has already been provided to the appellant in appeal case No.2017 of 2018 and in appeal case No.1561 of 2018 which were disposed off by the concerned SICs on 04.09.2018 & 03.12.2018 respectively. The appellant has denied having received the information in the present case.

I have gone through the RTI application and the reply of the PIO and hereby direct the PIO to provide information regarding points 1,2,6& 9. The appellant is also asked to visit the office of PIO for inspection and get the information.”

Hearing dated 12.02.2019:

The respondent present pleaded that the information has already been provided to the appellant. The appellant informed that he has sought the information regarding application filed in the office of DIG Patiala.

Now the matter is that the appellant is seeking information regarding action taken report on his complaints which were filed in the office of the DIG Patiala whereas the information that has been provided to the appellant pertains to his complaints filed in the office of SSP Patiala.

At the hearing, the appellant has informed that the DIG office has been abolished and the task of the DIG is now being handled by the IG Patiala. The PIO-IG Patiala is hereby directed to look at the RTI application and provide the action taken report on the applications mentioned above. The PIO-IG Office is also directed to be present personally or through its representative at the next date of hearing.

Both the parties to be present on **02.04.2019 at 11.00 AM** for further hearing.

Chandigarh
Dated: 12.02.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com

E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh.Manjit Singh, S/o Sh.Sohan Singh,
H no-388/3, Bahera Road,
Patiala.

Appellant.

Versus

Public Information Officer
O/o Finance Minister,
Pb, Chandigarh..

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Chief Minister,
Pb, Chandigarh.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3316 of 2018

Present: Sh.Manjit Singh as Appellant
Ms.SimranpreetKaur O/o Principal Secretary, Punjab, Department of
Transport for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was last heard **on 18.12.2018**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The appellant through RTI application dated 05.07.2018 has sought information regarding action taken report on his complaint dated 03.10.2017 whereby the loss to Govt exchequer by the officials of Transport office in connivance with the agents was reported and other information concerning the office of Finance Minister, Punjab, Chandigarh. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 11.08.2018.

The respondent present pleaded that the appellant had filed RTI application with the office of Finance Minister, Punjab and they received the application from the office of Finance Minister on 25.07.2018. The respondent further pleaded that the appellant was asked vide letter dated 03.08.2018 to deposit requisite fee for getting information but the appellant has not deposited the fee. The appellant has denied having received the reply of the PIO.

Having gone through the file, it is observed that the RTI application was attended by the PIO well within the time but the appellant has not filed first appeal with the appropriate authority. The appellant is hereby directed to deposit the requisite fee and get the information.

During further scrutiny of the case, it is observed that the appellant has filed two similar applications seeking exactly the same information vide appeal case No.3317/2018 & appeal case No.3318/2018 from the office of Chief Secretary, Punjab, Chandigarh This is clearly a violation of the spirit of the RTI Act as it diverts the resources of the department/public authority unnecessarily. Keeping this fact in mind, all these three cases are clubbed together. The Commission makes Ms.Simranpreet Kaur O/o of Principal Secretary, Govt of Punjab, Department of Transport as deemed PIO and directs the PIO to provide the information to the appellant within 10 days after receipt of requisite fee. The PIO is also directed to submit proof of dispatch of letter dated 03.08.2018.”

Hearing dated 12.02.2019:

The respondent present pleaded that the appellant has not deposited the requisite fee. The respondent has also submitted proof of dispatch of letter dated 03.08.2018.

At the last hearing, Ms.Simranpreet Kaur was made a deemed PIO and she was directed to provide the information in all three cases which were clubbed together keeping in view the appellant's two other similar applications seeking exactly the same information vide appeal case No.3317/2018 and appeal case No.3318/2018 from the office of Chief Secretary, Punjab, Chandigarh. The respondent pleaded that since part of the information sought pertains to the office of STC Punjab, they have already sent a request letter to the STC asking them to provide the information but the same is still awaited.

The PIO-STC, Punjab, Chandigarh is hereby made a party and is directed to handover the information to Ms.Simranpreet Kaur immediately enabling her to send the information to the appellant before the next date of hearing. The PIO is directed to provide the information after taking requisite applicable fee from the appellant.

To come up on **02.04.2019 at 11.00 AM** for further hearing.

Chandigarh
Dated: 12.02.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

CC to: The PIO, State Transport Commissioner, Punjab,
Chandigarh.

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com
[E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in)

Sh.Manjit Singh, S/o Sh.Sohan Singh,
H no-388/3, Bahera Road,
Patiala.

Appellant.

Versus

Public Information Officer
O/oChief Secretary,
Pb, Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority,
O/oChief Secretary,
Pb, Chandigarh.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3317 of 2018

Present: **Sh.Manjit Singh as Appellant**
 Ms.SimranpreetKaur O/o Principal Secretary, Punjab, Department of
 Transport for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was last heard **on 18.12.2018**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The appellant through RTI application dated 02.07.2018 has sought information regarding action taken report on his complaint dated 27.09.2017 whereby the loss to Govt exchequer by the officials of Transport office in connivance with the agents was reported and other information concerning the office of Chief Secretary, Punjab, Chandigarh. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 11.08.2018.

The respondent present pleaded that the appellant had filed RTI application with the office of Chief Secretary, Punjab and they received the application from the office of Chief Secretary on 06.07.2018. The respondent further pleaded that the appellant was asked vide letter dated 18.07.2018 to deposit requisite fee for getting the information but the appellant has not deposited the fee. The appellant has denied having received the reply of the PIO.

Having gone through the file, it is observed that the RTI application was attended by the PIO well within the time. The appellant is hereby directed to deposit the requisite fee and get the information.

During further scrutiny of the case, it is observed that the appellant has filed two similar applications seeking exactly the same information vide appeal case No.3316/2018 & appeal case No.3318/2018 from the office of Finance Minister, Punjab and the office of Chief Secretary, Punjab, Chandigarh. This is clearly a violation of the spirit of the RTI Act as it diverts the resources of the department/public authority unnecessarily. Keeping this fact in mind, all these three cases are clubbed together. The Commission makes Ms.SimranpreetKaur O/o of Principal Secretary, Govt of Punjab, Department of Transport as deemed PIO and directs the PIO to provide the information to the appellant within 10 days after receipt of requisite fee. The PIO is also directed to submit proof of dispatch of letter dated 18.07.2018.”

Hearing dated 12.02.2019:

The respondent present pleaded that the appellant has not deposited the requisite fee. The respondent has also submitted proof of dispatch of letter dated 18.07.2018.

At the last hearing, Ms.Simranpreet Kaur was made a deemed PIO and she was directed to provide the information in all three cases which were clubbed together keeping in view the appellant's two other similar applications seeking exactly the same information vide appeal case No.3316/2018 and appeal case No.3318/2018 from the office of Finance Minister, Punjab and the office of Chief Secretary, Punjab, Chandigarh. The respondent pleaded that since part of the information sought pertains to the office of STC Punjab, they have already sent a request letter to the STC asking them to provide the information but the same is still awaited.

The PIO-STC, Punjab, Chandigarh is hereby made a party and is directed to handover the information to Ms.Simranpreet Kaur immediately enabling her to send the information to the appellant before the next date of hearing. The PIO is directed to provide the information after taking requisite applicable fee from the appellant.

To come up on **02.04.2019 at 11.00 AM** for further hearing.

Chandigarh
Dated: 12.02.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

CC to: The PIO, State Transport Commissioner, Punjab,
Chandigarh.

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com
E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh.Manjit Singh, S/o Sh.Sohan Singh,
H no-388/3, Bahera Road,
Patiala.

Appellant.

Versus

Public Information Officer
O/o Chief Secretary,
Pb, Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Chief Secretary,
Pb, Chandigarh.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3318 of 2018

Present: Sh.Manjit Singh as Appellant
Ms.SimranpreetKaur O/o Principal Secretary, Punjab, Department of Transport for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was last heard **on 18.12.2018**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The appellant through RTI application dated 05.07.2018 has sought information regarding action taken report on his complaint dated 25.09.2017 whereby the loss to Govt exchequer by the officials of Transport office in connivance with the agents was reported and other information concerning the office of Chief Secretary, Punjab, Chandigarh. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 11.08.2018.

The respondent present pleaded that the appellant had filed RTI application with the office of Chief Secretary, Punjab and they received the application from the office of Chief Secretary on 12.07.2018. The respondent further pleaded that the appellant was asked vide letter dated 18.07.2018 to deposit requisite fee for getting the information but the appellant has not deposited the fee. The appellant has denied having received the reply of the PIO.

Having gone through the file, it is observed that the RTI application was attended by the PIO well within the time. The appellant is hereby directed to deposit the requisite fee and get the information.

During further scrutiny of the case, it is observed that the appellant has filed two similar applications seeking exactly the same information vide appeal case No.3316/2018 & appeal case No.3317/2018 from the office of Finance Minister, Punjab and the office of Chief Secretary, Punjab, Chandigarh This is clearly a violation of the spirit of the RTI Act as it diverts the resources of the department/public authority unnecessarily. Keeping this fact in mind, all these three cases are clubbed together. The Commission makes Ms.SimranpreetKaur O/o of Principal Secretary, Govt of Punjab, Department of Transport as deemed PIO and directs the PIO to provide the information to the appellant within 10 days after receipt of requisite fee. The PIO is also directed to submit proof of dispatch of letter dated 18.07.2018.”

Hearing dated 12.02.2019:

The respondent present pleaded that the appellant has not deposited the requisite fee. The respondent has also submitted proof of dispatch of letter dated 18.07.2018.

At the last hearing, Ms.Simranpreet Kaur was made a deemed PIO and she was directed to provide the information in all three cases which were clubbed together keeping in view the appellant's two other similar applications seeking exactly the same information vide appeal case No.3316/2018 and appeal case No.3317/2018 from the office of Finance Minister, Punjab and the office of Chief Secretary, Punjab, Chandigarh. The respondent pleaded that since part of the information sought pertains to the office of STC Punjab, they have already sent a request letter to the STC asking them to provide the information but the same is still awaited.

The PIO-STC, Punjab, Chandigarh is hereby made a party and is directed to handover the information to Ms.Simranpreet Kaur immediately enabling her to send the information to the appellant before the next date of hearing. The PIO is directed to provide the information after taking requisite applicable fee from the appellant.

To come up on **02.04.2019 at 11.00 AM** for further hearing.

Chandigarh
Dated: 12.02.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

CC to: The PIO, State Transport Commissioner, Punjab,
Chandigarh.

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com
E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh.Palwinder Singh S/o Sh.Lakhbir Singh
R/o Village Karampatti, Tehsil Malout,
Distt. Shri Mukatsar Sahib.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer
O/o Tehsildar,
Abohar.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Deputy Commissioner,
Fazilka.

.Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3800 of 2018

Present: Sh.Palwinder Singh as Appellant
Lakhbir Singh and Sh.Bachittar Singh Patwari for the Respondent

ORDER:

The complainant through RTI application dated 02.07.2018 has sought information regarding khasra No.556(5-2) khewat No.572/518 Khatauni No.1474 situated in village Raipura Tehsil Abohar concerning the office of Tehsildar Abohar. The complainant was not provided the information after which the complainant filed first complaint in the Commission on 27.08.2018.

The respondent present informed that the information has been provided to the complainant. The complainant is present and informed that he has received the information and is satisfied.

Since the information has been provided, no further course of action is required. The case is **disposed off and closed.**

Chandigarh
Dated: 12.02.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner