



Shri Harwinder Singh,  
S/o Late Shri Gurdev Singh,  
# 200 (Ground Floor), Sector 41 A, Chandigarh.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Examiner,  
Local Fund Accounts,  
Yojna Bhawan, Sector 33-A, PB,  
Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o Secretary (Expenditure),  
Punjab Civil Secretariat, Sector 1,  
Chandigarh.

Respondents

**Complaint Case Converted into Appeal Case No. 977/2018**

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
24-05-2018	25.05-2018	25.06.2018	Nil	24.08.2018

**Present:** None on behalf of the Appellant.  
1. Sh. Jagdeep Bansal, PIO – cum – Deputy Director, O/o Examiner, Local Fund Accounts, Punjab,  
2. Smt. Paramjeet Kaur, APIO – cum – Section Officer, O/o Examiner, Local Fund Accounts, Pb., Chandigarh – for Respondents.

**Order**

The Commission had made the following observations on 01.01.2019:

*“Smt. Paramjeet Kaur, APIO, submits that file is in process and seeks an adjournment enabling them to file an appropriate reply. The Commission takes strong exception to such a lackadaisical attitude. The stipulated period of providing the information has since elapsed. The PIO is desired to provide appellant the complete information and explain his conduct of having violated the provisions under section 7 (1) of the Right to Information Act, 2005. Be it noted that no*

Contd....page....2



-2-

**Complaint Case Converted into Appeal Case No. 977/2018**

*further opportunity shall be granted and the penal provisions shall be invoked in the event of failure to comply.”*

*“The case has come up today. It transpires that the sought for record is quite old and according to the respondents, is not traceable. The appellant suspects some foul play. He agrees that he will be satisfied if some connected information is provided. The appellant shall convey in writing about the specifics of the aforesaid information to the respondents who shall endeavor to provide it at the earliest. “*

The case has come up finally for consideration. Succinctly speaking the appellant had sought a copy of an office order dated on 23.10.1993. The respondents have been seeking to know the subject of the information enabling them to trace it. However, the appellant has refused to divulge the subject as well as the motive in seeking the information. From the perusal of record it is understood that the father of the appellant who was an employee of the same department is since missing. Probably he was aggrieved with an administrative decision of the department. It has also been mentioned that the Writ is also pending with the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh on this score. The respondents have also mentioned that a file relating to the promotion in the department from the post of Deputy Director to Joint Director was found to be missing from the record and a DDR with the SSP was also lodged on the subject.

The Commission has endeavoured to provide the appellant complete access to the

*Contd....page....3*



-3-

**Complaint Case Converted into Appeal Case No. 977/2018**

record. The Commission feels that the respondents have extended their cooperation in tracing the letter but without revealing the subject of the issue the non-provision of copy of a letter which is more than twenty years old, cannot lead this forum to draw adverse inferences. The Commission feels that he has been sufficiently informed. No malafide appears attributable to the respondents.

The appeal is **disposed**.

**12.03.2019**

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