



Sh. Surinder Pal Singh, (9814087436)

H.No 5530, Street No 4, Gobind Nagar,
Daba Side , Ludhiana-141003.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer

.....Respondent

O/o Principal,

Adesh Institute of Dental Science and Research Adesh University,
Bathinda.

First Appellate Authority

O/o Registrar,

Adesh Institute of Dental Science and Research Adesh University,
Bathinda.

Appeal Case No. 205,449,546,1332,,1338,1339,1340,1341,1342,

1343,1344,1345 and 1346 of 2021

(Cisco Webex Proceedings)

Present: Appellant: Sh. Surinder Pal Singh

Respondent: Dr. Amanish (Principal), 9815991401 along with Advocate Rajan

Bansal

ORDER

1. The Appellant filed above mentioned appeal cases in the Commission at different dates but later he requested the undersigned bench to club all his Thirteen (13) cases as concerned Public Information officer is same in all the aforesaid cases. Therefore a single speaking order is being passed in all the above mentioned cases.

INFORMATION SOUGHT: Information pertaining to Adesh Institute of Dental Science and Research Adesh University in all the above cases.

2. Respondent, Dr. Amanish pleaded that with the compliance of the commission's order, he had called appellant Sh. Surinder Pal Singh along with her daughter who is also the student of Adesh Institute. He further added that he had made available the complete record for inspection and provided the copies of documents so identified by the appellant duly attested. In addition to this, Dr. Amanish said that despite of doing all these, the appellant remained unsatisfied and kept on raising new queries which were not justified.
3. Appellant, Sh. Surinder Pal Singh although had attended the hearing through cisco webex (VC), but he remained on mute throughout the proceeding of this case. However, various requests were made by the undersigned bench to unmute his mic and speak, but all seemed to be failed as he didn't turned up.

Appeal Case No. 205,449,546,1332,,1338,1339,1340,1341,1342,
1343,1344,1345 and 1346 of 2021
(Cisco Webex Proceedings)

4. Keeping in view the facts of the cases and after going through the records placed in the case file, the Commission finds that the RTI application has been **suitably replied** and the information has been supplied to the **best extent. However, the PIO is directed to furnish an affidavit providing therein the factual situation and affirming the position that the information sought by the appellant has been supplied to their best extent. In case the partial information is not available in the office record then an undertaking/affidavit may be filled in this regard also to the appellant with a copy to the Commission therein mentioning the reasons for its non-availability.**

The afore-mentioned appeals stands **disposed** with the above direction.

Chandigarh
Dated: 12.05.2021
Commissioner

Sd/-
(Maninder Singh Patti)
State Information



Sh. Harinder Singh Sidhu, (9815355655)

S/o Late Sh. Jagdev Singh,
R/o 127, Sector 23 A, Chandigarh.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o Registrar, Cooperative Societies, PB,
Sector-17, Chandigarh.

.....Respondent

First Appellate Authority

O/o Registrar, Cooperative Societies, PB,
Sector-17, Chandigarh

Appeal Case No. 3719 of 2020

Present: Appellant: Sh. Harinder Singh Sidhu
Respondent: Sh. Amandeep (Suptd.), 9815277711

ORDER

1. To be read in the continuity of the previous order dated 30.03.2021.

Information Sought: Information pertaining to concerned official documents i.e.

letter no. 1/27534/2019/4758 dated 16.07.2020

2. Appellant, Sh. Harinder Singh Sidhu had acknowledged the receipt of sought information has requested to close the case.
3. Commission is in receipt of information/reply pertaining to the case no. 3719 and 3720/2020 vide dated 23.04.2021 diary no. 9207. This correspondence is taken on record with all supporting enclosures
4. As the information stands supplied therefore, no cause of action is required in this case. Hence, the instant appeal case is **disposed & closed**.

Chandigarh
Dated: 12.05.2021

Sd/-
(Maninder Singh Patti)
State Information Commissioner



Sh. Sanjeev Thakur, (Press Reporter), (8968084100)

VPO Madhopur Cant-145024.

Dist. Pathankot.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o XEN, Centre Works Division No 2,

PWD B&R, Amritsar.

.....Respondent

First Appellate Authority

O/o SE, Construction Circle,

PWD B&R, Amritsar.

Appeal Case No. 3864 of 2020

Present: None

ORDER

1. To be read in the continuity of the previous order dated 30.03.2021.

Information Sought: Information pertaining to copy of administrator approval as per list 7 works and other information related to it.

2. Appellant, **Sh. Sanjeev Thakur** had acknowledged the receipt of sought information via email dated 11.05.2021.
3. As the information stands supplied therefore, no cause of action is required in this case. Hence, the instant appeal case is **disposed & closed.**

Chandigarh
Dated:12.05.2021

Sd/-
(Maninder Singh Patti)
State Information Commissioner



Sh. Jatinder Kumar, (9872324111)

C/o Sachkhand Mishthan Bhandhar,
Nehru Gate, Nawanshahr.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o EO, Nagar Council,
Nawanshahr.

.....Respondent

First Appellate Authority

O/o cum Regional Deputy Director,
Local Govt, Jalandhar.

Appeal Case No. 276,277,278,279 and 280 of 2021

(Cisco Webex Proceedings)

Present: Appellant: Sh. Jatinder Kumar

Respondent: Sh. Ramparkash (EO), 9417479460

ORDER

1. To be read in the continuity of the previous order dated 30.03.2021 vide which the respondent was directed to offer a record inspection to the appellant at mutually decided date and time.

As both the parties are same in above mentioned appeals, therefore these two cases are clubbed together for pronouncement today.

INFORMATION SOUGHT: Information pertaining to the records available in the EO, Nagar Council, Nawanshahr in all the above cases.

2. Respondent: Sh. Ramparkash pleaded that with the compliance of the commission's previous order he had made available the complete record for inspection and provided the copies of documents so identified by the appellant duly attested.
3. Whereas, appellant Sh. Jatinder Kumar contended on this and stated that only partial information has been supplied.
4. After hearing both the parties and going through the case file, the Commission finds that the RTI application has been **suitably replied** and the information has been supplied to the **best extent. However, the PIO is directed to furnish an affidavit providing therein the factual situation and affirming the position that the information sought by the appellant has been supplied to their best extent. In case the partial information is not available in the office record then an undertaking/affidavit may be filled in this regard also to the appellant with a copy to the Commission therein mentioning the reasons for its non-availability.**

The afore-mentioned appeals stands **disposed** with the above direction.

Chandigarh
Dated: 12.05.2021

Sd/-
(Maninder Singh Patti)
State Information Commissioner

