



Smt Mandeep Kaur, D/o Sh Baljinder Singh,  
R/o Village Meerpur, P.O Kheri Naudh Singh,  
Tehsil Khamanoo, Distt Fatehgarh Sahib.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o Director of Education SGPC,  
Bahadurgarh, Patiala.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o Director of Education SGPC,  
Bahadurgarh, Patiala.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 1277 of 2021**

**PRESENT:     None for the Appellant**  
**None for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant through an RTI application dated 03.12.2020 has sought information regarding the recruitment of Assistant Professors (History) in Mata Gujri College Fatehgarh Sahib against advertisement No.306/2020 dated 04.09.2020 by SGPC Bahadurgarh Patiala and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of Director of Education, SGPC Patiala. The appellant was not provided with the information, after which the appellant filed a first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 08.01.2021, which did not decide on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 20.07.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information.

The respondent was absent. The PIO was directed to provide the information to the appellant within 15 days and send a compliance report to the Commission. The PIO was also directed to appear before the Commission on the next date of hearing along with an explanation for not attending to the RTI application within the time prescribed under the RTI Act.

On the date of the next hearing on **14.09.2021**, both the parties were absent. The case was adjourned.

On the date of hearing on **04.01.2022**, the respondent Sh.Simarjit Singh was present at Amritsar and informed that the information has already been sent to the appellant.

Because of the non-presence of the staff in the DC office Patiala due to farmers' protests, the appellant could not be heard. The case was adjourned.

On the date of the last hearing on **19.04.2022**, both the parties were absent. The case was adjourned.

**Hearing dated 12.09.2022:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. Both parties are absent.

At the hearing on 04.01.2022, Sh.Simarjit Singh, PIO was present and informed that the information has been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 28.12.2021.

**Appeal Case No. 1277 of 2021**

The appellant is absent on 3<sup>rd</sup> consecutive hearing nor is represented as well has not communicated any discrepancies.

It is presumed that the appellant has received the information and is satisfied with the provided information.

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

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 12.09.2022**

**Sd/-**  
**(Khushwant Singh)**  
**State Information Commission**



Sh.Lajpat Rai, S/o Sh Harbans Lal,  
H no-B-3/287, Romana Street,  
Jaito, Distt Faridkot.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o Addl, Chief Secretary,  
Local Govt, Sector-35-A,  
Chandigarh

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o Addl, Chief Secretary,  
Local Govt, Sector-35-A,  
Chandigarh

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 1706 of 2020**

**PRESENT: Sh.Lajpat Rai as the Appellant**  
**Smt.Sunita Sharma-PIO for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant through RTI application dated 20.01.2020 has sought information regarding action taken on the application filed for cancellation of probation period of Ramesh Kumar and Prem Chand – action taken on the complaint dated 13.11.2019 for missing record by Ajay Singh Clerk - and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of Addl.Chief Secretary Local Govt. Punjab Chandigarh. The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the first appellate authority on 19.02.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 02.11.2020 through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The respondent was absent. The case was adjourned.

On the date of the hearing on **04.01.2021**, both the parties were absent.

Having gone through the file, the Commission observed that there has been an enormous delay in attending to the RTI application and the PIO was absent on 2<sup>nd</sup> consecutive hearing, the PIO was issued a **show-cause notice under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 and directed to file reply on an affidavit.** The PIO was again directed to provide the information within 10 days of the receipt of this order.

On the date of the hearing on **16.08.2021**, the respondent present pleaded that the information relating to point-9 concerning them was denied u/s 8(H) since the matter was under consideration with the Govt. and the reply was sent to the appellant on 13.03.2020. Thereafter, on the recommendation of DC Faridkot, show cause notice was issued to all the employees found responsible and a reply was sent to the appellant vide letter dated 30.07.2021. Further, since the remaining information related to the office of Director, Local Govt., the RTI application was transferred to them u/s 6(3) on 06.03.2020. The PIO-Director Local Govt has also sent information to the appellant vide letters dated 27.02.2020 and 19.03.2020.

The appellant was not satisfied with the information provided and wanted information regarding the action taken by the Principal Secretary Local Govt. on his applications as mentioned in the RTI application.

The PIO was directed to relook at the RTI application and provide whatever action has been taken by the Principal Secretary on the applications of the appellant along with all noting/correspondence. The PIO was also directed to file a reply to the show-cause notice.

On the date of hearing on **03.01.2022**, the respondent present informed that the information has already been provided to the appellant.

As per the appellant, the PIO had not provided the copy of his complaints along with action taken by Principal Secretary Local Govt. thereon as mentioned in the RTI application.

Hearing both the parties, the PIO was directed to provide information as per earlier order, which still stands and as discussed during the hearing. The PIO was also directed to file a reply to the show-cause notice.

On the date of last hearing on **19.04.2022**, the appellant claimed that the PIO has not supplied the information.

The respondent was absent and vide email has sought exemption. In the said email, the PIO further mentioned that since the matter of action against the employees of MC Jaito is under consideration with the Govt., the information cannot be provided.

**Hearing dated 12.09.2022:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The appellant claims that the PIO has not supplied the information.

The respondent present pleaded that after the inspection of the record by the appellant in the present case and appeal case No.1702 of 2020, the available information has already been provided to the appellant and no further information relating to this RTI application is available in the record.

The respondent has further informed that the appellant has also already filed numerous RTI applications against the employees of NC Jaito in the last six years and one such appeal case No.1702 of 2020 for seeking exactly the same information has been filed with Director Local Govt.

Having gone through the record, the Commission observes that the appellant has filed two appeal cases No.1702 of 2020 and 1706 of 2020, one with Director Health and another with Secretary Health seeking exactly the same information. This is clearly a misuse of the RTI act and leads to the diversion of time and resources of the public authority as it has to dig out the same information twice as the custodian of this sought information is one PIO.

Moreover, an affidavit has already been filed stating the information that has been provided is complete.

Given the facts above, the appeal is **dismissed**.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated :12.09.2022**

**Sd/-**  
**(Khushwant Singh)**  
**State Information Commissioner**



Sh.Lajpat Rai, S/o Sh Harbans Lal,  
H no-B-3/287, Romana Street,  
Jaito, Distt. Faridkot.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o Director,  
Local Govt. Deptt, Sector-35-A,  
Chandigarh.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o Director,  
Local Govt., Sector-35-A,  
Chandigarh

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 1702 of 2020**

**PRESENT: Sh.Lajpat Rai as the Appellant**  
**Smt.Sunita Sharma-PIO for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant through RTI application dated 23.01.2020 has sought information on 15 points regarding action taken on the application filed for cancellation of probation period of Ramesh Kumar and Prem Chand – action taken on the complaint dated 13.11.2019 for misplacing the record by Ajay Singh Clerk - and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of Director Local Govt. Punjab Chandigarh. The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the first appellate authority on 20.02.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 02.11.2020 through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The respondent was absent. The case was adjourned.

On the date of the next hearing on **04.01.2021**, both the parties were absent.

Having gone through the file, the Commission observed that there has been an enormous delay in attending to the RTI application and the PIO was absent on 2<sup>nd</sup> consecutive hearing, the PIO was issued a **show-cause notice under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 and directed to file reply on an affidavit.** The PIO was again directed to provide the information within 10 days of the receipt of this order.

On the date of the hearing on **16.08.2021**, as per the appellant, the PIO had supplied information on 09.04.2020 which was incomplete.

The respondent was absent on 3<sup>rd</sup> consecutive hearing nor has sent a reply to the show-cause notice as well as not provided the complete information.

The PIO was given one last opportunity to provide complete information and file a reply to the show-cause notice otherwise it will be construed that the PIO has nothing to say on the matter and a decision will be taken accordingly.

On the date of hearing on **03.01.2022**, The appellant informed that the PIO has not provided the complete information.

The respondent was absent. The Commission received a reply from the PIO on 23.09.2021 which was taken on the file of the Commission.

On the date of last hearing on **19.04.2022**, the respondent PIO was present at Chandigarh and informed that the appellant has already inspected the record and the information( 99 pages) as identified by the appellant has been provided.

The appellant however, claimed that the PIO has only supplied the information on points 8 & 11 but no information on remaining points has been provided.

Having gone through the RTI application and hearing both the parties, the Commission directed the PIO to relook at the RTI application and provided information on all points as discussed during the hearing and send a compliance report to the Commission. The PIO was also directed to file reply to the show cause notice.

**Hearing dated 12.09.2022:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The appellant claims that the PIO has not supplied the information.

The respondent present pleaded that after the inspection of the record by the appellant, the available information has already been provided to the appellant and no further information relating to this RTI application is available in the record. The PIO has also filed an affidavit in this regard.

The respondent has further informed that the appellant has already filed numerous RTI applications against the employees of NC Jaito in the last six years and one such appeal case No.1706 of 2020 for seeking exactly the same information has been filed with Secretary Local Govt.

Having gone through the record, the Commission observes that the appellant has filed two appeal cases No.1702 of 2020 and 1706 of 2020, one with Director Health and another with Secretary Health seeking exactly the same information. This is clearly a misuse of the RTI act and leads to the diversion of time and resources of the public authority as it has to dig out the same information twice as the custodian of this sought information is one PIO.

Moreover, an affidavit has already been filed stating the information that has been provided is complete..

Given the facts above, the appeal is **dismissed**.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated :12.09.2022**

**Sd/-**  
**(Khushwant Singh)**  
**State Information Commissioner**



Smt.Mandeep Kaur D/o Sh Iqbal Singh,  
R/o Village Sherpur Sadha,  
Tehsil Sultanpur Lodhi  
Distt Kapurthala.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Director, Department of Health  
And Family Welfare, Pb  
Sector 34-A, Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o Director, Department of Health  
And Family Welfare, Pb  
Sector 34-A, Chandigarh.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 2418 of 2022**

**PRESENT: Smt.Mandeep Kaur as the Appellant**  
**None for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant, through an RTI application dated 29.07.2021 has sought information regarding the counselling merit list of 600 posts of Multipurpose health workers published by Baba Farid University of Sciences Faridkot on 13.07.2020 and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of Director Health and Family Welfare, Pb Chandigarh. The appellant was not satisfied with the reply of the PIO dated 21.09.2021, after which the appellant filed a first appeal before the first appellate authority on 21.12.2021, which did not decide on the appeal.

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Kapurthala. As per the appellant, the PIO has not supplied the complete information.

The respondent is absent nor is represented.

Having gone through the RTI application and the reply of the PIO, the Commission finds that the RTI application has been sufficiently replied to.

A reply from the PIO (dated 25.02.2022) states that a list of 498 candidates out of 600 posts that the appellant is seeking has been uploaded on the website of the department. The complete list has not been uploaded on the website as the process is yet to be completed.

I am marking this to the Secretary, Department of Health and Family Welfare, Pb if the remaining 102 names have not been uploaded due to any other reason as stated by the PIO. If yes, the matter may be resolved accordingly.

With the above observations and order, the case is **disposed of and closed**.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 12.09.2022**

**Sd/-**  
**(Khushwant Singh)**  
**State Information Commission**



Sh Gurtej Singh, S/o Sh Bakshish Singh,  
R/o Village Rohti Mouran,  
P.O Village Rohta, Distt Patiala.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o BDPO, Nabha,  
Distt Patiala.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o DDPO,  
Patiala.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 119 of 2022**

**PRESENT: Sh.Gurtej Singh as the Appellant**  
**Sh.Sandeep Kumar, Panchayat Secretary for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant, through an RTI application dated 02.12.2019 has sought information on 16 points regarding details of the development work done by Gram Panchayat Rohti Morha – the details of work done by the amount of contract received against Panchayat land – a copy of the letter issued on 2<sup>nd</sup> October for cleanliness work – detail of cleanliness work of village pool either by MNREGA – total contract amount of contract for cleaning of pool alongwith copies of bills – activities register of village Panchayat from 01.01.2019 to 02.2019 - copies of photographs taken on 22.11.2019 – details of the medical team which visited the village on 22.11.2019 during the medical camp and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of BDPO Nabha. The appellant was not provided with the information, after which the appellant filed a first appeal before the first appellate authority on 26.02.2020, which did not decide on the appeal.

The case last came up for hearing on 20.06.2022 through video conferencing at DAC Patiala.

The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information.

The respondent was absent. There was nothing on record which shows that the RTI application has been attended to by the PIO within the prescribed time. There has been an enormous delay of more than two years and six months. The PIO was issued a **show cause notice under section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 for not supplying the information within the statutorily prescribed period of time and directed to file reply on an affidavit.** The PIO was also directed to provide information to the appellant within 15 days of the receipt of the order as per the RTI Act.

**Hearing dated 12.09.2022:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. Both parties are present at Chandigarh. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been supplied to the appellant.

The appellant has acknowledged having received the information and requested that his appeal case be closed.



**Appeal Case No. 119 of 2022**

The respondent has also submitted a reply to the show cause notice, which has been taken on record.

Since the information has been supplied and the appellant does not want to pursue the case further, I accept the plea of the PIO and drop the show cause.

The case is **disposed of and closed**.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 12.09.2022**

**Sd/-**  
**(Khushwant Singh)**  
**State Information Commissioner**



Dr. Harsimran Singh,  
Professor and Unit Head Eye Unit-2,  
Govt Medical College, Patiala.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Supdt Health-3 Branch,  
Deptt of Medical Education Research,  
Pb, Civil Secretariat-2, Mini Secretariat,  
Sector-9-C, Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o Deputy Secretary,  
O/o Pr. Secy,  
Deptt of Medical Education & Research,  
Pb, Civil Secretariat-2, Mini Secretariat,  
Sector-9-C, Chandigarh,

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 5676 of 2022**

**PRESENT:   None for the   Appellant**  
**Sh.Davinderjit Singh, Sr.Assistant and Sh.Amandeep Singh, PIO for the**  
**Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant, through an RTI application dated 09.09.2021 has sought information on 08 points regarding the entire file including all the sub-files leading to the prosecution sanction decision regarding an FIR No.83 dated 29.04.2013 registered against the appellant under SC/ST Act. All file notings and correspondence between Punjab police and Govt/Department of Medical Education and Research/between the office of VC BFUHS Faridkot and the Govt /between DRME and the Govt/between the office of Principal Secretary and Hon'ble Cabinet Minister - copies of correspondence between the Govt department of Medical Education and the OSD(Litigation) and legal remembrances and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of Suptd. Health-3 Branch, Deptt of Medical Education Research Pb Chandigarh. The appellant was not satisfied with the reply of the PIO dated 19.10.2021 after which the appellant filed a first appeal before the first appellate authority on 28.10.2021, which did not decide on the appeal.

The case last came up for hearing on 20.06.2022 through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. The appellant pleaded that earlier an RTI application was filed on 09.09.2020 in response to which the PIO sent a reply vide letter dated 29.09.2020 stating that the matter is under consideration with the higher authorities. The appellant again filed a fresh RTI application on 28.09.2021, however, the PIO denied the information under section 8(1)(g) vide letter dated 19.10.2021 stating that as per the decision of Central Information Commission dated 14.06.2007, noting/correspondence portion of the file cannot be provided.

The respondent was absent.

Having gone through the RTI application and the reply of the PIO, the Commission observed that the PIO had wrongfully denied the information under section 8(1)(g) whereas Section 2(f) of the RTI Act clearly defines that the notings and correspondence portion is the part of the information, hence cannot be denied. The PIO was directed to provide all the information point-wise to the appellant and send a compliance report to the Commission.

**Appeal Case No. 5676 of 2022**

The case was also marked to the Secretary, Department of Medical Education & Research, Pb Chandigarh, with the direction to ensure that all the information that has been sought and is available in the record be provided.

**Hearing dated 12.09.2022:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. The respondent present pleaded that in compliance with the order of the Commission, the information (363 pages) was supplied to the appellant on 26.08.2022. However, the appellant informed that some of the pages are not legible, which, were again provided to the appellant on 31.08.2022, and the appellant has acknowledged having received the same.

The appellant is absent nor represented.

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

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 12.09.2022**

**Sd/-**  
**(Khushwant Singh)**  
**State Information Commissioner**



Sh Navdeep Gupta,  
# 04, Nimrit Villa,  
Mansahia Colony, Patiala.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o Director,  
Food & Supplies,  
Sec-39-C, Chandigarh.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o Director,  
Food & Supplies,  
Sec-39-C, Chandigarh.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 4035 of 2020**

**PRESENT: Sh.Pawan Goel for the Appellant**  
**Sh.Amandeep Singh, Inspector for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant, through an RTI application dated 27.08.2020, has sought information regarding 24.69 lakhs ration packets distributed during the lockdown period to the poor and labour class – district-wise details of discrepancy in data updated by Covid-19 control room – responsibility fixed for the gap of actual packets prepared for the purpose and distributed – Amount received from the State Govt and Central Govt. – printing cost of the inscription on 24.69 lacs ration packets and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of Director Food & Supply Pb Chandigarh. The appellant was not provided with the information, after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 27.10.2020, which took no decision on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 09.08.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Patiala/Mohali. The appellant claimed that the PIO had not provided the information.

The respondent was absent without any legitimate reasons for the absence. There had been an enormous delay of one year in providing the information. The PIO was directed to explain the reasons for not attending to the RTI application within the time prescribed under the RTI Act. The PIO was again directed to provide information to the appellant and send a compliance report to the Commission.

On the date of the hearing on **13.12.2021**, as per the appellant, the information was not supplied by the PIO.

The respondent appeared at Chandigarh and submitted a reply which was taken on the file of the Commission.

A copy of the reply was sent to the appellant along with the order. The appellant was directed to file his reply to the PIO with a copy to the Commission.

On the date of the hearing on **05.04.2022**, both parties were absent. The commission received a reply from the appellant on 10.02.2022, which was taken on record. The case was adjourned.

**Appeal Case No. 4035 of 2020**

On the date of the last hearing on **10.05.2022**, the respondent informed that the information regarding points 1 & 2 relates to Covid Control Room which comes under the Health Department and the information on points 3 & 4 relates to their department. However, on the basis of the available information through their software (point 4) their figure does not match with the figure (24.69 lacs ration packets)) as cited by the appellant in the RTI application. As per them, the newspaper had published an incorrect figure.

The following was concluded-

**“Points 1 & 2- Ajay Bir Singh Sarao, Jt. Director, Food & Supplies** is made a deemed PIO under sections 5 (4) & 5(5) and directed to procure the information from the concerned department and provide it to the appellant. The Health Department, Punjab is directed to coordinate and provide the information

**Points 3 & 4**

Point 3 to be provided since it relates to the respondent's department.

Regarding point 4, the respondent claims that on the basis of the available information through their software their figure does not match with the figure (24.69 lacs ration packets)) as cited by the appellant in the RTI application. As per them, the newspaper has published an incorrect figure. Having gone through the reading of the RTI application regarding 4, what the appellant primarily seeks is information regarding the printing cost of the inscription on ration packets distributed in Punjab. The information be provided in spite of the figures not matching.”

**Hearing dated 12.09.2022:**

**The case** has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. The respondent present pleaded that in compliance with the order of the Commission, the information on point-1 & 2 has been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 08.08.2022 and information on point-3 & 4 has been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 29.06.2022 with a copy to the Commission.

Having gone through the RTI application and the copy of information/reply of the PIO, the Commission finds that the RTI application has been sufficiently replied to and the information has been supplied to the best possible extent.

No further interference of the Commission is required. The case is **disposed of and closed**.

Chandigarh  
Dated: 12.09.2022

Sd/-  
(Khushwant Singh)  
State Information Commissioner

CC to: PIO-Chief  
Covid Control Room, Pb(SCCR)  
SCO No.149-152, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor,  
Sector 17-C, Chandigarh.



Sh Tejinder Singh,  
Civil Court, Tehsil Complex,  
Backside Sanjh Kender, Phillaur.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Civil Surgeon,  
Patiala.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o Civil Surgeon,  
Patiala.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 4318 of 2021**

**PRESENT:**     **None for the Appellant**  
                  **None for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant, through an RTI application dated 24.04.2021 has sought information regarding records relating to the purchase of medicine/diagnostics/sheets/electrical by the office of Civil Surgeon for the year 2018 – number of Corona cases admitted and the expenses incurred on their treatment from March 2020 – medicines/diagnostics purchased under the authority of National Health Mission from 2018 – payments made by civil surgeon office from 2018 as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of Civil Surgeon Patiala. The appellant was not satisfied with the reply of the PIO dated 27.05.2021 after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the first appellate authority on 03.08.2021, which did not decide on the appeal.

The case last come up for hearing on 17.05.2022 through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. As per the respondent, the information had been supplied to the appellant vide letter dated 27.05.2021.

As per the appellant, the information was incomplete and not as per the RTI application.

Having gone through the RTI application and hearing both the parties, the following was concluded:

- |               |   |  |
|---------------|---|--|
| - Point-1,2&3 | - | As per the respondent, the information is not specific. The PIO to relook at the application and provide information as discussed during the hearing.  |
| - Point-4     | - | PIO to provide copies of the bill relating to payments Made as discussed during the hearing.   |
| - Point-5     | - | As per the respondent, the information has been sent to The appellant. The appellant has not received the same. The PIO to send the information again. |

**Hearing dated 12.09.2022:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Ludhiana/Patiala. Both parties are absent.

The Commission has received a letter dated 17.06.2022 from the PIO vide which the PIO has sent the information to the appellant with a copy to the Commission.

**Appeal Case No. 4318 of 2021**

The appellant, vide email, has informed that the PIO has not yet supplied the information on point-5.

At the last hearing, Sh.Amit Jain, District Accounts Officer, was present and informed that the information on point-5 has been sent to the appellant. The appellant had not received the information. The PIO was directed to resend the information on point 5.

The PIO is directed to send the information on point-5 to the appellant immediately with a copy to the Commission.

With the above order, the case is **disposed of and closed**.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 12.09.2022**

**Sd/-**  
**(Khushwant Singh)**  
**State Information Commission**



Sh. Jaspreet Singh,  
# 2041/5, Lahill Colony,  
Patiala .

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o District Controller,  
Food Supplies and Consumer Affairs,  
Patiala.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o Food Civil Supplies and Consumer Affairs,  
Pb, Chandigarh.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 3532 of 2020**

**PRESENT:   None for the Appellant**  
**Sh.Rakesh Garg, AFSC for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The case was first heard on 23.03.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information.

The respondent present pleaded that they received the RTI application from the appellant on 18.06.2020 and since the information is voluminous and was to be called from different branches, after calling the details of information, the appellant was asked to vide letter dated 06.07.2020 to deposit the requisite fee of Rs.30000/- which the appellant did not deposit.

The respondent further informed that some of the information regarding points 3 & 6 relates to 3<sup>rd</sup> parties since the appellant has asked for complete files of the shellers in the area, which includes personal information of the owners of the rice shellers.

Having gone through the RTI application and hearing both the parties, the appellant was directed to inspect the record by visiting the office of the PIO on 05.04.2021 at 12.00 Noon and get the relevant information after depositing the requisite fee as per the RTI Act. The PIO was directed to allow inspection of the record and provide the relevant information to the appellant except for information on points 3 & 6, the decision on which will be taken at the next date of hearing.

On the date of the hearing on **09.06.2021**, the appellant informed that he visited the office of the PIO on 05.04.2021 but could inspect only 3 Registers out of 38 Registers and concerned files. The appellant stated that since the information is voluminous, he needs 15 continuous days to inspect the file and specify the information.

The case was adjourned.

On the date of the hearing on **16.08.2021**, the appellant reiterated his plea that since the information is voluminous, he needs 15 days to inspect the record and specify the information.



**Appeal Case No. 3532 of 2020**

The appellant was directed to file a written submission giving reasons that why this record is important for the appellant and why should he be given rights to inspect the record for such a lengthy period, as prima facie it is evident that it will clearly divert the resources and hamper the functioning of the public authority.

On the date of hearing on **04.01.2022**, due to the non-presence of the staff in the DC office Patiala due to the farmers' protest the hearing could not take place. The case was adjourned.

On the date of the last hearing on **19.04.2022**, the appellant was absent nor had filed his written submission as per order of the Commission. The case was adjourned.

**Hearing dated 12.09.2022:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. The appellant is absent on 2<sup>nd</sup> consecutive hearing nor is represented.

On the date of hearing on 23.03.2021, the appellant was directed to inspect the record on 05.04.2021 and get the relevant information. However, on the date of hearing on 09.06.2021 and again on 16.08.2021 the appellant informed that since the information was voluminous, only three registers out of 38 registers could be inspected, and a further time of 15 continuous days to inspect the record was required.

The appellant was directed to file a written submission giving reasons why this record is important for the appellant to allow such a lengthy period of inspection as it may divert the resources and hamper the functioning of the public authority.

The appellant is continuously absent on 2<sup>nd</sup> consecutive hearing nor is represented to pursue his case as well as not filed any submission.

The case is **disposed of and closed** for non-pursuance of the case by the appellant.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated 12.09.2022**

**Sd/-**  
**(Khushwant Singh)**  
**State Information Commissioner**