

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,**  
**Sector 16, Chandigarh.**  
**Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - [psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in)**  
**Visit us: - [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)**



Sh Thakur Dass Sharma, S/o Sh Om Parkash,  
Chamber No-22, Civil Court complex,  
Tehsil Gidderbaha, Distt Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Civil Surgeon,  
Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o Punjab Health System Corporation,  
Sector-38, Chandigarh.

... Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 3999 of 2021**

**PRESENT: Sh.Thakur Dass as the Appellant**  
**Dr.Arpan for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant, through an RTI application dated 29.04.2021, has sought information on 06 points regarding a copy of the specified form for obtaining disability certificate, clinical psychologist report issued by Govt Medical College, Faridkot and report of medical suptd. – a copy of the application for getting said disability certificate along with documents required – date of application form received and referred to Govt medical college with the reference number – criteria followed in issuing the certificate etc. as enumerated in the RTI application from the office of Civil Surgeon, Sri Mukatsar Sahib. The appellant was not satisfied with the reply of the PIO dated 11.05.2021, after which the complainant filed a first appeal before the first appellate authority on 28.05.2021, which disposed of the appeal on 24.05.2021.

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

The respondent present pleaded that the information is personal and could not be provided.

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

- Point-1 - PIO to provide information.
- Point-2 - PIO to provide the information.
- Point-43 - Not to be provided.
- Point-4,5&6 - To be discussed at the next date of hearing.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **27.07.2022** at 11.00 AM through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 13.04.2022**

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



Sh Sanjeev Thakur,  
Village Gudha Khurd,  
P.O Madhopur Cantt, Pathankot.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o DFSC,  
Pathankot.

First Appellate authority,  
O/o Deputy Director, Field,  
Food Supplies Deptt,  
Jalandhar.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 4420 of 2021**

**PRESENT: None for the Appellant**  
**Sh.Harish Kumar, Asstt.Food Supply Officer for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant, through an RTI application dated 15.06.2021, has sought information regarding a copy of the rule under which depot is allocated and verification protected under labour law – a copy of verification of depot holder – a copy of the service book of Puneet Jaitly except for personal information, i.e. postings during service – number of the depot in 2018 – number of depots allocated from 01.01.2019 to 01.06.2021 etc. as enumerated in the RTI application from the office of District Food Supply Controller, Pathankot. . The appellant was not provided with the information after which the complainant filed a first appeal before the first appellate authority on 28.05.2021 which disposed of the appeal on 26.07.2021.

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Pathankot. The respondent present pleaded that the information had been supplied to the appellant vide letter dated 02.03.2022.

The appellant is absent, and vide email has informed that the PIO has not supplied the information on point-2. As per the respondent, there are 85 depot holders, but the appellant has not specified for which depot the appellant wants information.

Having gone through the record, the Commission observes that there has been an enormous delay of more than nine months in attending to the RTI application since the RTI application was filed on 15.06.2021, but the reply was sent on 02.03.2022. The Commission has taken a serious view of this and hereby directs the PIO to **show cause why the penalty be not imposed on him under section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 for not supplying the information within the statutorily prescribed period. 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 person(s) of the show cause and direct them to appear before the Commission along with the written replies.

To come up for further hearing on **13.09.2022** at 11.00 AM through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Pathankot.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 13.04.2022**

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



Sh Rohit Sharma,  
Chamber NO-320, Lawyers Chamber,  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Distt courts, Bathinda.

... Complainant

Versus

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

...Respondent

**Complaint Case No. 1085 of 2021**

**PRESENT: None for the Complainant**  
**Sh. Rakesh Kumar, clerk and Sh.Mandeep Singh, Coordinator PNDT for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The complainant, through an RTI application dated 06.07.2021, has sought information on 04 points regarding detailed procedure followed as per PC PNDT Act for printing new form – F – provision/circular/order to buy form-F from Red Cross Society – order/circular to bar or not allowed to print the form-F – order prohibiting the use of xerox copy of form F etc. as enumerated in the RTI application from the office of Civil Surgeon, Ludhiana. The complainant was not provided with the information after which the complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 25.08.2021.

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Ludhiana. As per the respondent Sh.Mandeep Singh, they have not received the RTI application since the earlier clerk Sh.Ajay Kumar, who was dealing with the RTI application, has expired.

The complainant is absent nor is represented.

Since there is prima facie evidence of a delay of more than eight months in providing the information, the Commission has taken a serious view of this and hereby directs the PIO to **show cause why penalty be not imposed on him under section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 for not supplying the information within the statutorily prescribed period. 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 person(s) of the show cause and direct them to appear before the Commission along with the written replies.

To come up for further hearing on **13.09.2022** at 11.00 AM through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Bathinda. The PIO to appear at DAC Ludhiana.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 13.04.2022**

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



Sh Brij Mohan, S/o Late Sh Sukhvir Kaur,  
W/o Late sh Ashok Walia, H No-126,  
Street No-5, North Estate, Bathinda.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o DPI (Colleges), Punjab,  
PSEB, Phase-8, Mohali.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o DPI (Colleges), Punjab,  
PSEB, Phase-8, Mohali.

... Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 4411 of 2019**

**PRESENT: Sh.Varun Bansal, Advocate for the Complainant**  
**None for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant, through RTI application dated 25.07.2019, has sought information regarding a copy of acknowledgement/diary number of a letter dated 11.11.2004 as per DPI office record- a copy of reply sent to SSD Girls College Bathinda by DPI –a copy of action taken report – a copy of record vide which the said application was sent to other offices for required action – action recommended or ordered by any office to DPI colleges etc. as enumerated in the RTI application from the office of DPI (Colleges)Pb Mohali. The appellant was not provided the information, after which the complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 28.08.2019.

The case first came up for hearing before Sh.N.S.Brar, State Information Commissioner on 24.02.2020 where Ms.Paramjit Kaur, Sr.Assistant, appeared and informed that due to shifting of the office and the record being very old, the complete record couldn't be traced. However, the appellant may inspect the available record and get the relevant information per available record.

The case again came up for hearing before Ms.Preety Chawla, State Information Commissioner on 02.09.2020, wherein the respondent was absent and, as per the appellant, the information was not provided. The case was adjourned.

The case was again heard on 14.01.2021 by the same bench. None was present on behalf of the respondent. The PIO was issued a show-cause notice under section 20 of the RTI Act and directed to file a reply.

On the date of hearing on 17.03.2021, Sh.Avtar Singh, Sr.Assistant, appeared and informed that the information had been supplied to the appellant. The respondent also submitted his reply, which was taken on record.

The appellant was not satisfied. The appellant was directed to inspect the record on 19.03.2021 and get the relevant record. The PIO was directed to allow inspection of the record and provided the relevant information to the appellant.

The reply of the PIO was not in order. The PIO was directed to file a fresh reply to the show-cause notice.

**Appeal Case No. 4411 of 2019**

None was present on the next date of hearing on 18.05.2021, and the case was adjourned. On the date of hearing on 03.08.2021, the respondent filed a reply to the show-cause notice, and after having gone through the reply, the show cause notice was dropped. However, the PIO was directed to provide complete information to the appellant since the appellant was not satisfied with the provided information.

On the hearing date on 24.08.2021, the counsel for the appellant informed that the PIO had supplied misleading information. The respondent was absent. The case was adjourned.

The case has come up for **hearing before this bench today** through video conferencing at DAC Bathinda. Sh.Varun Bansal, counsel for the appellant, is present and informed that despite the order of the Commission, the PIO had not supplied the complete information.

The respondent is absent nor is represented and has not complied with the order of the Commission to provide the complete information.

Keeping the facts mentioned above in the case, it is clear that the PIO-DPI(Colleges), Pb Mohali is flouting the spirit of the RTI Act continuously. The PIO has not only shown utter disregard for the Commission's repeated orders to provide the information but has shown willful stubbornness in not appearing before the commission despite various orders of the Commission.

To secure an erring PIO's presence before the commission, the Information Commission is empowered to issue warrants to the PIO Under Section 18(3) of the RTI Act. A bailable Warrant of the PIO-DPI (Colleges), Pb Phase-8, Mohali is hereby issued through Senior Superintendent of Police, SAS Nagar, Mohali for his presence before the Commission on **08.08.2022**.

To come up for further hearing on **08.08.2022 at 11.00 AM**.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 13.04.2022**

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

**BAILABLE WARRANT OF PRODUCTION  
BEFORE  
SHRI KHUSHWANT SINGH  
STATE INFORMATION COMMISSIONER,  
PUNJAB AT CHANDIGARH**

In case: Brij Mohan Singh V/s PIO-DPI(Colleges), Pb SAS Nagar,  
Mohali

APPEAL CASE NO.4411 of 2019

**UNDER SECTION 18 OF THE RIGHT TO INFORMATION ACT, 2005**

Next Date of Hearing: **08.08.2022**

To

**The Senior Superintendent of  
Police, SAS Nagar, Mohali**

Whereas PIO- PIO-DPI(Colleges), Pb SAS Nagar Mohali has failed to appear before the State Information Commissioner, Punjab despite the issuance of notice/summon in the above mentioned appeal case. Therefore, you are hereby directed to serve this bailable warrant to the PIO- PIO-DPI(Colleges), Pb SAS Nagar Mohali to appear before the undersigned at Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden, Sector 16, Chandigarh on **08.08.2022 at 11.00A.M.**

**Chandigarh  
Dated:13.04.2022**

**(Khushwant Singh)  
State Information Commissioner**

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden, Sector 16, Chandigarh.**  
**Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in**  
**Visit us: - www.infocompunjab.com**



Sh Deven Munjal,  
Ward No-19, Street NO-4, Roop Nagar,  
Gidderbaha, Distt Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o Tehsildar, Gidderbaha,  
Distt Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o SDM, Gidderbaha,  
Distt Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 1227 of 2019**

**PRESENT: Sh.Devan Munjal as the Appellant**  
**None for the Respondent**

**ORDER: Facts of the case:**

The appellant through RTI application dated 06.09.2018 has sought information regarding sale/transfer deeds registered for properties falling under the MC limit of Gidderbaha alongwith copies of NOC, details of RTIs and funds utilized and other information concerning the office of Tehsildar, Gidderbaha. The appellant was not provided with the information after which he filed the first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 09.11.2018, which did not decide on the appeal.

That, the case has already been heard on 31.07.2019, 28.11.2019, 25.02.2020, 16.06.2020, 07.09.2020, 18.11.2020, 19.01.2021, 24.03.2021, 01.11.2021 & 31.01.2022.

On the date of the first hearing on 31.07.2019, it was observed that the information was not provided and there has been a delay of more than 10 months in attending to the RTI application, the PIO was issued a **show-cause notice** under section 20 of the RTI Act and directed to file reply on an affidavit. The PIO was again directed to provide the information to the appellant within 10 days.

That further since the complete information was not provided by the PIO and the PIO was not appearing before the Commission, the PIO was issued a bailable warrant was issued on 25.02.2020 under section 18(3) of the RTI Act through SSP Sri Mukatsar Sahib for his appearance before the Commission on 08.04.2020 which date was further postponed.

That on the date of hearing on 18.11.2020, Sh.Jatinder Pal Singh, Naib Tehsildar, and Gidderbaha appeared and informed that the information on points 2,3 & 4 has been provided and regarding the information on point-1, the appellant may get the information from Suvidha Kenra. The PIO was directed to provide information on all points and allow inspection of records to the appellant regarding point-1.

That on the date of hearing on 19.01.2021, the respondent informed that after inspecting the record, the appellant did not specify the sale/transfer deeds. As per the appellant, the inspection was not complete since the PIO did not allow the appellant two more visits for inspection of record relating to point-1 and relook and relook at points 2 & 3 and provide complete information.

**Appeal Case No. 1227 of 2019**

That on the date of hearing on 24.03.2021, the appellant informed that the information on point-2 has been provided, but information on points 1 & 3 is pending. The PIO was given one last opportunity to comply with the earlier order of the Commission and provide complete information to the appellant on points 1 & 3.

That on the date of last hearing on 01.11.2021, the appellant informed that he has received partial information on point-3 but the PIO has not supplied information on point-1.

The respondent was absent and vide email sought adjournment on the plea that the PIO Tehsildar Gidderbaha has been transferred and Naib Tehsildar Gidderbaha is on medical leave. However, the PIO has sent an affidavit stating that the available information has been provided to the appellant and no further information is available in the record.

The Commission was not in agreement with the affidavit of the PIO and directed the PIO to provide a revised affidavit wherein it is specifically mentioned point-wise ( i.e. point-1... point-2...) wherever information has been provided, or no further information is available relating to this RTI application.

That the case has come up for **hearing today through** video conferencing at DAC Sri Mukatsar Sahib. The appellant claims that the PIO has not provided the revised affidavit as per the order of the Commission and the information that has been provided is incomplete as well as with a delay of more than three years.

The Commission has received an affidavit from the PIO on 08.03.2022 which has been taken on record. The affidavit in original is being sent to the appellant and a copy of the same is retained in the record.

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

Hence the PIO- Tehsildar Gidderbaha is directed to pay an amount of **Rs.10000/-** via demand draft 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 with the order and submit proof of having compensated the appellant.

To come up for compliance only **27.07.2022 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated:13.04.2022**

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



**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,**  
**Sector 16, Chandigarh.**  
**Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in**  
**Visit us: - [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)**



Sh Suresh Kumar, S/o Sh Om Parkash,  
1 nd 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Ward NO-20,  
Piara Lal Thekedar Street, Mansa.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o DC,  
Mansa.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o DC,  
Mansa.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 3316 of 2021**

**PRESENT: None for the Complainant**  
**Smt.Saroj Aggarwal, DRO for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant through the RTI application dated 17.07.2020 has sought information regarding a copy of the application dated 06.03.2020 alongwith action taken thereon and enquiry report, noting etc. as enumerated in the RTI application from the office of DC Mansa. The appellant was not provided with the information after which the complainant filed a first appeal before the first appellate authority on 19.09.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 03.02.2021 before Ms.Preeti Chawla, State Information Commissioner when the respondent stated that the information available in the record has been provided to the appellant. The appellant was absent. The case was adjourned.

On the next date of hearing on 22.06.2021, the appellant was again absent. The appellant was given one more opportunity to appear, and the case was adjourned. On the date of the hearing on 16.08.2021, the appellant was present and informed that the PIO has not supplied the complete information. The PIO was directed to send a copy of the information to the Commission before the next date of the hearing.

The case has come up for hearing before this bench today through video conferencing at DAC Mansa. As per the respondent, the information has already been sent to the appellant (64 pages) vide letter dated 02.02.2021.

However, the PIO has not sent a copy of the information to the Commission as per the earlier order dated 16.08.2021.

The appellant is absent.

Earlier order stands. The PIO is directed to send a copy of the information to the Commission.

The appellant is directed to point out the discrepancies in the provided information in writing to the PIO and the PIO is directed to sort out the same.

To come up for further hearing on **13.09.2022** at 11.00 AM through video conferencing at DAC Mansa.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 13.04.2022**

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

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden, Sector 16, Chandigarh.**  
**Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in**  
**Visit us: - [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)**



Sh Suresh Kumar, S/o Sh Om Parkash,  
1 nd 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Ward NO-20,  
Piara Lal Thekedar Street, Mansa.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o DC,  
Mansa.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o DC,  
Mansa.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 3317 of 2021**

**PRESENT: None for the Complainant**  
**Smt.Saroj Aggarwal, DRO for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant through RTI application dated 17.07.2020 has sought information regarding a copy of the application dated 05.03.2020 sent to DC Mansa alongwith order of the DC thereon and other documents, statement, noting etc. as enumerated in the RTI application from the office of DC Mansa. The appellant was not provided with the information after which the complainant filed a first appeal before the first appellate authority on 19.09.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 03.02.2021 before Ms.Preeti Chawla, State Information Commissioner when the respondent stated that the information available in the record has been provided to the appellant. The appellant was absent. The case was adjourned.

On the next date of hearing on 22.06.2021, the appellant was again absent. The appellant was given one more opportunity to appear, and the case was adjourned. On the date of the hearing on 16.08.2021, the appellant was present and informed that the PIO has not supplied the complete information. The PIO was directed to send a copy of the information to the Commission before the next date of the hearing.

The case has come up for hearing before this bench today through video conferencing at DAC Mansa. As per the respondent, the information has already been sent to the appellant (64 pages) vide letter dated 02.02.2021.

However, the PIO has not sent a copy of the information to the Commission as per the earlier order dated 16.08.2021.

The appellant is absent.

Earlier order stands. The PIO is directed to send a copy of the information to the Commission.

The appellant is directed to point out the discrepancies in the provided information in writing to the PIO and the PIO is directed to sort out the same.

To come up for further hearing on **13.09.2022** at 11.00 AM through video conferencing at DAC Mansa.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 13.04.2022**

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