



Sh. Manjit Singh  
H.No.2877, Phase-7,  
SAS Nagar ( Mohali) .

Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Deputy Commissioner,  
SAS Nagar (Mohali).

Respondent

**Complaint Case No.139/2019**

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/ Complaint
01.11.2017	Nil	Nil	Nil	04.02.2019

**Present:** Sh. Manjit Singh, Complainant in person.  
Sh. Devinder Singh, Clerk, DC Office, Mohali.  
Smt. Surinder Kumar, DC Office, Ropar  
- on behalf of respondents.

**ORDER:**

The following order was passed by this forum on 02.04.2019:

*“The complainant has sought to know the information pertaining to the licenses issued to the stamp venders and some allied information.*

*The Respondent says that the district of Mohali came into the being on 13<sup>th</sup> of April, 2006. As it was a part of the Ropar district prior to its existence his application was forwarded under Section 6(3) of the RTI Act to the Deputy Commissioner, Ropar. Nothing has been heard from the respondent in the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Ropar. They are required to give available information to the complainant besides filing a suitable reply to the Commission.”*

The case has come up today.

The respondent in the DC Office, Ropar, have provided him the information and the complainant has admitted to have received it. However, the complainant insists and demands vociferously and cantankerously on the imposition of penalty on the respondent as the information sought pertained to the respondents in Mohali as well. As they have failed to provide it timely, they should be penalized.



-2-

**Complaint Case No.139/2019**

The respondent from Mohali says that they construed to relate it with Ropar only. Nonetheless, they are ready to provide the same immediately. However, the complainant stubbornly takes a stance that he is no more interested in information and is adamant to get a penalty imposed.

The Commission has gone through the file. His original application was filed on 01.11.2017. The complaint has been filed after a year of cause of action. It is hopelessly time barred and should not have been entertained at all at the first instance. However, the Commission, in the interest of probity and transparency have arranged to provide the information and is inclined to make good the deficient one. But the complainant is not interested in the same.

The penal provisions are not meant to be used to bring the PIO to abject submission on the slightest infraction of time. These have been incorporated to promote the cause of transparency. The Commission does not find any malafide on the part of respondent to withhold the information. There is no merit whatsoever in the case. It is **dismissed**.

**13.06.2019**

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

