



Sh. Jatinder Singh,  
# 32-B.N. 90, Odeon Street No-2,  
Manjitha Road, Amritsar.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o DCP,  
Amritsar.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o Commissioner of Police,  
Amritsar.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 960 of 2021**

**PRESENT: Sh.Jatinder Singh as the Appellant**  
**Sh.Swaran Singh, Inspector for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant through an RTI application dated 08.03.2018 has sought information regarding a copy of the complaint filed by Rakhi Bedi against the appellant on 27.07.2016 which was marked by Commissioner office to Police station civil line – statement of witnesses – any documents produced by Rakhi Bedi and her husband during the hearing – enquiry reports and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of DCP Amritsar. The appellant was not satisfied with the reply of the PIO dated 12.08.2019 after which the appellant filed a first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 08.02.2020 which rejected the application on 11.03.2020 saying it was time-barred but provided the same information that the PIO had sent earlier.

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Amritsar. The respondent present pleaded that they received the RTI application on 17.06.2019 which was earlier heard by Sh.Avtar Singh Kaler, State Information Commissioner and disposed of the same on 12.06.2019 with the direction to the appellant to provide his identity proof to the PIO. The respondent further informed that since the complaint of Rakhi Bedi dated 27.07.2016 (which was sent to Assistant Commissioner of Police Amritsar (North) who further sent the same to the Police Station Civil Line for enquiry), was not traceable, the responsibility was fixed for the then Head Munshi Sahib Singh, and the case was sent to higher authority for departmental enquiry. The reply was sent to the appellant vide letter dated 12.08.2019 after he submitted the ID proof. Now the department enquiry has been completed and the case has been closed.

The Commission has also received a reply from the PIO on 30.06.2021 which has been taken on the file of the Commission.

Having gone through the reply, I find that the RTI application of 08.03.2018 has been sufficiently replied to.

No further course of action is required. The case is **disposed of and closed**.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated : 13.07.2021**

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



Sh Rajwinder Singh, S/o Sh Kuldeep Singh,  
# 26, Nagar Nigam colony,  
O/s Gillwali Gate, Amritsar.

... Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o DCP,  
Amritsar.

...Respondent

**Complaint Case No. 201 of 2021**

**PRESENT: Sh.Rajwinder Singh as the Appellant**  
**Sh.Swaran Singh Inspector for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The complainant through the RTI application dated 15.12.2020 has sought information regarding a copy of the complaint dated 28.11.2020 filed by Sandeep Kumar and complaint dated 11.11.2020 filed by Ved Parkash – enquiry report of officers – statement of witnesses – the name of enquiry officers and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of DCP Amritsar. The complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 12.02.2021.

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Amritsar. The respondent present pleaded that they received the RTI application on 18.12.2020 and since an enquiry into the complaints was still pending, the reply was sent to the appellant vide letter dated 26.12.2020. Now the enquiry has been completed and the enquiry report has been provided to the complainant. The appellant has received the information.

The Commission has also received a copy of a reply from the PIO on 02.07.2021 which has been taken on the file of the Commission.

Having gone through the reply, I find that the PIO has replied within reasonable time to the RTI application and thus I find no malafide or ill intention on the part of the PIO while handling this RTI application. If the appellant was aggrieved or had disagreement with the reply of the PIO (dated 26.12.2020) the appellant should have appealed to the first appeal authority as prescribed under section 19 (1) of the RTI Act.

No further course of action is required in this case. Disposed **of and closed**.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated : 13.07.2021**

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



Sh Rajwinder Singh, S/o Sh Kuldeep Singh,  
# 26, Nagar Nigam colony,  
O/s Gillwali Gate, Amritsar.

... Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o DCP,  
Amritsar.

...Respondent

**Complaint Case No. 213 of 2021**

**PRESENT: Sh.Rajwinder Singh as the Appellant**  
**Sh.Swaran Singh Inspector for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The complainant through RTI application dated 16.12.2020 has sought information regarding copy of entry register of complaints without number alongwith name of complainant from 01.01.2014 to 30.11.2020 – total number of complaints year-wise as well as inspection of record and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of DCP Amritsar. The complaint was filed in the Commission on 15.02.2021.

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Amritsar. The respondent present pleaded that they received the RTI application on 28.12.2020 and since the information sought by the complaint was not specific and was to be created, a reply was sent to the complainant vide letter dated 05.01.2021. The respondent further informed that if the complaint wants to inspect the record of some particular case, he may visit the office of PIO and inspect the record and get the relevant information.

The Commission has also received a copy of reply from the PIO on 30.06.2021 which has been taken on the file of the Commission.

Having gone through the reply, I find that the PIO has replied within reasonable time to the RTI application and thus I find no malafide or ill intention on the part of the PIO while handling this RTI application. If the appellant was aggrieved or had disagreement with the reply of the PIO (dated 5.01.2021) the appellant should have appealed to the first appeal authority as prescribed under section 19 (1) of the RTI Act.

No further action is required in this case. Case **disposed of and closed.**

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated : 13.07.2021**

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