

# PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,  
Madhya Marg, Sector 16, Chandigarh.  
Ph: 0172-2864100-101, Fax 0172 2864110

Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com), Email: [pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in)



Sh. Sahib Singh,  
S/o Sh. Raja Ram,  
Vill: Tandi,  
P.O: Laroya,  
Distt: Jalandhar.

.....Appellant

Vs

Public Information Officer,  
Block Development and Panchayats Officer, Bhogpur,  
District Jalandhar.

First Appellate Authority,  
District Development and Panchayats Officer,  
District Jalandhar.

.....Respondents

## Appeal Case No. 2833 of 2019

Present:- Shri Sahib Singh appellant in person.  
Shri Paramjit Singh, Panchayat Secretary-cum-PIO on behalf of the respondents.

### ORDER

This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 27.01.2020 in which it is mentioned that only meager information has been provided to the appellant whereas the respondent-PIO states that complete information has been provided to him as per its availability in the record of Gram Panchayat. To settle this matter, both the parties were directed to appear before the Commission with original record regarding information supplied/received on the next date of hearing.

2. In compliance to the previous order, both the parties appeared in Commission's office at Chandigarh with original record. Point-wise information is discussed with both the parties during the hearing. Regarding point at Sr. No.1, the respondent-PIO states that copy of notification was provided to the appellant regarding change of purpose of grant, It is mentioned in that notification that District Development and Panchayats Officer is the competent authority to change the purpose of grant. Regarding point at Sr. No.2, the respondent-PIO states that complete information regarding expenditure incurred on Community Centre, General/SC Dharamshala collectively has been provided to the appellant. Regarding points at Sr. No.3, the respondent-PIO states that no quotations/tenders are called for supply of bricks, sariya, sand, cement etc. He further states that they are buying these items on rates fixed by the Deputy Commissioner, Jalandhar and no correspondence between the office and parties regarding

Contd.....p/2

-2-

purchase/supply of material are available in respondent's record but copies of bills have already been provided to the appellant, which are available in the record of the respondents. No diary/dispatch register is maintained at the level of Gram Panchayat. Copy of measurement book was also provided to the appellant of new construction done in Dharamshala. He further states that complete information has been provided to the appellant and nothing has been left, which could be supplied to him, as per its availability in the record of Gram Panchayat, Tandi.

3. In view of the aforementioned discussion, the Commission is of the considered opinion that complete information has been provided to the appellant as per its availability in the record of Gram Panchayat. Accordingly, the present case is disposed of and closed. Copies of the order be sent to the parties.

Dated : 14.02.2020

sd/-  
( **Suresh Arora** )  
Chief Information Commissioner  
Punjab

# PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,  
Madhya Marg, Sector 16, Chandigarh.

Ph: 0172-2864100-101, Fax 0172 2864110

Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com), Email: [pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in)



Sh. Ranjit Singh s/o Shri Jaspinder Singh,  
Village Ruina Niwan, Tehsil and District Fatehgarh Sahib. ....Appellant

Vs

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Panchayats Secretary, Ruina Niwan,  
Block Sirhind, Distt. Fatehgarh Sahib.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o District Development and Panchayats Officer,  
Fatehgarh Sahib. ....Respondents

**Appeal Case No. 4692 of 2019**  
(Video Conference Proceedings)

Present:- Shri Ranjit Singh, appellant, at Chandigarh.

Shri Khushpreet Singh, Panchayats Secretary-cum- PIO, on behalf of the respondents.

## ORDER

This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 27.01.2020 vide which the respondents were directed to provide information from 10.10.2014 to 10.10.2019 under the provisions of RTI Act, 2005 before the next date of hearing.

2. The respondent-PIO states that complete information has been provided to the appellant and nothing has been left, which could be supplied to him, as per his RTI application under the provisions of RTI Act, 2005. Shri Ranjit Singh, appellant, confirms that he has received the information to his satisfaction and he does not want to pursue the matter any further.

3. After hearing the parties and going through the record available on the case file, it is revealed that complete information has been provided to the appellant to his satisfaction and nothing has been left, which could be supplied to him as per his RTI application under the provisions of RTI Act, 2005. Accordingly, the present case is disposed of and closed. Copies of the order be sent to the parties.

Dated: 14.02.2020

sd/-  
( **Suresh Arora** )  
Chief Information Commissioner  
Punjab

# PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,  
Madhya Marg, Sector 16, Chandigarh.  
Ph: 0172-2864100-101, Fax 0172 2864110



Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com), Email: [pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in)

Sh. Sucha Singh,  
S/o Sh. Rajinder Singh,  
VPO: Jasraur, Block Chowgavan,  
Tehsil: Ajnala,  
Distt: Amritsar.

.....Complainant.

Vs

Public Information Officer,  
O/o District Development and Panchayat Officer,  
Mini Secretariat,  
Distt: Amritsar.

.....Respondent

## **Complaint Case No. 762 2019** (Through Video Conference Facility)

Present:- Shri Sucha Singh, complainant.  
Shri Mubarak Singh, Accountant, on behalf of the respondent-PIO.

### ORDER

This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 27.01.2020 in which it is mentioned that the complainant is absent without intimation and information pertaining to Sr. No.1 to 4 and 45 to 62 has been supplied to the complainant. It is further mentioned in that order, that with the supply of this information, complete information has been provided to the complainant and nothing has been left, which could be supplied to him as per his RTI application under the provisions of RTI Act, 2005. Last opportunity was afforded to the complainant to revert back to the authorities in case of deficiencies in the information supplied to him. In compliance to the previous order, nothing has been received from the complainant regarding deficiencies in the information supplied to him.

2. The complainant confirms that he has received the information to his satisfaction and does not want to pursue the matter any further.

3. In view of the statement of the complainant, the present case is disposed of and closed. Copies of the order be sent to the parties.

Dated: 14.02.2020

sd/-  
(Suresh Arora)  
Chief Information Commissioner  
Punjab

# PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,  
Madhya Marg, Sector 16, Chandigarh.  
Ph: 0172-2864100-101, Fax 0172 2864110

Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com), Email: [pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in)



Sh. Jasbir Singh Sekhon,  
s/o Late Shri Kartar Singh  
VillageTandi, P.O. Laroya,  
District Jalandhar.

.....Appellant

Vs

Public Information Officer,  
o/o Sarpanch, Gram Panchayat  
Tandi, Block Bhogpur, District Jalandhar.

First Appellate Authority,  
o/o Block Development and Panchayats Officer,  
Bhogpur, District Jalandhar.

.....Respondents

## Appeal Case No. 4005 of 2019

Present:- Shri Jasbeer Singh, appellant in person.  
Shri Paramjit Singh, Panchayats Secretary, on behalf of the respondents.

### ORDER

This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 27.01.2020 vide which both the parties were directed to appear in the office of the Commission at Chandigarh with original record regarding receipt/supply of the information.

2. In compliance to the previous order dated 27.01.2020 both the parties appear at Chandigarh. The information supplied to the appellant is discussed point-wise during the hearing, from which it is found that information has been supplied to the appellant but the appellant states that information supplied to him is not complete. He further states that he wants to know, whether the same streets are got repaired again and again during the years 2003 to 2018 and not. The respondent-PIO states that he will check up the record and report on the next date of hearing. The respondents are directed to confirm this aspect on or before 4.3.2020 to the appellant with a copy to the Commission. The appellant places on record a letter stating that he has sent a registered letter to PIO/Sarpanch Gram Panchayat, Tandi, Block Bhogpur, Jalandhar for seeking information but the said office returned that letter without receiving the same. In this context, the respondent-PIO states that there is no PIO of Gram Panchayat, Tandi. Hence, the registered letter sent by the appellant was returned by Sarpanch without receiving the same. The respondent-PIO is directed to check up the record and intimate the appellant with a copy to the Commission whether the same streets are not got repaired again and again during the period 2003 to 2008.

3. To come up on 4.3.2020 at 3.00 P.M. to be heard through Video Conference Facility available in the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Jalandhar.

Dated : 14.02.2020

sd/-  
( Suresh Arora )  
Chief Information Commissioner  
Punjab

# PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,  
Madhya Marg, Sector 16, Chandigarh.  
Ph: 0172-2864100-101, Fax 0172 2864110

Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com), Email: [pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in)



Sh. Jasbir Singh Sekhon,  
s/o Late Shri Kartar Singh  
Village Tandi, P.O. Laroya,  
District Jalandhar.

.....Appellant

Vs

Public Information Officer,  
o/o Sarpanch, Gram Panchayat  
Tandi, Block Bhogpur,  
District Jalandhar.

First Appellate Authority,  
o/o Block Development and Panchayats Officer,  
Bhogpur, District Jalandhar.

.....Respondents

## Appeal Case No. 4008 of 2019

Present:- Shri Jasbeer Singh, appellant in person.  
Shri Paramjit Singh, Panchayats Secretary, on behalf of the respondents.

### ORDER

This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 27.01.2020 vide which both the parties were directed to appear at Chandigarh with original record regarding receipt/supply of the information.

2. In compliance to the previous order dated 27.01.2020 both the parties appeared in the office of the Commission at Chandigarh. The information supplied to the appellant is discussed point-wise during the hearing, from which it is found that information has been supplied to the appellant but the appellant states that information supplied to one Shri Sahib Singh is about Rs.5,80,000/- spent on Community Centre and Dharamshalas for General and Scheduled Castes whereas he has been given in writing that about Rs.4,50,000/- has been spent on these places during the years 2003 to 2018. The respondent-PIO states that he will check up the record and difference of amount with original record and report on the next date of hearing. The respondents are directed to confirm this aspect on or before 04.03.2020. The appellant places on record that he has sent a registered letter to PIO/Sarpanch Gram Panchayat, Tandi, Block Bhogpur, Jalandhar for seeking information but received back undelivered. He requests that action be taken against PIO/Sarpanch. In this context, the respondent-PIO states that there is no PIO of Gram Panchayat, Tandi. Hence, the registered letter sent by the appellant was returned by the Sarpanch without receiving the same.

3. To come up on 04.03.2020 at 3.00 P.M. to be heard through Video Conference Facility available in the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Jalandhar.

Dated : 14.02.2020

sd/-  
( Suresh Arora )  
Chief Information Commissioner  
Punjab

# PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,  
Madhya Marg, Sector 16, Chandigarh.  
Ph: 0172-2864100-101, Fax 0172 2864110



Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com), Email: [pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in)

Sh. Nirmal Singh Dhiman  
S/o Late Sh. Gurbax Singh,  
R/o House No. 895, Phase 11,  
District SAS Nagar.

.....Appellant  
Vs

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Financial Commissioner, Revenue,  
Administration -1 Branch,  
Punjab Civil Secretariat,  
Sector-1, Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o Financial Commissioner, Revenue,  
Punjab Civil Secretariat,  
Sector-1, Chandigarh.

..... Respondents

## Appeal Case No. 4500 of 2019

Present:- Shri Nirmal Singh Dhiman, appellant in person.

None on behalf of the respondents.

### ORDER

This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 27.01.2020 vide which the appellant was advised to send public interest involved in seeking the information before the next date of hearing. The respondents were advised to remove the deficiencies in the information handed over to him by the appellant during the hearing, with a copy to the Commission.

2. In compliance to the previous order dated 27.01.2020, the appellant places his submissions dated 14.02.2020 alongwith its annexures, on the record of the case file.

3. None is present on behalf of the respondents without intimation. Viewing the absence of the respondents seriously, the PIO is directed to take action on the submissions dated 27.01.2020 (handed over to the representative of the respondents during hearing) and letter dated 14.02.2020 said to have been sent to the respondents through registered post and send reply to the appellant with a copy to the Commission before the next date of hearing, failing which punitive action under the provisions of RTI Act, 2005 will be initiated against him.

4. To come up on 04.03.2020 at 11.00 A.M.

Dated: 14.02.2020.

sd/-  
(Suresh Arora),  
Chief Information Commissioner,  
Punjab.

# PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,  
Madhya Marg, Sector 16, Chandigarh.  
Ph: 0172-2864100-101, Fax 0172 2864110



Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com), Email: [pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in)

Sh. Gurdaulat Singh Sidhu,  
Village Dhani Sham Singh, Ghanga Kalan,  
P.O. Pakka Kale Wala, Block Guru Harsahai,  
Tehsil Jalalabad (West), District Ferozepur.

.....Appellant

Vs

Public Information Officer,  
District Development and Panchayats Officer,  
District Administrative Complex,  
Ferozepur.

First Appellate Authority  
o/o Deputy Commissioner  
District Administrative Complex,  
Ferozepur.

PIO/Special Secretary to Government of Punjab,  
Department of Rural Development and Panchayats, Punjab,  
Vikas Bhawan, Phase VIII, Mohali.

.....Respondents

## **Appeal Case No. 3357 of 2019** (Video Conference Proceedings)

Present:- None on behalf of the appellant.

Shri Sukhdeep Singh, Panchayats Secretary, on behalf of the respondents through VC alongwith Shri Budh Singh, Senior Assistant on behalf of the Directorate of Rural Development and Panchayats Punjab, SAS Nagar at Chandigarh.

### ORDER

This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 27.01.2020 vide which the respondent-PIO was directed to send the information brought by him, to be handed over to the appellant, through registered post. On receipt of the information, the appellant was advised to go through the same and revert back to the authorities, in case of deficiencies, in the information within ten days from today. On receipt of deficiencies from the appellant, the respondents were directed to remove the same before the next date of hearing. In view of the verbal explanation given by the PIO, show cause notice issued to him for imposition of penalty and award of compensation was dropped.

2. The appellant remained absent on 17.01.2020, 27.01.2020 and today without intimation.

Contd.....p/2



-2-

3. The representatives of the respondents state that complete information has been supplied to the appellant twice through registered post and nothing has been left which could be supplied to him as per his application for seeking information under the provisions of RTI Act, 2005. He further states that no deficiency has been received in their office after the receipt of the information by the appellant.

4. After hearing the representatives of the respondents and going through the record available on the case file, it is revealed that complete information has been provided to the appellant and nothing has been received from the appellant after supply of information to him even in the office of the Commission. From his absence and non-receipt of deficiencies, it is presumed that the appellant is satisfied with the information supplied to him. Accordingly, the present case is disposed of and closed. Copies of the order be sent to the parties.

Dated :14 02.2020

sd/-  
( **Suresh Arora** )  
Chief Information Commissioner  
Punjab

Subsequent to the hearing, Shri Bikramjit Singh Sidhu, Counsel for the appellant appears, who is apprised of the above orders. He states that information concerning points at Sr. No.1 to 5 has been received by the appellant to his satisfaction but no information has been received concerning point at Sr. No.6. Shri Sukhdeep Singh, Panchayats Secretary (M.No.97797-09700) is contacted on his mobile number in the presence of the counsel for the appellant. He states that one copy of the information was supplied (by hand) at the address of the appellant Village Dhani Sham Singh Ganga Kalan personally and one more copy of the same was sent through registered post. The counsel for the appellant states that nobody is residing at the given village address by the appellant. He will confirm whether the information has been received at the residence of the appellant or not. Shri Sukhdeep Singh, Panchayats Secretary, is advised to send complete information to the counsel of the appellant at his e-mail address 'sidhubikram83@yahoo.com'. On this, he states that it is not easy to scan and send the information which is comprising of 800 to 900 pages to the representative at his e-mail address. Both the parties exchange mobile numbers to contact each other in case of any problem in receipt/supply of information.

Dated :14 02.2020

sd/-  
( **Suresh Arora** )  
Chief Information Commissioner  
Punjab

# PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,  
Madhya Marg, Sector 16, Chandigarh.  
Ph: 0172-2864100-101, Fax 0172 2864110



Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com), Email: [pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in)

Sh. Balwinder Singh,  
Village Rao Ke Uttar,  
P.O. Mamdot Uttar, District Ferozepur. ....Appellant

Vs

Public Information Officer,  
o/o Block Development and Panchayats Officer,  
Mamdot, District Ferozepur.

FAA-District Development and Panchayats Officer,  
Ferozepur. ....Respondents

**Appeal Case No. 3510 of 2019**  
(Video Conference Proceeding)

Present:- None on behalf of the appellant.

Shri Nishan Singh, Panchayats Secretary on behalf of the respondent-PIO.

## ORDER

This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 27.01.2020 vide which the appellant was advised to go through the information supplied to him during the hearing and revert back to the authorities, in case of deficiencies, in the information supplied to him.

2. The appellant is absent without intimation but he has sent an e-mail stating that one adjournment may be given as he is busy in his brother's marriage.

3. The representative of the respondents states that Shri Roshan Lal, Panchayats Secretary, is absent but he is appearing on behalf of Shri Roshan Lal, Panchayats Secretary, and states that he has brought Utilization Certificates to be handed over to the appellant. With the supply of these utilization certificates, complete information has been supplied to the appellant and nothing has been left, which could be supplied to him as per his RTI application under the provisions of RTI Act, 2005.

4. After going through the record available on the case file, it is revealed that partial information was supplied to the appellant. The respondents are directed to send Utilization Certificates to the appellant through registered post. As per the version of the representative of the respondents with the supply of these documents, complete information has been supplied and nothing has been left, which could be supplied to him. Last opportunity is afforded to the

Contd.....p/2

-2-

appellant to go through the same supplied to him and revert back to the authorities, in case of deficiencies, in the information supplied to him failing which the case will be decided on merits. Regarding show cause notice issued to Shri Roshan Lal, Panchayats Secretary, he is directed to send his written explanation before the next date of hearing failing which matter regarding imposition of penalty and award of compensation will be decided and recommendation for taking disciplinary action against Shri Roshan Lal, Panchayat Secretary, will be made to the higher authorities. On receipt of his explanation, decision on show cause notice will be taken on the next date of hearing.

4. To come up on 04.03.2020 at 3.00 P.M. to be heard through Video Conference Facility available in the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Ferozepur.

Dated : 14.02.2020

sd/-  
( Suresh Arora )  
Chief Information Commissioner,  
Punjab

CC

Shri Roshan Lal,  
Panchayats Secretary  
o/o Block Development and Panchayats Officer,  
Mamdot, District Ferozepur.

(Regd.)

# PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,  
Madhya Marg, Sector 16, Chandigarh.  
Ph: 0172-2864100-101, Fax 0172 2864110

Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com), Email: [pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in)



Sh. Vikram Singh,  
# 983-E, Benipal Colony,  
Machhiwara,  
Distt: Ludhiana-141115

.....Appellant

Vs

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Tehsildar, Samrala,  
Distt: Ludhiana.

First Appellate Authority  
O/o Sub Divisional Magistrate,  
Samrala, District- Ludhiana.

.....Respondents

**Appeal Case No. 3082 of 2019**  
(Through Video Conference Facility)

Present:- Shri Vikram Singh, appellant.  
None on behalf of the respondents.

## ORDER

This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 11.02.2020 vide which the respondents were directed to give in writing that will, power of attorney and death certificate are not available in the Revenue Record of Ludhiana as well as in the office of Tehsildar, Samrala.

2. The respondents are absent without intimation.

3. After hearing both the parties and going through the record available on the case file, it is revealed that in compliance to the previous order dated 11.02.2020, the respondents have not given in writing that the above mentioned three documents are available in the Revenue Record of Ludhiana and Samrala. Last opportunity is afforded to the respondents to give in writing that these documents are not available in the revenue record of Ludhiana and office of Tehsildar, Samrala failing which punitive action will be initiated on the next date of hearing.

4. To come up on 04.03.2020 at 3.00 P.M. through Video Conference Facility available in the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Ludhiana.

Dated : 14.02.2020

sd/-  
( Suresh Arora )  
Chief Information Commissioner,  
Punjab

# PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,  
Madhya Marg, Sector 16, Chandigarh.  
Ph: 0172-2864100-101, Fax 0172 2864110



Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com), Email: [pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in)

Sh. Tarsem Lal S/o Sh. Karam Chand,  
R/o House No. 482, Street No. 5,  
Vishnu Nagar, Rahon Road,  
Ludhiana.

.....Appellant

Vs

Public Information Officer,  
O/o District Revenue Officer,  
Mini Secretariat, Ludhiana.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o Deputy Commissioner,  
Administrative Complex,  
Ludhiana.

.....Respondents

## Appeal Case No. 4441 of 2019 (Video Conference Proceeding)

Present:- Shri Tarsem Lal, appellant.  
None on behalf of the respondents.

### ORDER

This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 30.01.2020 vide which Shri Gurmit Singh Mann, Tehsildar, Ludhiana (East) was made necessary party and show cause notice was issued to him for imposition of penalty and award of compensation for non-appearance and for non-supply of information within stipulated period under the provisions of RTI Act, 2005 to the appellant for loss and detriment suffered by him.

2. None is present on behalf of the respondents without intimation
3. The appellant states that no information regarding points at Sr. Nos.1 and 4 has been supplied to him till date by the respondents.
4. After hearing the appellant and going through the record available on the case file, it is ascertained that information regarding points at Sr. No.1 and 4 is left to be supplied, which is said to have been supplied by the office of Tehsildar, Ludhiana (East). The absence of Shri Gurmit Singh Mann, Tehsildar, Ludhiana (East) is viewed seriously. Last opportunity is afforded to him to supply the information and appear before the Commission failing which action as proposed on 10.01.2020 will be taken against him and no more opportunity will be afforded to him.
4. To come up on **04.03.2020 at 3.00 P.M.** to be heard through Video Conference Facility available in the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Ludhiana.

sd/-

Dated : 14.02.2020

( **Suresh Arora** )  
Chief Information Commissioner  
Punjab

# PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,  
Madhya Marg, Sector 16, Chandigarh.  
Ph: 0172-2864100-101, Fax 0172 2864110

Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com), Email: [pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in)



Shri Jarnail Singh Mitke,  
Vice President Malwa Zone, Indian National Trade Union Congress,  
r/o H.No.318, Near Baba Manjil Gurudwara  
Hambran Road, Partap Singh Wala,  
Tehsil Lodhi West, Ludhiana. ....Appellant

Vs

Public Information Officer,  
o/o Block Development and Panchayats Officer-1,  
Ludhiana.

First Appellate Authority,  
o/o Block Development and Panchayats Officer-1,  
Ludhiana. ....Respondents

## Appeal Case No. 2635 of 2019 (Video Conference Proceeding)

Present:- Shri Jarnail Singh Mitke appellant.

Shri Bipan Kumar, Junior Engineer o/o BDPO, Ludhiana-I on behalf of the respondents.

### ORDER

This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 27.01.2020, vide which Shri Gurmit Singh Mann, Tehsildar, Ludhiana (East) was made necessary party to supply the information regarding point at ਓ and ਖ of Sr.. No. 3 and show cause notice was issued to him for non-appearance and not supplying the information as per the provisions of the RTI Act, 2005.

2. The representative of the respondents states that complete information has been provided to the appellant. On this, the appellant states that information has been supplied to him without attestation. The representative of the respondents was directed to attest the same during the hearing. On this, the representative of the respondents starts attestation but the appellant states that he does not want to get the same attested from him and requests that he may be allowed to withdraw his case.

3. In view of request of the appellant, the case is disposed of and closed as withdrawn. Copies of the order be sent to the parties.

Dated : 14.02.2020

sd/-  
( Suresh Arora )  
Chief Information Commissioner,  
Punjab

# PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,  
Madhya Marg, Sector 16, Chandigarh.  
Ph: 0172-2864100-101, Fax 0172 2864110



Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com), Email: [pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in)

Sh. Rachhpal Singh Sandhu S/o Sh. Malkit Singh,  
R/o H No. 1896, Street No. 1, (98556-95755)  
Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar,  
Kacha Dosanj Road, Moga-142001

.....Appellant

Vs

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Deputy Commissioner,  
Administrative Complex, Ludhiana.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o Deputy Commissioner,  
Administrative Complex, Ludhiana.

.....Respondents

## Appeal Case No. 4491 of 2019 (Video Conference Proceeding)

Present:- Shri Rachhpal Singh, appellant.

Shri Ranjijt Singh, Patwari, on behalf of the respondents.

### ORDER

This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 27.01.2020 vide which last opportunity was afforded to the respondents to supply complete information to the appellant within ten days after receipt of the information from the respondents. The appellant was advised to peruse the information and revert back to the respondents with a copy to the Commission, in the information supplied to him.

2. The appellant states that no information has been provided to him by the respondents till date.

3. The representative of the respondents states that concerned file placed in the bunch of other files and till date no inquiry has been started in the absence of the file. They have traced the file and the file has been put up to the authorities for conducting inquiry. He assures that information will be supplied after the completion of the inquiry..

4. After hearing the parties and going through the record available on the case file, it is revealed that the appellant has sought present status of inquiry. The respondents are directed to get the concerned file inspected from 1.3.2017 to 6.8.2019 and supply the documents, which he requires. The respondents have supplied the present status of the inquiry as it is under progress. The present case is disposed of and closed. Copies of the order be sent to the parties.

sd/-

Dated: 14.02.2020.

(Suresh Arora),  
Chief Information Commissioner,  
Punjab.

# PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,  
Madhya Marg, Sector 16, Chandigarh.  
Ph: 0172-2864100-101, Fax 0172 2864110

Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com), Email: [pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in)



Sh. Jogi Ram S/o Sh. Nathuni Ram,(94635 26517)

R/o H No. 2, Manmohan Nagar,

New Aman Nagar Extention,

Near Makkar Chaki, Bahadar ke Road,

PO –Netaji Nagar, Salem Tabri, Ludhiana.

.....Appellant

Vs

Public Information Officer,

O/o District Revenue Officer,

Administrative Complex, Ludhiana.

First Appellate Authority,

O/o Deputy Commissioner,

Administrative Complex,

Ferozepur Road, Ludhiana.

..... Respondents

**Appeal Case No. 4058 of 2019**

(Video Conference Proceeding)

Present:- None on behalf of the appellant.

Shri Ranjit Singh, Patwari, SK Branch on behalf of the respondents.

## ORDER

This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 27.01.2020 vide which last opportunity was afforded to the appellant to seek specific information concerning points at Sr. No.2 and 4. On receipt of the request from the appellant seeking specific information, the respondents were directed to supply the same before the next date of hearing.

2. The appellant remained absent on 06.01.2020, 13.01.2020, 27.01.2020 and today without intimation.

3. The representative of the respondents states that they have sent information to the complainant on his given address but the postal authorities have returned the same with the remarks that the person, in question, is not available at the said address. He further states that he has brought the same to be handed over to the appellant during the hearing, who is absent today.

4. After hearing the representative of the respondents and going through the record available on the case file, it is revealed that the appellant has not sought specific information regarding point at Sr. No.2 and 4. The representative of the respondents is directed to contact him on his mobile number and send the same again to the appellant as early as possible. He assures that he will send the same to the appellant today itself. On the assurance of the representative of the respondents, the present case is disposed of and closed with the advice to the appellant to peruse the information, on its receipt and approach the respondents with a copy to the Commission, in case of any deficiency in the information within seven days from today. Copies of the order be sent to the parties.

sd/-

( **Suresh Arora** )

Chief Information Commissioner  
Punjab

Dated :14.02.2020



# PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,  
Madhya Marg, Sector 16, Chandigarh.  
Ph: 0172-2864100-101, Fax 0172 2864110

Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com), Email: [pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in)



Sh. Mitter Sain Meert,  
R/o # 297, (98556-31777)  
Street No. 5, Upkar Nagar,  
Civil Lines, Ludhiana.

.....Complainant

Vs

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Financial Commissioner (Appeal-1),  
Punjab Civil Secretariat -2,  
Sector-9, Chandigarh.

PIO/Deputy Commissioner,  
District Administrative Complex,  
Shahid Bhagat Singh Nagar.

.....Respondents

**Complaint Case No. 1040 of 2019**  
(Video Conference Proceedings)

Present:- None on behalf of the complainant.

Ms. Jasvir Kumari, alongwith Shri Darshan Singh, both Senior Assistants on behalf of the respondent-PIO.

## ORDER

This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 27.01.2020, in which it is mentioned that on the request of the complainant the case was adjourned to 14.02.2020 to be heard through Video Conference Facility available in the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Ludhiana. The respondent-PIO was directed to take appropriate action on the request of the complainant and intimate regarding action taken to the complainant with a copy to the Commission.

2. The complainant remained absent on 13.01.2020. 27.01.2020 and today without intimation.

3. The representatives of the respondent-PIO sent a letter dated 07.02.2020 stating that the requisite information, as sought by the complainant, has been provided to him vide their letter dated 10.01.2020 and after the previous date of hearing no deficiency has been received from him till date. They further state that same information was already supplied to the complainant in CC Nos. 1084/2019 and 1085/2019 and both the cases were disposed of by Shri Nidharak Singh Brar, Hon'ble SIC after supply of complete information. She further requests that this case may also be disposed of and closed.

Contd.....p/2

4. After hearing the representatives of the respondent-PIO and going through the record available on the case file, it is ascertained that complete information has been provided to the appellant vide their letter dated 10.01.2020 as sought by the complainant as per his RTI application under the provisions of RTI Act, 2005. The same information has already been supplied to the complainant in CC No.1084/2019 and 1085/2019 and both the cases were disposed of and closed by Shri Nidharak Singh Brar, Hon'ble SIC. Furthermore, the complainant has not made his appearance on any of the hearing dates and he has not sent any deficiency after the receipt of information to the respondent-PIO as well as to the Commission. Hence, the present case is disposed of and closed. Copies of the order be sent to the parties.

Dated: 14.02.2020.

sd/-  
(Suresh Arora),  
Chief Information Commissioner,  
Punjab.

## PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,  
Madhya Marg, Sector 16, Chandigarh.

Ph: 0172-2864100-101, Fax 0172 2864110

Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com), Email: [pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in)



Sh. Harjap Singh Boparai,  
s/o Sh. Kuldeep Singh Boparai,  
VPO ghudani Kalan,  
Tehsil Payal  
District Ludhiana.

....Complainant

Vs

Public Information Officer,  
o/o Block Development and Panchayats Officer,  
Doraha,  
District Ludhiana.

....Respondent

Complaint Case No. 732 of 2019

### ORDER

This order was reserved on 10.1.2020 and is pronounced today. In both the cases the complainant and respondent are same and the information relates to the same village i.e. Ghudani Kalan, hence the Commission decided to club both the cases.

2. The background of the case is that the complainant sought the following information from the Public Information Officer-cum- Block Development and Panchayats Officer Doraha, District Ludhiana :-

1. Please supply the information regarding the total numbers of streets appro ed to be uprooted.
2. Please supply the total numbers of street uprooted during the time period in last 1<sup>st</sup> June 20188 to 30<sup>th</sup> April 2019.
3. Please supply the name and address of approval authority who approved uprooting work of streets.

Due to non receipt of the complete information, the appellant filed the complaint case in the Commission and the notice was served to the Public Information Officer-cum-Block Development and Panchayats Officer to appear before the Commission on 18.9.2019.

3. Due to technical problem in Video Conference Facility, the case was adjourned to 24.9.2019 and the respondent stated that they have brought the information

Contd..P/2

but due to absence of the complainant they were directed to send the same through registered post at the address of the complainant and the complainant was advised to revert back to the authorities in case of deficiencies with a copy to the Commission and the case was fixed for 16.10.2019 for further proceedings.

4. On 16.10.2019, the case was again adjourned to 30.10.2019 due to technical fault in the Video Conference Facility. On 30.10.2019, none was present on behalf of the respondents and the Commission viewed it seriously and show casuse notice for penalty was issued to the Public Information Officer along with the directions to remove the deficiencies i.e. all the papers should be attested, name of the sarpanch and the extra amount asked by the respondent office be refunded to the complainant and the case was adjourned to 21.11.2019.

5. On 21.11.2019 the representative of the respondent brought to the notice that two streets were uprooted without any permission of the competent authority and till date no grant has been received from the Central government and stated that on receipt of the grant under MANREGA scheme, the work will be started. With regard to the uprooted of streets, the representative of the respondent stated that these were uprooted before July, 2018 and no street has been uprooted during the months of July, 2018 to April, 2019 and the directions were issued to the respondent to refund the remaining amount after deduction of fees for the copies of document so provided to the information seeker.

6. On 10.12.2019 although the representative of the respondent was present but due to non satisfaction of the complainant with the information as well as the non reply of the Public Information Officer-cum-Block Development and Panchayats Officer in the case, the penalty of Rs.5000/- (Rupees Five thousand only) was imposed and the case was adjourned to 10.1.2020.

7. On 10.1.2020, the complainant and the Public Information Officer-cum-Block Development and Panchayats Officer, Ms Navdeep Kaur remained present during the course of hearing. The complainant showed the complete satisfaction with the information so provided by the respondent-Public Information Officer and also satisfied with the amount so refunded by the respondent. The Public Information Officer filed the written submissions, which was taken on record and stated that she has transferred the applications under section 5(5) and 6(3) of the RTI Act, 2005 to the assistant Program Officer, MANREGA as the same pertained to MANREGA scheme and with regard to the hearings she stated that she has not received orders of dated 18.9.19, 24.9.19, 16.10.19, 30.10.19, 21.11.19, and 10.12.19 and only the orders dated 18.9.2019, 30.10.2019 and 10.1.2019 have been

received. She further stated that she was over busy as her profile mandates to look into the development work of the villages, conduct, inquiries, attend to the rural public, keep a check on work and conduct of sarpanches and other nominated members, carry out works under MANREGA, look into court cases and encroachment issues etc. and also working as State Nodal Officer, due to her outstanding work, for Solid Waste management many times, she has to attend the meetings and give presentations too, to the district heads and fellow BDPOs. She further requested that a mild view be taken in view of the huge workload which has been assigned to her by the State Government and requested to close the case and withdraw the penalty imposed upon her.

According to the written submissions of the Public Information Officer –cum-Block Development and Panchayats Officer with regard to penalty imposed and narrating the facts of the case, the Commission accept the plea put forth by her and the penalty imposed upon Ms Navdeep Kaur, Public Information Officer-cum-Block Development and Panchayats Officer is hereby withdrawn.

Since no more cause of action is left in this case as the complete information has already been provided to the complainant to his entire satisfaction, the case is disposed of and closed.

Dated:14.2.2020

sd/-  
(Suresh Arora)  
Chief Information Commissioner,  
Punjab.



Sh. Harjap Singh Boparai,  
s/o Sh. Kuldeep Singh Boparai,  
VPO ghudani Kalan,  
Tehsil Payal  
District Ludhiana.

....Complainant

Vs

Public Information Officer,  
o/o Block Development and Panchayats Officer,  
Doraha,  
District Ludhiana.

....Respondent

Complaint Case No. 733 of 2019

ORDER

This order was reserved on 10.1.2020 and is pronounced today. In both the cases the complainant and respondent are same and the information relates to the same village i.e. Ghudani Kalan, hence the Commission decided to club both the cases.

2. The background of the case is that the complainant sought the following information from the Public Information Officer-cum- Block Development and Panchayats Officer Doraha, District Ludhiana :-

1. Please supply the current situation of the work (stabilization of pond) under MIS Rural sanitation Technical Sanction No. 3257 District 25.10.2018.
  2. Please supply the current situation of the work (stabilization of pond) under MIS Rural sanitation Technical Sanction No. 3259 District 25.10.2018.
  3. Please supply the current situation of the work (stabilization of pond) under MIS Rural sanitation technical Sanction No. 3257 District. 25.10.2018.
  4. Please supply the current situation of the work (stabilization of pond) under MiS Rural Sanitation Technical Sanction No. 471 District 23.10.2018.
  5. Please supply the current situation of the work (construction of interlocking block/tiles road for community) under MIS rural connectivity Technical Sanction No. MANREGA.
- B. 1. Please supply the action taken reports for the above said works Part A(1,2,3,4,5).

Due to non receipt of the complete information, the appellant filed the complaint case in the Commission and the notice was served to the Public Information Officer-cum-Block Development and Panchayats Officer to appear before the Commission on 18.9.2019.

3. Due to technical problem in Video Conference Facility, the case was adjourned to 24.9.2019 and the respondent stated that they have brought the information

Contd..P/2

but due to absence of the complainant they were directed to send the same through registered post at the address of the complainant and the complainant was advised to revert back to the authorities in case of deficiencies with a copy to the Commission and the case was fixed for 16.10.2019 for further proceedings.

4. On 16.10.2019, the case was again adjourned to 30.10.2019 due to technical fault in the Video Conference Facility. On 30.10.2019, none was present on behalf of the respondents and the Commission viewed it seriously and show casuse notice for penalty was issued to the Public Information Officer along with the directions to remove the deficiencies i.e. all the papers should be attested, name of the sarpanch and the extra amount asked by the respondent office be refunded to the complainant and the case was adjourned to 21.11.2019.

5. On 21.11.2019 the representative of the respondent brought to the notice that two streets were uprooted without any permission of the competent authority and till date no grant has been received from the Central government and stated that on receipt of the grant under MANREGA scheme, the work will be started. With regard to the uprooted of streets, the representative of the respondent stated that these were uprooted before July, 2018 and no street has been uprooted during the months of July, 2018 to April, 2019 and the directions were issued to the respondent to refund the remaining amount after deduction of fees for the copies of document so provided to the information seeker.

6. On 10.12.2019 although the representative of the respondent was present but due to non satisfaction of the complainant with the information as well as the non reply of the Public Information Officer-cum-Block Development and Panchayats Officer in the case, the penalty of Rs.5000/- (Rupees Five thousand only) was imposed and the case was adjourned to 10.1.2020.

7. On 10.1.2020, the complainant and the Public Information Officer-cum-Block Development and Panchayats Officer, Ms Navdeep Kaur remained present during the course of hearing. The complainant showed the complete satisfaction with the information so provided by the respondent-Public Information Officer and also satisfied with the amount so refunded by the respondent. The Public Information Officer filed the written submissions, which was taken on record and stated that she has transferred the applications under section 5(5) and 6(3) of the RTI Act, 2005 to the assistant Program Officer, MANREGA as the same pertained to MANREGA scheme and with regard to the hearings she stated that she has not received orders of dated 18.9.19, 24.9.19, 16.10.19, 30.10.19, 21.11.19, and 10.12.19 and only the orders dated 18.9.2019, 30.10.2019 and 10.1.2019 have been

received. She further stated that she was over busy as her profile mandates to look into the development work of the villages, conduct, inquiries, attend to the rural public, keep a check on work and conduct of sarpanches and other nominated members, carry out works under MANREGA, look into court cases and encroachment issues etc. and also working as State Nodal Officer, due to her outstanding work, for Solid Waste management many times, she has to attend the meetings and give presentations too, to the district heads and fellow BDPOs. She further requested that a mild view be taken in view of the huge workload which has been assigned to her by the State Government and requested to close the case and withdraw the penalty imposed upon her.

According to the written submissions of the Public Information Officer –cum-Block Development and Panchayats Officer with regard to penalty imposed and narrating the facts of the case, the Commission accept the plea put forth by her and the penalty imposed upon Ms Navdeep Kaur, Public Information Officer-cum-Block Development and Panchayats Officer is hereby withdrawn.

Since no more cause of action is left in this case as the complete information has already been provided to the complainant to his entire satisfaction, the case is disposed of and closed.

Dated:14.2.2020

sd/-  
(Suresh Arora)  
Chief Information Commissioner,  
Punjab.



# PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,  
Madhya Marg, Sector 16, Chandigarh.

Ph: 0172-2864100-101, Fax 0172 2864110

Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com), Email: [pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in)



Sh. Bhupinder Punj,  
r/o # 186, village Luhara,  
District Ludhiana.

....Appellant

Vs

Public Information Officer,  
o/o Secretary,  
Regional Transport Authority,  
Ferozepur

First Appellate Authority  
o/o State Transport Commissioner, Pb.  
SCO 177-78, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Sector 17,  
Chandigarh.

....Respondents

## Appeal Case No. 3751 of 2019

### ORDER

The case was listed for hearing on 17.12.2019 but was reserved to be pronounced.

2. The brief of the case is that the appellant filed the RTI application with the Public Information Officer to seek the following information :-

“ 1. ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਆਟੋਮੈਟਿਕ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਟੈਸਟ ਟਰੈਕ ਤੇ ਮਿੱਤੀ 1.1.2019 ਤੋਂ ਲੈ ਕੇ 20.6.2019 ਤੱਕ ਪੱਕੇ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਲਾਇਸੰਸਾਂ ਦੇ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਟੈਸਟ ਕਿੰਨੀ ਗਿਣਤੀ ਵਿੱਚ ਲਏ ਗਏ, ਲੜੀਵਾਰ ਨੰਬਰ ਅਤੇ ਤਾਰੀਖ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਕੰਪਿਊਟਰਾਈਜ਼ ਲਿਸਟ ਮੁਹੱਈਆ ਕਰਵਾਈ ਜਾਵੇ।

2. ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਆਟੋਮੈਟਿਕ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਟੈਸਟ ਟਰੈਕ ਤੇ ਪੱਕੇ ਲਾਇਸੰਸਾਂ ਦੇ ਟੈਸਟ ਕਿਸ ਕਰਮਚਾਰੀ/ਡਾਟਾ ਐਂਟਰੀ ਆਪ੍ਰੇਟਰ ਦੀ ਆਈ.ਡੀ. ਰਾਹੀਂ ਲਏ ਗਏ, ਉਸ ਕਰਮਚਾਰੀ/ਡਾਟਾ ਐਂਟਰੀ ਆਪ੍ਰੇਟਰ ਦਾ ਨਾਮ ਅਤੇ ਆਈ.ਡੀ. ਨੰਬਰ ਲਿਖਤੀ ਰੂਪ ਵਿੱਚ ਮੁਹੱਈਆ ਕਰਵਾਇਆ ਜਾਵੇ।

3. ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਆਟੋਮੈਟਿਕ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਟੈਸਟ ਟਰੈਕ ਤੇ ਐਪਲੀਕਾਟਾ ਨੇ ਖੁਦ ਆ ਕੇ ਟੈਸਟ ਦਿਤੇ, ਲਿਖਤੀ ਰੂਪ ਵਿੱਚ ਮੁਹੱਈਆ ਕਰਵਾਇਆ ਜਾਵੇ।

4. ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਆਟੋਮੈਟਿਕ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਟੈਸਟ ਟਰੈਕ ਤੇ ਪੱਕੇ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਲਾਇਸੰਸਾਂ ਦੇ ਟੈਸਟ ਕਿਸ ਅਫਸਰ ਅਤੇ ਕਰਮਚਾਰੀ ਦੀ ਦੇਖਰੇਖ ਵਿੱਚ ਲਏ ਗਏ ਸਨ, ਉਸ ਅਫਸਰ ਅਤੇ ਕਰਮਚਾਰੀ ਦਾ ਨਾਮ ਅਤੇ ਅਹੁਦਾ ਲਿਖਤੀ ਰੂਪ ਵਿੱਚ ਮੁਹੱਈਆ ਕਰਵਾਇਆ ਜਾਵੇ।

5. ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਆਟੋਮੈਟਿਕ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਟੈਸਟ ਟਰੈਕ ਤੇ ਪੱਕੇ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਲਾਇਸੰਸਾਂ ਦੇ ਟੈਸਟ ਲੈਣ ਵੇਲੇ ਟਰੈਕ ਦੇ ਉਪਰ ਸੰਸਾਰਾਂ ਦੇ ਨਾਲ ਜੋ ਸੀ.ਸੀ.ਟੀ.ਵੀ. ਕੈਮਰੇ ਲਾਏ ਗਏ ਹਨ, ਜਿਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਦੇ ਰਾਹੀਂ ਟਰੈਕ ਤੇ ਚੱਲ ਰਹੀ ਕਾਰ ਦੀ ਵੀਡੀਓਗ੍ਰਾਫੀ ਹੁੰਦੀ ਹੈ, ਉਸ ਕਾਰ ਦੀ ਰਿਕਾਰਡਿੰਗ ਮਿੱਤੀ 1.1.2019 ਤੋਂ 20.6.2019 ਤੱਕ ਦੀ ਸੀ.ਡੀ. ਵਿਚ ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਕਰਕੇ ਮੁਹੱਈਆ ਕਰਵਾਈ ਜਾਵੇ।

Contd..P/2

6. ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਮਿੱਤੀ 1.1.2019 ਤੋਂ ਲੈ ਕੇ 20.6.2019 ਨੂੰ ਆਟੋਮੈਟਿਕ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਟ੍ਰੈਕ ਤੇ ਜੋ ਪੱਕੇ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਲਾਇਸੰਸਾਂ ਦੇ ਡਾਟਾ ਐਂਟਰੀ ਆਪ੍ਰੇਟਰ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਲਏ ਗਏ ਟੈਸਟ ਪਾਸ/ਫੇਲ ਦੇ ਗ੍ਰਾਫਸ ਦੀਆਂ ਤਸਦੀਕਸ਼ੁਦਾ ਫੋਟੋ ਕਾਪੀਆਂ ਮੁਹੱਈਆ ਕਰਵਾਈਆਂ ਜਾਣ।

7. ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਆਟੋਮੈਟਿਕ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਟੈਸਟ ਟ੍ਰੈਕ ਤੇ ਡਾਟਾ ਐਂਟਰੀ ਆਪ੍ਰੇਟਰ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਲਏ ਗਏ ਪੱਕੇ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਲਾਇਸੰਸਾਂ ਦੇ ਟੈਸਟ ਸਮੇਂ ਬਿਨੈਕਾਰ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਜੋ ਐਪਲੀਕੇਸ਼ਨ ਫਾਰਮ ਲਏ ਗਏ, ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਐਪਲੀਕੇਸ਼ਨ ਫਾਰਮਾਂ ਦੀਆਂ ਮਿੱਤੀ 1.1.2019 ਤੋਂ ਲੈ ਕੇ 20.6.2019 ਤੱਕ ਦੀਆਂ ਤਸਦੀਕਸ਼ੁਦਾ ਫੋਟੋ ਕਾਪੀਆਂ ਮੁਹੱਈਆ ਕਰਵਾਈਆਂ ਜਾਣ।

8. ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਆਟੋਮੈਟਿਕ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਟੈਸਟ ਟ੍ਰੈਕ ਤੇ ਪੱਕੇ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਲਾਇਸੰਸ ਜਾਰੀ ਕਰਨ ਤੋਂ ਪਹਿਲਾਂ ਜੋ ਰੈਡ ਕ੍ਰਾਸ ਸੁਸਾਇਟੀ ਦਾ ਸਰਟੀਫਿਕੇਟ ਬਿਨੈਕਾਰ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਮੰਗਿਆ ਜਾਂਦਾ ਹੈ, ਉਸ ਸਰਟੀਫਿਕੇਟਾਂ ਦੀਆਂ ਮਿੱਤੀ 1.1.2019 ਤੋਂ ਲੈ ਕੇ 20.6.2019 ਤੱਕ ਸਾਰੇ ਜਾਰੀ ਕੀਤੇ ਪੱਕੇ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਲਾਇਸੰਸਾਂ ਦੇ ਨਾਲ ਲੱਗੇ ਸਰਟੀਫਿਕੇਟਾਂ ਦੀਆਂ ਤਸਦੀਕਸ਼ੁਦਾ ਫੋਟੋ ਕਾਪੀਆਂ ਮੁਹੱਈਆ ਕਰਵਾਈਆਂ ਜਾਣ।”

He filed the similar application to almost all the Secretary, Regional Transport, Authorities of the Punjab state.

3. During the hearing on 17.12.2019, the appellant stated that the respondent authorities are not providing the complete information to him. However, the representative of the respondents stated that the information sought by the appellant has already been provided vide No. RTA/Ferozepur/588 dated 2.7.2019 i.e. whatever available in the office concerning his RTI application. Regarding the rest of the information, the representative of the respondents stated that it is not maintained in their office and the office has to create the same and is a voluminous, which is not according to the provisions of the RTI Act.

4. The representative of the respondents also referred the instructions of DOPT circulated vide their letter dated 1/18/2011/IR dated 16.09.2011 stating that “the undersigned is directed to invite attention to this Department’s O.M.No.1/4/2009-IR dated 5.10.2009 whereby a guide on the Right to Information Act, 2005 was circulated para 10 of Part 1 of the Guide, inter alia, stated that only such information can be supplied under the Act which already exists and is held by the public authority or held under the control of the public authority. The Public Information Officer is not supposed to create information; or to interpret information; or to solve the problems raised by the applicants; or to furnish replies to hypothetical questions.

5. The representative of the respondents further stated that the same issue has been elaborated by the Supreme Court of India in the matter of Central Board of Secondary Education & Anr. Vs. Aditya Bandopadhyay & Ors (Civil Appeal No.6454 of 2011) reported as 2011(3)RCT(Civil) as follows:-

*“At this juncture, it is necessary to clear some misconceptions about the RTI Act. The RTI Act provides access to all information that is available and existing. This is clear from a combined reading of section 3 and the definitions of ‘information’ and ‘right to information’ under clauses (f) and (j) of section 2 of the Act. If a public authority has any information in the form of data or analysed data, or abstracts, or statistics, an applicant may access such information, subject to the exemptions in section 8 of the Act. But where the*

*information sought is not a part of the record of a public authority, and where such information is not required to be maintained under any law or the rules or regulations of the public authority, the Act does not cast an obligation upon the public authority, to collect or collate such non available information and then furnish it to an applicant. A public authority is also not required to furnish information which require drawing of inferences and/or making of assumptions. It is also not required to provide 'advice' or 'opinion' to an applicant, nor required to obtain and furnish any 'opinion' or 'advice' to an applicant. The reference to 'opinion' or 'advice' in the definition of 'information' in section 2(f) of the Act, only refers to such material available in the records of the public authority. Many public authorities have, as a public relation exercise, provide advice, guidance and opinion to the citizens. But that is purely voluntary and should not be confused with any obligation under the RTI Act."*

Hon'ble Apex Court further held that *"The RTI Act should not be allowed to be misused or abused, to become a tool to obstruct the national development and integration, or to destroy the peace, tranquility and harmony among its citizens-- Nor should it be converted into a tool of oppression or intimidation of honest officials striving to do their duty-National does not want a scenario where 75% of the staff of public authorities spends 75% of their time in collection and furnishing information to applicants instead of discharging their regular duties---- Indiscriminate and impractical demands or directions under RTI Act for disclosure of all the sundry information (unrelated to transparency and accountability in the functioning of public authorities and eradication of corruption) would be counter-productive as it will adversely affect the efficiency of the administration and result in the executive getting bogged down with the non-productive work of collecting and furnishing information"*.

6. Further, the representative of the respondents stated that the Appellant/information seeker has sought the information which needs to be created/manufactured and collated for supplying the same directly to the information-seeker. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has time and again said that the information envisaged under the Act is that which is available on the records of a public authority. Their Lordships held that though an information-seeker is entitled to all the information available on the records of public authority. No public authority is supposed to create or manufacture information for the benefit of the information seeker. This is a crux of the judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme court of India.

In some points the information-seeker has sought information by raising questions, how many, how much etc. which is not available on the record of the public authority and cannot be supplied by the PIO as per the provisions of the RTI Act, 2005.

Information sought by the appellant is voluminous and is to be collected from other public authorities working under its control is exempted under Section 7(9) of the RTI Act, 2005, which speaks, *"An information shall ordinarily be provided in the*

*form in which it is sought unless it would disproportionately divert the resources of public authority or would be detrimental to the safety or preservation of the record in question.*

7. The representative of the respondents further drawn the attention of the Commission towards the decision in ICAI v. Shaunak H. Satya, (2011) 8 SCC781 the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that:-

"39. We however agree that it is necessary to make a distinction in regard to information intended to bring transparency, to improve accountability and to reduce corruption, falling under [Sections 4\(1\)\(b\)](#) and (c) and other information which may not have a bearing on accountability or reducing corruption. The competent authorities under the [RTI Act](#) will have to maintain a proper balance so that while achieving transparency, the demand for information does not reach unmanageable proportions affecting other public interests, which include efficient operation of public authorities and the Government, preservation of confidentiality of sensitive information and optimum use of limited fiscal resources."

8. Further, the representative of the respondents stated that the appellant has failed to establish any public interest for seeking such voluminous information from all the Secretary, Regional Transport Authorities including the Ferozepur, therefore, he requests for the closure of the case.

9. After hearing both the parties, and having examined the information sought for by the appellant, and the information so provided by the respondents, and considering the judicial decisions as mentioned herein, and as per the provisions of the RTI Act, the Commission is of the view that no further cause of action is left in this case, hence, the case is disposed of and closed.

Dated: 14.2.2020

sd/-  
(Suresh Arora)  
Chief Information Commissioner,  
Punjab.

# PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,  
Madhya Marg, Sector 16, Chandigarh.

Ph: 0172-2864100-101, Fax 0172 2864110

Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com), Email: [pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in)



Sh. Bhupinder Punj,  
r/o # 186, village Luhara,  
District Ludhiana.

....Appellant

Vs

Public Information Officer,  
o/o Secretary,  
Regional Transport Authority,  
Hoshiarpur

First Appellate Authority  
o/o State Transport Commissioner, Pb.  
SCO 177-78, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Sector 17,  
Chandigarh.

....Respondents

## Appeal Case No. 3770 of 2019

### ORDER

The case was listed for hearing on 17.12.2019 but was reserved to be pronounced.

2. The brief of the case is that the appellant filed the RTI application with the Public Information Officer to seek the following information :-

- " 1. ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਟਰੱਕਾਂ ਦਾ ਵਜ਼ਨ ਵਧਾਉਣ ਦਾ ਕੰਮ ਕਿਸ ਨਾਮ ਦੇ ਕਰਮਚਾਰੀ ਨੂੰ ਆਪ ਜੀ ਦੇ ਹੁਕਮ ਦੇ ਤਹਿਤ ਜਿਸ ਪੱਤਰ ਰਾਹੀਂ ਸੋਧਿਆ ਗਿਆ ਹੈ, ਉਸ ਕਰਮਚਾਰੀ ਦਾ ਨਾਮ ਅਤੇ ਉਸ ਪੱਤਰ ਦੀ ਤਸਦੀਕਸ਼ੁਦਾ ਫੋਟੋ ਕਾਪੀ ਮੁਹੱਈਆ ਕਰਵਾਈ ਜਾਵੇ।
2. ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਟਰੱਕਾਂ ਦਾ ਵਜ਼ਨ ਵਧਾਉਣ ਦਾ ਕੰਮ ਜਿਸ ਕਰਮਚਾਰੀ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਕਿਸ ਨਾਮ ਦੀ ਆਈ. ਡੀ. ਵਿੱਚ ਕੀਤਾ ਜਾਂਦਾ ਹੈ, ਉਸ ਆਈ.ਡੀ. ਦਾ ਨਾਮ ਅਤੇ ਨੰਬਰ ਮੁੱਹਈਆ ਕਰਵਾਇਆ ਜਾਵੇ।
3. ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਟਰੱਕਾਂ ਦਾ ਵਜ਼ਨ ਵਧਾਉਣ ਦਾ ਕੰਮ ਜਿਸ ਕਰਮਚਾਰੀ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਕੀਤਾ ਜਾਂਦਾ ਹੈ, ਉਸਦੀ ਹਾਜ਼ਰੀ ਰਿਪੋਰਟ ਦੀ ਤਸਦੀਕਸ਼ੁਦਾ ਫੋਟੋ ਕਾਪੀ ਮੁਹੱਈਆ ਕਰਵਾਈ ਜਾਵੇ।
4. ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਟਰੱਕਾਂ ਦਾ ਵਜ਼ਨ ਵਧਾਉਣ ਦਾ ਕੰਮ ਜਿਸ ਕਰਮਚਾਰੀ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਕੀਤਾ ਜਾਂਦਾ ਹੈ, ਉਸਨੂੰ ਹੋਰ ਕਿਹੜੇ ਕਿਹੜੇ ਦਫਤਰੀ ਕੰਮ ਕਰਨ ਦੀ ਆਪ ਜੀ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਪ੍ਰਵਾਨਗੀ ਦਿੱਤੀ ਹੋਈ ਹੈ, ਉਸ ਕੰਮਾਂ ਦੇ ਪ੍ਰਵਾਨਗੀ ਪੱਤਰਾਂ ਦੀਆਂ ਤਸਦੀਕਸ਼ੁਦਾ ਫੋਟੋ ਕਾਪੀਆਂ ਮੁਹੱਈਆ ਕਰਵਾਈਆਂ ਜਾਣ।
5. ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਟਰੱਕਾਂ ਦਾ ਵਜ਼ਨ ਵਧਾਉਣ ਦਾ ਕੰਮ ਜਿਸ ਕਰਮਚਾਰੀ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਕੀਤਾ ਜਾਂਦਾ ਹੈ, ਜਿਸ ਪੱਤਰ ਰਾਹੀਂ ਆਪ ਜੀ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਟਰੱਕਾਂ ਦਾ ਵਜ਼ਨ ਵਧਾਉਣ ਦਾ ਕੰਮ ਅਤੇ ਪ੍ਰਵਾਨਗੀ ਲੈਣ ਦੇ ਲਈ ਸਰਕਾਰੀ ਦਸਤਾਵੇਜ਼ਾਂ ਤੇ ਹਸਤਾਖਰ ਕਰਨ ਦਾ ਅਧਿਕਾਰ ਦਿਤਾ ਗਿਆ ਹੈ, ਉਸ ਪੱਤਰ ਦੀ ਤਸਦੀਕਸ਼ੁਦਾ ਫੋਟੋ ਕਾਪੀ ਮੁਹੱਈਆ ਕਰਵਾਈ ਜਾਵੇ।

Contd..P/2

6. ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਮਿਤੀ 1.5.2019 ਤੋਂ ਲੈ ਕੇ 20.6.2019 ਤੱਕ ਕੁੱਲ ਕਿੰਨੇ ਟੱਰਕਾਂ ਦੇ ਵਜ਼ਨ ਵਧਾਏ ਗਏ, ਟੱਰਕਾਂ ਦੇ ਵਜ਼ਨ ਕਿਸ ਕਰਮਚਾਰੀ ਦੀ ਆਈ.ਡੀ. ਵਿਚ ਵਧਾਏ ਗਏ, ਉਸ ਆਈ.ਡੀ. ਵਿੱਚੋਂ ਕੰਪਿਊਟਰਾਈਜ਼ ਟੱਰਕਾਂ ਦੇ ਨੰਬਰਾਂ ਦੀ ਲੜੀਵਾਰ ਤਾਰੀਖ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਲਿਸਟ ਮੁਹੱਈਆ ਕਰਵਾਈ ਜਾਵੇ।

7. ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਟੱਰਕਾਂ ਦਾ ਵਜ਼ਨ ਵਧਾਉਣ ਦਾ ਕੰਮ ਜਿਸ ਕਰਮਚਾਰੀ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਕੀਤਾ ਜਾਂਦਾ ਹੈ, ਉਸਦੀ ਹਾਜ਼ਰੀ ਜਿਸ ਰਜਿਸਟਰ ਵਿਚ ਲਾਈ ਜਾਂਦੀ ਹੈ, ਉਸ ਰਜਿਸਟਰ ਦੀ ਮਿਤੀ 1.1.2018 ਤੋਂ ਲੈ ਕੇ 20.6.2019 ਤੱਕ ਦੀ ਤਸਦੀਕਸ਼ੁਦਾ ਫੋਟੋ ਕਾਪੀ ਮੁਹੱਈਆ ਕਰਵਾਈ ਜਾਵੇ।

8. ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਮਿਤੀ 1.5.2019 ਤੋਂ ਲੈ ਕੇ 20.6.2019 ਤੱਕ ਟੱਰਕਾਂ ਦੇ ਵਧਾਏ ਗਏ ਵਜ਼ਨ ਸਮੇਂ ਜੋ ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਕੰਪਿਊਟਰਾਂ ਵਿੱਚ ਸਕੈਨ ਕੀਤਾ ਗਿਆ, ਉਸ ਸਾਰੇ ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਦੀਆਂ ਤਸਦੀਕਸ਼ੁਦਾ ਫੋਟੋ ਕਾਪੀਆਂ ਮੁੱਹਈਆ ਕਰਵਾਈਆਂ ਜਾਣ।

9. ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਟੱਰਕਾਂ ਦਾ ਵਜ਼ਨ ਵਧਾਉਣ ਲਈ ਕਿਹੜੇ ਕਿਹੜੇ ਦਸਤਾਵੇਜ਼ ਜਰੂਰੀ ਹੋਣੇ ਚਾਹੀਦੇ ਹਨ, ਲਿਖਤੀ ਰੂਪ ਵਿੱਚ ਮੁੱਹਈਆ ਕਰਵਾਇਆ ਜਾਵੇ। "

3. During the hearing on 17.12.2019, the appellant stated that the respondent authorities are not providing the complete information to him. However, the representative of the respondents stated that the information sought by the appellant has been provided vide No.RTA/1496 dated 16.12.2019, copy of the same letter along with the information has been given to the appellant during the course of hearing with a copy to the Commission, which has been taken on record. He further stated that whatever information available in the office concerning the RTI application of the appellant the same has been provided. The representative of the respondents also stated that the similar information has been asked by the appellant from almost all the Regional Transport Authorities of Punjab State.

4. The representative of the respondents also referred the instructions of DOPT circulated vide their letter dated 1/18/2011/IR dated 16.09.2011 stating that "the undersigned is directed to invite attention to this Department's O.M.No.1/4/2009-IR dated 5.10.2009 whereby a guide on the Right to Information Act, 2005 was circulated para 10 of Part 1 of the Guide, inter alia, stated that only such information can be supplied under the Act which already exists and is held by the public authority or held under the control of the public authority. The Public Information Officer is not supposed to create information; or to interpret information; or to solve the problems raised by the applicants; or to furnish replies to hypothetical questions.

5. The representative of the respondents further stated that the same issue has been elaborated by the Supreme Court of India in the matter of Central Board of Secondary Education & Anr. Vs. Aditya Bandopadhyay & Ors (Civil Appeal No.6454 of 2011) reported as 2011(3)RCT(Civil) as follows:-

*"At this juncture, it is necessary to clear some misconceptions about the RTI Act. The RTI Act provides access to all information that is available and existing. This is clear from a combined reading of section 3 and the definitions of 'information' and 'right to information' under clauses (f) and (j) of section 2 of the Act. If a public authority has any information in the form of data or analysed data, or abstracts, or statistics, an applicant may access such information, subject to the exemptions in section 8 of the Act. But where the*

*information sought is not a part of the record of a public authority, and where such information is not required to be maintained under any law or the rules or regulations of the public authority, the Act does not cast an obligation upon the public authority, to collect or collate such non available information and then furnish it to an applicant. A public authority is also not required to furnish information which require drawing of inferences and/or making of assumptions. It is also not required to provide 'advice' or 'opinion' to an applicant, nor required to obtain and furnish any 'opinion' or 'advice' to an applicant. The reference to 'opinion' or 'advice' in the definition of 'information' in section 2(f) of the Act, only refers to such material available in the records of the public authority. Many public authorities have, as a public relation exercise, provide advice, guidance and opinion to the citizens. But that is purely voluntary and should not be confused with any obligation under the RTI Act."*

Hon'ble Apex Court further held that *"The RTI Act should not be allowed to be misused or abused, to become a tool to obstruct the national development and integration, or to destroy the peace, tranquility and harmony among its citizens-- Nor should it be converted into a tool of oppression or intimidation of honest officials striving to do their duty-National does not want a scenario where 75% of the staff of public authorities spends 75% of their time in collection and furnishing information to applicants instead of discharging their regular duties---- Indiscriminate and impractical demands or directions under RTI Act for disclosure of all the sundry information (unrelated to transparency and accountability in the functioning of public authorities and eradication of corruption) would be counter-productive as it will adversely affect the efficiency of the administration and result in the executive getting bogged down with the non-productive work of collecting and furnishing information"*.

6. Further, the representative of the respondents stated that the Appellant/information seeker has sought the information which needs to be created/manufactured and collated for supplying the same directly to the information-seeker. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has time and again said that the information envisaged under the Act is that which is available on the records of a public authority. Their Lordships held that though an information-seeker is entitled to all the information available on the records of public authority. No public authority is supposed to create or manufacture information for the benefit of the information seeker. This is a crux of the judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme court of India.

In some points the information-seeker has sought information by raising questions, how many, how much etc. which is not available on the record of the public authority and cannot be supplied by the PIO as per the provisions of the RTI Act, 2005.

Information sought by the appellant is voluminous and is to be collected from other public authorities working under its control is exempted under Section 7(9) of the RTI Act, 2005, which speaks, *"An information shall ordinarily be provided in the*

*form in which it is sought unless it would disproportionately divert the resources of public authority or would be detrimental to the safety or preservation of the record in question.*

7. The representative of the respondents further drawn the attention of the Commission towards the decision in ICAI v. Shaunak H. Satya, (2011) 8 SCC781 the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that:-

"39. We however agree that it is necessary to make a distinction in regard to information intended to bring transparency, to improve accountability and to reduce corruption, falling under [Sections 4\(1\)\(b\)](#) and (c) and other information which may not have a bearing on accountability or reducing corruption. The competent authorities under the [RTI Act](#) will have to maintain a proper balance so that while achieving transparency, the demand for information does not reach unmanageable proportions affecting other public interests, which include efficient operation of public authorities and the Government, preservation of confidentiality of sensitive information and optimum use of limited fiscal resources."

8. After hearing both the parties, and having examined the information sought for by the appellant, and the information so provided by the respondents, and considering the judicial decisions as mentioned herein, and as per the provisions of the RTI Act, the Commission is of the view that no further cause of action is left in this case, hence, the case is disposed of and closed.

Dated: 14.2.2020

sd/-  
(Suresh Arora)  
Chief Information Commissioner,  
Punjab.



# PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,  
Madhya Marg, Sector 16, Chandigarh.

Ph: 0172-2864100-101, Fax 0172 2864110

Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com), Email: [pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in)



Sh. Bhupinder Punj,  
r/o # 186, village Luhara,  
District Ludhiana.

....Appellant

Vs

Public Information Officer,  
o/o Secretary,  
Regional Transport Authority,  
Ludhiana

First Appellate Authority  
o/o State Transport Commissioner, Pb.  
SCO 177-78, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Sector 17,  
Chandigarh.

....Respondents

## Appeal Case No. 3750 of 2019

### ORDER

The case was listed for hearing on 17.12.2019 but was reserved to be pronounced.

2. The brief of the case is that the appellant filed the RTI application with the Public Information Officer to seek the following information :-

“ 1. ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਆਟੋਮੈਟਿਕ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਟੈਸਟ ਟਰੈਕ ਤੇ ਮਿੱਤੀ 1.1.2019 ਤੋਂ ਲੈ ਕੇ 20.6.2019 ਤੱਕ ਪੱਕੇ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਲਾਇਸੰਸਾਂ ਦੇ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਟੈਸਟ ਕਿੰਨੀ ਗਿਣਤੀ ਵਿੱਚ ਲਏ ਗਏ, ਲੜੀਵਾਰ ਨੰਬਰ ਅਤੇ ਤਾਰੀਖ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਕੰਪਿਊਟਰਾਈਜ਼ ਲਿਸਟ ਮੁਹੱਈਆ ਕਰਵਾਈ ਜਾਵੇ।

2. ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਆਟੋਮੈਟਿਕ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਟੈਸਟ ਟਰੈਕ ਤੇ ਪੱਕੇ ਲਾਇਸੰਸਾਂ ਦੇ ਟੈਸਟ ਕਿਸ ਕਰਮਚਾਰੀ/ਡਾਟਾ ਐਂਟਰੀ ਆਪ੍ਰੇਟਰ ਦੀ ਆਈ.ਡੀ. ਰਾਹੀਂ ਲਏ ਗਏ, ਉਸ ਕਰਮਚਾਰੀ/ਡਾਟਾ ਐਂਟਰੀ ਆਪ੍ਰੇਟਰ ਦਾ ਨਾਮ ਅਤੇ ਆਈ.ਡੀ. ਨੰਬਰ ਲਿਖਤੀ ਰੂਪ ਵਿੱਚ ਮੁਹੱਈਆ ਕਰਵਾਇਆ ਜਾਵੇ।

3. ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਆਟੋਮੈਟਿਕ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਟੈਸਟ ਟਰੈਕ ਤੇ ਐਪਲੀਕਾਟਾ ਨੇ ਖੁਦ ਆ ਕੇ ਟੈਸਟ ਦਿਤੇ, ਲਿਖਤੀ ਰੂਪ ਵਿੱਚ ਮੁਹੱਈਆ ਕਰਵਾਇਆ ਜਾਵੇ।

4. ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਆਟੋਮੈਟਿਕ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਟੈਸਟ ਟਰੈਕ ਤੇ ਪੱਕੇ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਲਾਇਸੰਸਾਂ ਦੇ ਟੈਸਟ ਕਿਸ ਅਫਸਰ ਅਤੇ ਕਰਮਚਾਰੀ ਦੀ ਦੇਖਰੇਖ ਵਿੱਚ ਲਏ ਗਏ ਸਨ, ਉਸ ਅਫਸਰ ਅਤੇ ਕਰਮਚਾਰੀ ਦਾ ਨਾਮ ਅਤੇ ਅਹੁਦਾ ਲਿਖਤੀ ਰੂਪ ਵਿੱਚ ਮੁਹੱਈਆ ਕਰਵਾਇਆ ਜਾਵੇ।

5. ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਆਟੋਮੈਟਿਕ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਟੈਸਟ ਟਰੈਕ ਤੇ ਪੱਕੇ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਲਾਇਸੰਸਾਂ ਦੇ ਟੈਸਟ ਲੈਣ ਵੇਲੇ ਟਰੈਕ ਦੇ ਉਪਰ ਸੰਸਾਰਾਂ ਦੇ ਨਾਲ ਜੋ ਸੀ.ਸੀ.ਟੀ.ਵੀ. ਕੈਮਰੇ ਲਾਏ ਗਏ ਹਨ, ਜਿਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਦੇ ਰਾਹੀਂ ਟਰੈਕ ਤੇ ਚੱਲ ਰਹੀ ਕਾਰ ਦੀ ਵੀਡੀਓਗ੍ਰਾਫੀ ਹੁੰਦੀ ਹੈ, ਉਸ ਕਾਰ ਦੀ ਰਿਕਾਰਡਿੰਗ ਮਿੱਤੀ 1.1.2019 ਤੋਂ 20.6.2019 ਤੱਕ ਦੀ ਸੀ.ਡੀ. ਵਿਚ ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਕਰਕੇ ਮੁਹੱਈਆ ਕਰਵਾਈ ਜਾਵੇ।

Contd..P/2

6. ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਮਿੱਤੀ 1.1.2019 ਤੋਂ ਲੈ ਕੇ 20.6.2019 ਨੂੰ ਆਟੋਮੈਟਿਕ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਟ੍ਰੈਕ ਤੇ ਜੋ ਪੱਕੇ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਲਾਇਸੰਸਾਂ ਦੇ ਡਾਟਾ ਐਂਟਰੀ ਆਪ੍ਰੋਟਰ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਲਏ ਗਏ ਟੈਸਟ ਪਾਸ/ਫੇਲ ਦੇ ਗ੍ਰਾਫਸ ਦੀਆਂ ਤਸਦੀਕਸ਼ੁਦਾ ਫੋਟੋ ਕਾਪੀਆਂ ਮੁਹੱਈਆ ਕਰਵਾਈਆਂ ਜਾਣ।

7. ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਆਟੋਮੈਟਿਕ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਟੈਸਟ ਟ੍ਰੈਕ ਤੇ ਡਾਟਾ ਐਂਟਰੀ ਆਪ੍ਰੋਟਰ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਲਏ ਗਏ ਪੱਕੇ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਲਾਇਸੰਸਾਂ ਦੇ ਟੈਸਟ ਸਮੇਂ ਬਿਨੈਕਾਰ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਜੋ ਐਪਲੀਕੇਸ਼ਨ ਫਾਰਮ ਲਏ ਗਏ, ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਐਪਲੀਕੇਸ਼ਨ ਫਾਰਮਾਂ ਦੀਆਂ ਮਿੱਤੀ 1.1.2019 ਤੋਂ ਲੈ ਕੇ 20.6.2019 ਤੱਕ ਦੀਆਂ ਤਸਦੀਕਸ਼ੁਦਾ ਫੋਟੋ ਕਾਪੀਆਂ ਮੁਹੱਈਆ ਕਰਵਾਈਆਂ ਜਾਣ।

8. ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਆਟੋਮੈਟਿਕ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਟੈਸਟ ਟ੍ਰੈਕ ਤੇ ਪੱਕੇ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਲਾਇਸੰਸ ਜਾਰੀ ਕਰਨ ਤੋਂ ਪਹਿਲਾਂ ਜੋ ਰੈਡ ਕ੍ਰਾਸ ਸੁਸਾਇਟੀ ਦਾ ਸਰਟੀਫਿਕੇਟ ਬਿਨੈਕਾਰ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਮੰਗਿਆ ਜਾਂਦਾ ਹੈ, ਉਸ ਸਰਟੀਫਿਕੇਟਾਂ ਦੀਆਂ ਮਿੱਤੀ 1.1.2019 ਤੋਂ ਲੈ ਕੇ 20.6.2019 ਤੱਕ ਸਾਰੇ ਜਾਰੀ ਕੀਤੇ ਪੱਕੇ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਲਾਇਸੰਸਾਂ ਦੇ ਨਾਲ ਲੱਗੇ ਸਰਟੀਫਿਕੇਟਾਂ ਦੀਆਂ ਤਸਦੀਕਸ਼ੁਦਾ ਫੋਟੋ ਕਾਪੀਆਂ ਮੁਹੱਈਆ ਕਰਵਾਈਆਂ ਜਾਣ।”

He filed the similar application to almost all the Secretary, Regional Transport, Authorities of the Punjab state.

3. During the hearing on 17.12.2019, the appellant stated that the respondent authorities are not providing the complete information to him. However, the representative of the respondents stated that the information sought by the appellant has been provided vide No. 10422 dated 16.12.2019, copy of the same letter along with the information has been given to the appellant during the course of hearing with a copy to the Commission, which has been taken on record. He further stated that whatever information available in the office concerning his RTI application the same has been provided, except that in which the information has to be created. Regarding the rest of the information, the representative of the respondents stated that it is not maintained in their office and the office has to create the same and is a voluminous, which is not according to the provisions of the RTI Act.

4. The representative of the respondents also referred the instructions of DOPT circulated vide their letter dated 1/18/2011/IR dated 16.09.2011 stating that “the undersigned is directed to invite attention to this Department’s O.M.No.1/4/2009-IR dated 5.10.2009 whereby a guide on the Right to Information Act, 2005 was circulated para 10 of Part 1 of the Guide, inter alia, stated that only such information can be supplied under the Act which already exists and is held by the public authority or held under the control of the public authority. The Public Information Officer is not supposed to create information; or to interpret information; or to solve the problems raised by the applicants; or to furnish replies to hypothetical questions.

5. The representative of the respondents further stated that the same issue has been elaborated by the Supreme Court of India in the matter of Central Board of Secondary Education & Anr. Vs. Aditya Bandopadhyay & Ors (Civil Appeal No.6454 of 2011) reported as 2011(3)RCT(Civil) as follows:-

*“At this juncture, it is necessary to clear some misconceptions about the RTI Act. The RTI Act provides access to all information that is available and existing. This is clear from a combined reading of section 3 and the definitions of ‘information’ and ‘right to information’ under clauses (f) and (j) of section 2 of the Act. If a public authority has any information in the form of data or analysed data, or abstracts, or statistics, an applicant may access such information, subject to the exemptions in section 8 of the Act. But where the*

*information sought is not a part of the record of a public authority, and where such information is not required to be maintained under any law or the rules or regulations of the public authority, the Act does not cast an obligation upon the public authority, to collect or collate such non available information and then furnish it to an applicant. A public authority is also not required to furnish information which require drawing of inferences and/or making of assumptions. It is also not required to provide 'advice' or 'opinion' to an applicant, nor required to obtain and furnish any 'opinion' or 'advice' to an applicant. The reference to 'opinion' or 'advice' in the definition of 'information' in section 2(f) of the Act, only refers to such material available in the records of the public authority. Many public authorities have, as a public relation exercise, provide advice, guidance and opinion to the citizens. But that is purely voluntary and should not be confused with any obligation under the RTI Act."*

Hon'ble Apex Court further held that *"The RTI Act should not be allowed to be misused or abused, to become a tool to obstruct the national development and integration, or to destroy the peace, tranquility and harmony among its citizens-- Nor should it be converted into a tool of oppression or intimidation of honest officials striving to do their duty-National does not want a scenario where 75% of the staff of public authorities spends 75% of their time in collection and furnishing information to applicants instead of discharging their regular duties---- Indiscriminate and impractical demands or directions under RTI Act for disclosure of all the sundry information (unrelated to transparency and accountability in the functioning of public authorities and eradication of corruption) would be counter-productive as it will adversely affect the efficiency of the administration and result in the executive getting bogged down with the non-productive work of collecting and furnishing information"*.

6. Further, the representative of the respondents stated that the Appellant/information seeker has sought the information which needs to be created/manufactured and collated for supplying the same directly to the information-seeker. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has time and again said that the information envisaged under the Act is that which is available on the records of a public authority. Their Lordships held that though an information-seeker is entitled to all the information available on the records of public authority. No public authority is supposed to create or manufacture information for the benefit of the information seeker. This is a crux of the judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme court of India.

In some points the information-seeker has sought information by raising questions, how many, how much etc. which is not available on the record of the public authority and cannot be supplied by the PIO as per the provisions of the RTI Act, 2005.

Information sought by the appellant is voluminous and is to be collected from other public authorities working under its control is exempted under Section 7(9) of the RTI Act, 2005, which speaks, *"An information shall ordinarily be provided in the*

*form in which it is sought unless it would disproportionately divert the resources of public authority or would be detrimental to the safety or preservation of the record in question.*

7. The representative of the respondents further drawn the attention of the Commission towards the decision in ICAI v. Shaunak H. Satya, (2011) 8 SCC781 the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that:-

"39. We however agree that it is necessary to make a distinction in regard to information intended to bring transparency, to improve accountability and to reduce corruption, falling under [Sections 4\(1\)\(b\)](#) and (c) and other information which may not have a bearing on accountability or reducing corruption. The competent authorities under the [RTI Act](#) will have to maintain a proper balance so that while achieving transparency, the demand for information does not reach unmanageable proportions affecting other public interests, which include efficient operation of public authorities and the Government, preservation of confidentiality of sensitive information and optimum use of limited fiscal resources."

8. Further, the representative of the respondents stated that the appellant has failed to establish any public interest for seeking such voluminous information from all the Secretary, Regional Transport Authorities including the Ludhiana, therefore, he requests for the closure of the case.

9. After hearing both the parties, and having examined the information sought for by the appellant, and the information so provided by the respondents, and considering the judicial decisions as mentioned herein, and as per the provisions of the RTI Act, the Commission is of the view that no further cause of action is left in this case, hence, the case is disposed of and closed.

Dated: 14.2.2020

sd/-  
(Suresh Arora)  
Chief Information Commissioner,  
Punjab.

# PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,  
Madhya Marg, Sector 16, Chandigarh.

Ph: 0172-2864100-101, Fax 0172 2864110

Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com), Email: [pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in)



Sh. Bhupinder Punj,  
r/o # 186, village Luhara,  
District Ludhiana.

....Appellant

Vs

Public Information Officer,  
o/o Secretary,  
Regional Transport Authority,  
Patiala

First Appellate Authority  
o/o State Transport Commissioner, Pb.  
SCO 177-78, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Sector 17,  
Chandigarh.

....Respondents

## Appeal Case No. 3768 of 2019

### ORDER

The case was listed for hearing on 17.12.2019 but was reserved to be pronounced.

2. The brief of the case is that the appellant filed the RTI application with the Public Information Officer to seek the following information :-

- “ 1. ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਆਟੋਮੈਟਿਕ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਟੈਸਟ ਟਰੈਕ ਤੇ ਮਿੱਤੀ 1.1.2019 ਤੋਂ ਲੈ ਕੇ 20.6.2019 ਤੱਕ ਪੱਕੇ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਲਾਈਸੰਸਾਂ ਦੇ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਟੈਸਟ ਕਿੰਨੀ ਗਿਣਤੀ ਵਿੱਚ ਲਏ ਗਏ, ਲਡੀਵਾਰ ਨੰਬਰ ਅਤੇ ਤਾਰੀਖ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਕੰਪਿਊਟਰਾਈਜ਼ ਲਿਸਟ ਮੁਹੱਈਆ ਕਰਵਾਈ ਜਾਵੇ।
2. ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਆਟੋਮੈਟਿਕ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਟੈਸਟ ਟਰੈਕ ਤੇ ਪੱਕੇ ਲਾਈਸੰਸਾਂ ਦੇ ਟੈਸਟ ਕਿਸ ਕਰਮਚਾਰੀ/ਡਾਟਾ ਐਂਟਰੀ ਆਪ੍ਰੋਟਰ ਦੀ ਆਈ.ਡੀ. ਰਾਹੀਂ ਲਏ ਗਏ, ਉਸ ਕਰਮਚਾਰੀ/ਡਾਟਾ ਐਂਟਰੀ ਆਪ੍ਰੋਟਰ ਦਾ ਨਾਮ ਅਤੇ ਆਈ.ਡੀ. ਨੰਬਰ ਲਿਖਤੀ ਰੂਪ ਵਿੱਚ ਮੁਹੱਈਆ ਕਰਵਾਇਆ ਜਾਵੇ।
3. ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਆਟੋਮੈਟਿਕ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਟੈਸਟ ਟਰੈਕ ਤੇ ਐਪਲੀਕਾਟਾ ਦੇ ਖੁਦ ਆ ਕੇ ਟੈਸਟ ਦਿਤੇ, ਲਿਖਤੀ ਰੂਪ ਵਿੱਚ ਮੁਹੱਈਆ ਕਰਵਾਇਆ ਜਾਵੇ।
4. ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਆਟੋਮੈਟਿਕ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਟੈਸਟ ਟਰੈਕ ਤੇ ਪੱਕੇ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਲਾਈਸੰਸਾਂ ਦੇ ਟੈਸਟ ਕਿਸ ਅਫਸਰ ਅਤੇ ਕਰਮਚਾਰੀ ਦੀ ਦੇਖਰੇਖ ਵਿੱਚ ਲਏ ਗਏ ਸਨ, ਵੁਸ ਅਫਸਰ ਅਤੇ ਕਰਮਚਾਰੀ ਦਾ ਨਾਮ ਅਤੇ ਅਹੁਦਾ ਲਿਖਤੀ ਰੂਪ ਵਿੱਚ ਮੁਹੱਈਆ ਕਰਵਾਇਆ ਜਾਵੇ।
5. ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਆਟੋਮੈਟਿਕ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਟੈਸਟ ਟਰੈਕ ਤੇ ਪੱਕੇ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਲਾਈਸੰਸਾਂ ਦੇ ਟੈਸਟ ਲੈਣ ਵੇਲੇ ਟਰੈਕ ਦੇ ਉਪਰ ਸੰਸਾਰਾਂ ਦੇ ਨਾਲ ਜੋ ਸੀ.ਸੀ.ਟੀ.ਵੀ. ਕੈਮਰੇ ਲਾਏ ਗਏ ਹਨ, ਜਿਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਦੇ ਰਾਹੀਂ ਟਰੈਕ ਤੇ ਚੱਲ ਰਹੀ ਕਾਰ ਦੀ ਵੀਡੀਓਗ੍ਰਾਫੀ ਹੁੰਦੀ ਹੈ, ਉਸ ਕਾਰ ਦੀ ਰਿਕਾਰਡਿੰਗ ਮਿੱਤੀ 1.1.2019 ਤੋਂ 20.6.2019 ਤੱਕ ਦੀ ਸੀ.ਡੀ. ਵਿੱਚ ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਕਰਕੇ ਮੁਹੱਈਆ ਕਰਵਾਈ ਜਾਵੇ।

Contd..P/2

6. ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਮਿੱਤੀ 1.1.2019 ਤੋਂ ਲੈ ਕੇ 20.6.2019 ਨੂੰ ਆਟੋਮੈਟਿਕ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਟ੍ਰੈਕ ਤੇ ਜੋ ਪੱਕੇ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਲਾਇਸੰਸਾਂ ਦੇ ਡਾਟਾ ਐਂਟਰੀ ਆਪ੍ਰੋਟਰ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਲਏ ਗਏ ਟੈਸਟ ਪਾਸ/ਫੇਲ ਦੇ ਗ੍ਰਾਫਸ ਦੀਆਂ ਤਸਦੀਕਸ਼ੁਦਾ ਫੋਟੋ ਕਾਪੀਆਂ ਮੁਹੱਈਆ ਕਰਵਾਈਆਂ ਜਾਣ।

7. ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਆਟੋਮੈਟਿਕ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਟੈਸਟ ਟ੍ਰੈਕ ਤੇ ਡਾਟਾ ਐਂਟਰੀ ਆਪ੍ਰੋਟਰ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਲਏ ਗਏ ਪੱਕੇ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਲਾਇਸੰਸਾਂ ਦੇ ਟੈਸਟ ਸਮੇਂ ਬਿਨੈਕਾਰ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਜੋ ਐਪਲੀਕੇਸ਼ਨ ਫਾਰਮ ਲਏ ਗਏ, ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਐਪਲੀਕੇਸ਼ਨ ਫਾਰਮਾਂ ਦੀਆਂ ਮਿੱਤੀ 1.1.2019 ਤੋਂ ਲੈ ਕੇ 20.6.2019 ਤੱਕ ਦੀਆਂ ਤਸਦੀਕਸ਼ੁਦਾ ਫੋਟੋ ਕਾਪੀਆਂ ਮੁਹੱਈਆ ਕਰਵਾਈਆਂ ਜਾਣ।

8. ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਆਟੋਮੈਟਿਕ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਟੈਸਟ ਟ੍ਰੈਕ ਤੇ ਪੱਕੇ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਲਾਇਸੰਸ ਜਾਰੀ ਕਰਨ ਤੋਂ ਪਹਿਲਾਂ ਜੋ ਰੈਡ ਕ੍ਰਾਸ ਸੁਸਾਇਟੀ ਦਾ ਸਰਟੀਫਿਕੇਟ ਬਿਨੈਕਾਰ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਮੰਗਿਆ ਜਾਂਦਾ ਹੈ, ਉਸ ਸਰਟੀਫਿਕੇਟਾਂ ਦੀਆਂ ਮਿੱਤੀ 1.1.2019 ਤੋਂ ਲੈ ਕੇ 20.6.2019 ਤੱਕ ਸਾਰੇ ਜਾਰੀ ਕੀਤੇ ਪੱਕੇ ਡਰਾਈਵਿੰਗ ਲਾਇਸੰਸਾਂ ਦੇ ਨਾਲ ਲੱਗੇ ਸਰਟੀਫਿਕੇਟਾਂ ਦੀਆਂ ਤਸਦੀਕਸ਼ੁਦਾ ਫੋਟੋ ਕਾਪੀਆਂ ਮੁਹੱਈਆ ਕਰਵਾਈਆਂ ਜਾਣ।”

He filed the similar application to almost all the Secretary, Regional Transport, Authorities of the Punjab state.

3. During the hearing on 17.12.2019, the appellant stated that the respondent authorities are not providing the complete information to him. However, the representative of the respondents stated that the information sought by the appellant is voluminous and the office is not maintaining the information as sought by the appellant, hence, showed his inability to provide the information. He further stated that the information concerning his RTI application is not maintained in their office and the office has to create the same, which will be a clear violation of the provisions of the RTI Act.

4. The representative of the respondents also referred the instructions of DOPT circulated vide their letter dated 1/18/2011/IR dated 16.09.2011 stating that “the undersigned is directed to invite attention to this Department’s O.M.No.1/4/2009-IR dated 5.10.2009 whereby a guide on the Right to Information Act, 2005 was circulated para 10 of Part 1 of the Guide, inter alia, stated that only such information can be supplied under the Act which already exists and is held by the public authority or held under the control of the public authority. The Public Information Officer is not supposed to create information; or to interpret information; or to solve the problems raised by the applicants; or to furnish replies to hypothetical questions.”

5. The representative of the respondents further stated that the same issue has been elaborated by the Supreme Court of India in the matter of Central Board of Secondary Education & Anr. Vs. Aditya Bandopadhyay & Ors (Civil Appeal No.6454 of 2011) reported as 2011(3)RCT(Civil) as follows:-

*“At this juncture, it is necessary to clear some misconceptions about the RTI Act. The RTI Act provides access to all information that is available and existing. This is clear from a combined reading of section 3 and the definitions of ‘information’ and ‘right to information’ under clauses (f) and (j) of section 2 of the Act. If a public authority has any information in the form of data or analysed data, or abstracts, or statistics, an applicant may access such information, subject to the exemptions in section 8 of the Act. But where the*

*information sought is not a part of the record of a public authority, and where such information is not required to be maintained under any law or the rules or regulations of the public authority, the Act does not cast an obligation upon the public authority, to collect or collate such non available information and then furnish it to an applicant. A public authority is also not required to furnish information which require drawing of inferences and/or making of assumptions. It is also not required to provide 'advice' or 'opinion' to an applicant, nor required to obtain and furnish any 'opinion' or 'advice' to an applicant. The reference to 'opinion' or 'advice' in the definition of 'information' in section 2(f) of the Act, only refers to such material available in the records of the public authority. Many public authorities have, as a public relation exercise, provide advice, guidance and opinion to the citizens. But that is purely voluntary and should not be confused with any obligation under the RTI Act."*

Hon'ble Apex Court further held that *"The RTI Act should not be allowed to be misused or abused, to become a tool to obstruct the national development and integration, or to destroy the peace, tranquility and harmony among its citizens-- Nor should it be converted into a tool of oppression or intimidation of honest officials striving to do their duty-National does not want a scenario where 75% of the staff of public authorities spends 75% of their time in collection and furnishing information to applicants instead of discharging their regular duties---- Indiscriminate and impractical demands or directions under RTI Act for disclosure of all the sundry information (unrelated to transparency and accountability in the functioning of public authorities and eradication of corruption) would be counter-productive as it will adversely affect the efficiency of the administration and result in the executive getting bogged down with the non-productive work of collecting and furnishing information"*.

6. Further, the representative of the respondents stated that the Appellant/information seeker has sought the information which needs to be created/manufactured and collated for supplying the same directly to the information-seeker. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has time and again said that the information envisaged under the Act is that which is available on the records of a public authority. Their Lordships held that though an information-seeker is entitled to all the information available on the records of public authority. No public authority is supposed to create or manufacture information for the benefit of the information seeker. This is a crux of the judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme court of India.

In some points the information-seeker has sought information by raising questions, how many, how much etc. which is not available on the record of the public authority and cannot be supplied by the PIO as per the provisions of the RTI Act, 2005.

Information sought by the appellant is voluminous and is to be collected from other public authorities working under its control is exempted under Section 7(9) of the RTI Act, 2005, which speaks, *"An information shall ordinarily be provided in the*

*form in which it is sought unless it would disproportionately divert the resources of public authority or would be detrimental to the safety or preservation of the record in question.*

7. The representative of the respondents further drawn the attention of the Commission towards the decision in ICAI v. Shaunak H. Satya, (2011) 8 SCC781 the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that:-

"39. We however agree that it is necessary to make a distinction in regard to information intended to bring transparency, to improve accountability and to reduce corruption, falling under [Sections 4\(1\)\(b\)](#) and (c) and other information which may not have a bearing on accountability or reducing corruption. The competent authorities under the [RTI Act](#) will have to maintain a proper balance so that while achieving transparency, the demand for information does not reach unmanageable proportions affecting other public interests, which include efficient operation of public authorities and the Government, preservation of confidentiality of sensitive information and optimum use of limited fiscal resources."

8. Further, the representative of the respondents stated that the appellant has failed to establish any public interest for seeking such voluminous information from all the Secretary, Regional Transport Authorities including the Patiala, therefore, he requests for the closure of the case.

9. After hearing both the parties, considering the judicial decisions as mentioned herein, and as per the provisions of the RTI Act, the Commission is of the view that the respondents must provide the total number of driving test taken for the issuance of permanent licence, the name of officer and official incharge of test track to the appellant within 7 days from the issuance of this order. With these observations, the present case is disposed of and closed. However, the liberty is granted to the appellant to revert back due to non receipt of the same within 10 days from the issuance of this order.

Dated: 14.2.2020

sd/-  
(Suresh Arora)  
Chief Information Commissioner,  
Punjab.



# PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,  
Madhya Marg, Sector 16, Chandigarh.

Ph: 0172-2864100-101, Fax 0172 2864110

Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com), Email: [pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in)



Sh. Bhupinder Punj,  
r/o # 186, village Luhara,  
District Ludhiana.

....Appellant

Vs

Public Information Officer,  
o/o Secretary,  
Regional Transport Authority,  
Hoshiarpur

First Appellate Authority  
o/o State Transport Commissioner, Pb.  
SCO 177-78, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Sector 17,  
Chandigarh.

....Respondents

## Appeal Case No. 3761 of 2019

### ORDER

The case was listed for hearing on 17.12.2019 but was reserved to be pronounced.

2. The brief of the case is that the appellant has sought the following information in the instant case along with almost all of the Secretary, Regional Authorities of the Punjab State.

“ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਮਿੱਤੀ 11.03.2019 ਤੋਂ ਲੈ ਕੇ 20.3.2019 ਤੱਕ ਅਸਿਸਟੈਂਟ ਟਰਾਂਸਪੋਰਟ ਅਫਸਰ, ਫਿਰੋਜ਼ਪੁਰ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਜ਼ਿਲਾ ਫਿਰੋਜ਼ਪੁਰ ਦੀ ਹੇਂਦ ਅੰਦਰ ਕਮਰਸ਼ੀਅਲ ਗੱਡੀਆਂ ਦੀ ਰੋਜ਼ਾਨਾ ਚੈਕਿੰਗ ਦੌਰਾਨ ਜੋ ਗੱਡੀਆਂ ਦੇ ਚਾਲਾਨ ਕੱਟੇ ਗਏ, ਮੌਕੇ ਤੇ ਜੋ ਜੁਰਮਾਨਾ ਵਸੂਲਿਆ ਗਿਆ, ਲੜੀਵਾਰ ਤਾਰੀਖ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਕੱਟੇ ਗਏ ਚਾਲਾਨਾਂ ਦੀਆਂ ਅਤੇ ਜੋ ਮੌਕੇ ਤੇ ਜੁਰਮਾਨਾ ਵਸੂਲ ਕਰਕੇ ਰਸੀਦਾਂ ਕੱਟੀਆਂ ਗਈਆਂ, ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਦੀਆਂ ਵੀ ਲੜੀਵਾਰ ਤਾਰੀਖਾਂ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਫੋਟੋ ਕਾਪੀਆਂ ਦਿੱਤੀਆਂ ਜਾਣ ਅਤੇ ਜਿਸ ਵਾਉਚਰ ਰਾਹੀਂ ਬੈਂਕ ਵਿੱਚ ਸਰਕਾਰੀ ਕੈਸ਼ ਜਮ੍ਹਾਂ ਕਰਵਾਇਆ ਗਿਆ, ਉਸ ਭਰੇ ਗਏ ਵਾਉਚਰਾਂ ਦੀਆਂ ਵੀ ਲੜੀਵਾਰ ਤਾਰੀਖਾਂ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਫੋਟੋ ਕਾਪੀਆਂ ਦਿੱਤੀਆਂ ਜਾਣ ਅਤੇ ਮੌਕੇ ਤੇ ਜੋ ਧਾਰਾ 207 ਅਧੀਨ ਗੱਡੀਆਂ ਬੰਦ ਕੀਤੀਆਂ ਗਈਆਂ, ਲੜੀਵਾਰ ਨੰਬਰ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਕਿਹੜੀ ਕਿਹੜੀ ਗੱਡੀ, ਕਿਹੜੇ ਕਿਹੜੇ ਥਾਣੇ ਵਿੱਚ ਕਿਹੜੀ ਕਿਹੜੀ ਤਾਰੀਖ ਨੂੰ ਬੰਦ ਕੀਤੀ ਗਈ, ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਲਿਖਤੀ ਰੂਪ ਵਿੱਚ ਲਿਸਟ ਮੁਹੱਈਆ ਕਰਵਾਈ ਜਾਵੇ ਅਤੇ ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਬੰਦ ਗੱਡੀਆਂ ਵਿੱਚੋਂ ਕਿਹੜੇ ਕਿਹੜੇ ਨੰਬਰ ਦੀਆਂ ਗੱਡੀਆਂ ਕਿਹੜੀ ਕਿਹੜੀ ਤਾਰੀਖ ਨੂੰ ਜੁਰਮਾਨਾ ਵਸੂਲ ਕਰਕੇ ਆਪ ਜੀ ਵਲੋਂ ਰਿਲੀਜ਼ ਕਰ ਦਿੱਤੀਆਂ ਗਈਆਂ। ਰਿਲੀਜ਼ਿੰਗ ਆਰਡਰ ਅਤੇ ਵਸੂਲ ਕੀਤੇ ਜੁਰਮਾਨੇ ਦੀਆਂ ਰਸੀਦਾਂ ਸਮੇਤ ਫੋਟੋ ਕਾਪੀਆਂ ਤਸਦੀਕਸੁਦਾ ਦਿੱਤੀਆਂ ਜਾਣ। ਚੈਕਿੰਗ ਦੌਰਾਨ ਜੋ ਸਰਕਾਰ ਗੱਡੀ ਦੀ ਵਰਤੋਂ ਕੀਤੀ ਗਈ, ਸਰਕਾਰੀ ਗੱਡੀ ਦਾ ਰਜਿਸਟ੍ਰੇਸ਼ਨ ਨੰਬਰ ਅਤੇ ਲਾਗ ਬੁਕ ਦੀ ਵੀ ਲੜੀਵਾਰ ਤਾਰੀਖ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਫੋਟੋ ਕਾਪੀ ਦਿੱਤੀ ਜਾਵੇ ਅਤੇ ਚੈਕਿੰਗ ਦੌਰਾਨ ਕਿਹੜੇ ਕਿਹੜੇ ਪੁਲਿਸ ਮੁਲਾਜ਼ਮ ਅਤੇ ਸਰਕਾਰੀ ਕਰਮਚਾਰੀਆਂ ਦੀ ਮੌਜੂਦਗੀ ਵਿੱਚ ਚੈਕਿੰਗ ਕੀਤੀ ਗਈ। ਪੁਲਿਸ ਮੁਲਾਜ਼ਮਾਂ ਅਤੇ ਸਰਕਾਰੀ ਕਰਮਚਾਰੀਆਂ ਦੇ ਨਾ ਲਿਖਤੀ ਰੂਪ ਵਿੱਚ ਮੁਹੱਈਆ ਕਰਵਾਏ ਜਾਣ”

3. During the hearing on 17.12.2019, the appellant states that the respondent authorities are not providing the complete information to him. However, the representative of the respondents submits the copy of the letter bearing No. 1497/RTA-Hoshiarpur dated 16.12.2019, which is taken on record, in which it is submitted that “ਦਫਤਰੀ ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਅਸਿਸਟੈਂਟ ਆਰ.ਟੀ.ਏ. ਹੁਸ਼ਿਆਰਪੁਰ ਵਲੋਂ ਮਿਤੀ 11.03.2019 ਤੋਂ 20.03.2019 ਤੱਕ ਜ਼ਿਲ੍ਹਾ ਹੁਸ਼ਿਆਰਪੁਰ ਦੀ ਹੱਦ ਅੰਦਰ ਕਮਰਸ਼ੀਅਲ ਗੱਡੀਆਂ ਦੀ ਰੋਜ਼ਾਨਾ ਚੈਕਿੰਗ ਨਹੀਂ ਕੀਤੀ ਗਈ।”

4. After going through the submissions of the appellant as well as the respondents Commission is of the view that no cause of action is left in this case, hence, the case is disposed of and closed.

Dated: 14.2.2020

sd/-  
(Suresh Arora)  
Chief Information Commissioner,  
Punjab.