



Sh. Baljinder Singh,
S/o Sh. Harbhajan Singh (Ex Numberdar),
R/o Ward No. 4, Village-Teona Pujariya,
Tehsil-Talwandi Sabo, District-Bathinda.

Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Block Development and Panchayat Officer,
Talwandi Sabo, Bathinda.

Respondent

Complaint Cases No.357/2019 and 358 /2019

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA	Date of Second Appeal/ Complaint
07.01.2019	Nil	Nil	Nil	08.04.2019

Present:

Appellant- Respondents- Sh. Baljinder Singh;
Sh. Sewa Singh, Panchayat Secretary;
Sh. Jagtar Singh, Panchayat Secretary;
Sh. Jagdev Singh, Junior Assistant, O/o BDPO, Talwandi Sabo.

ORDER:

The case has been heard through video conferencing.

The Commission had made following observations on 11.06.2019:

“The complainant/respondent are the same and the information sought in the complaints is identical, this order shall dispose of both the complaints.

The complainant has sought information on the details of expenditure incurred by the Gram Panchayat, Village Teona Pujariya, Tehsil Talwandi Sabo, District Bathinda.

The respondent Shri Sewa Singh, Panchayat Secretary submits that the information has been sent across to him by registered cover. The complainant denies its receipt. The Commission feels that since this information has been sent a day ago, it should be in transit. A copy has been handed over on spot to the complainant. He points out some deficiencies. The expenditures shown are not supported by the bills/vouchers. The respondents are directed to provide him complete information under intimation to the

Contd...pg...2



-2-

Complaint Cases No.357/2019 and 358 /2019

Commission.”

The case has again come up today. Despite having been directed to provide the details of the amounts supported by bills and vouchers expended on the construction of a shed in the cremation ground and boundary wall of the stadium. The respondents have failed to comply with orders. The Commission takes a strong exception of it and treats it as a violation of section 7 (1) of the RTI Act, 2005. Sh. Sewa Singh, who is Panchayat Secretary and deemed PIO in the case is hereby issued a show cause notice to explain in a self-attested affidavit as to why a penalty @ Rs.250/- per day of delay subject to maximum of Rs.25,000/- till the complete information is furnished, be not imposed under Section 20(1) of RTI Act, 2005 on him for causing willful delay / denial of the information to the RTI applicant and why the compensation be not awarded to the Complainant under Section 19 (8) (b) of the Act for the detriment suffered by him.

In addition to the written reply, the PIO is also given an opportunity under Section 20 (1) proviso thereto, for a personal hearing before the imposition of such penalty on the next date of hearing. He may take note that in case he does not file his written reply and does not avail himself of the opportunity of personal hearing on the date fixed, it will be presumed that he has nothing to say and the Commission shall proceed to take further proceedings against him ex parte.

To come up on **23.10.2019 at 11.30 AM through video conference at Bathinda.**

14.08.2019

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

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
RED CROSS BUILDING, SECTOR-16, MADHYA MARG, CHANDIGARH
Tele No. 0172-2864112, FAX No. 0172-2864125, Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com
Email:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in



Sh. Jagtar Singh,
S/o Sh. Roop Singh,
R/o Village-Tangrali,
Tehsil Talwandi Sabo,
District-Bathinda.

Sh. Amandeep Singh,
S/o Sh. Kheta Singh,
R/o Village-Tangrali,
Tehsil Talwandi Sabo,
District-Bathinda

Complainants

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Block Development & Panchayat Officer,
Talwandi Sabo, Bathinda.

Respondent

Complaint Case No.340/2019

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA	Date of Second Appeal/ Complaint
11.02.2019	Nil	Nil	Nil	04.04.2019

Present:

Complainant- Sh. Jagtar Singh;
Respondent- Sh. Jagtar Singh, Panchayat Secretary O/o BDPO
Talwandi Sabo.

ORDER:

The case has been heard through video conferencing.

It shall be relevant to reproduce the order made by the bench on 11.06.2019:

"The complainant is seeking information about the income/revenue having been accrued to the Gram Panchayat, Village Tangrali, Teshil Talwandi Sabo, District Bathinda and the expenditure incurred on various development works during the period 2013 to 2018.

Sh. Jagtar Singh, Panchayat Secretary is present on behalf of the respondents. He submits that the record in question has not been handed over to him by the previous incumbent Shri Harbhajan Singh. The BDPO is directed to ensure that the record is procured from the said Sh.Harbhajan Singh and an inspection of record by the complainant is arranged and certified copies of the documents so identified on inspection, not beyond 150

Contd...pg...2



-2-

Complaint Case No.340/2019

pages are handed over to the complainant free of charge.”

The case has again come up today. Sh. Jagtar Singh, Panchayat Secretary, submits that the record from previous incumbent has just been handed over to him. He assures the Commission that he will pass it on to complainant within a couple of days. While accepting his request, the Commission directs the parties to abide by the conditions laid above.

To come up on **25.09.2019 at 11.30 AM through video conference at Bathinda.**

14.08.2019

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

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
RED CROSS BUILDING, SECTOR-16, MADHYA MARG, CHANDIGARH
Tele No. 0172-2864112, FAX No. 0172-2864125, Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com
Email:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in



S. Sukhwinder Singh,
S/o S. Amar Singh,
R/o Vill. Issapur Landa,
Tehsil Dhuri, Distt. Sangrur.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Block Development and Panchayat Officer,
Sherpur, Distt. Sangrur.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o District Development and Panchayat Officer,
Distt. Sangrur.

Respondents

Appeal Case No.1953/2018

Date of RTI application: 02.08.2017
Date of First Appeal : 04.12.2017
Date of Order of FAA or Reply: Nil
Date of 2nd Appeal/complaint: 01.06.2018

Present: Appellant- S. Sukhwinder Singh.
Respondents- Sh. Naresh Kumar, Panchayat Secretary.

ORDER

The case has been heard through video conferencing.

The following order was made by the bench on 09.01.2019:

"The appellant has sought for an information pertaining to various expenditures incurred by the Gram Panchayat of Village Issapur Landa, Block Sherpur Tehsil Dhuri, Distt. Sangrur. Besides, details of some other allied activities have also been asked. Despite the notice and directions issued by the DDPO, Sangrur, the PIO in the O/o BDPO, Sherpur, has failed to file any reply or pass on any information to the appellant. The Commission takes serious view of the same. Apparently, the respondents have contravened the provision of the Section 7(1) of the Act and rendered himself for penal consequences.

The BDPO, Sherpur is hereby issued a show cause notice under section 20(1) of the Right to Information Act as to why a penalty at the rate of Rs. 250/- per day, subject to a maximum of Rs. 25000/- be not imposed upon him for the delay in the supply of

Contd....page...2

-2-

Appeal Case No.1953/2018

information and also to why a suitable compensation under Section 19(8)(b) of the Right To Information Act, 2005, be not awarded to the appellant for the loss and detriment suffered by him. He is also afforded an opportunity of personal hearing on the next date of hearing, before taking any action.”

The case has come up today. Sh. Naresh Kumar, Panchayat Secretary, is present. He is evasive and has not been able to satisfy the Commission about transmission of information. The appellant denies having received any information. The BDPO, Sherpur, is already under show cause notice. The Commission finds that the original application was filed way back on 02.08.2017. The respondents have shown a grave misconduct and indifference, even in the face of issue of show cause notice. The BDPO, Sherpur, is hereby directed to come present in office of the Commission along with the original record on the next date of hearing. The Commission underlines that no further opportunity shall be afforded to finalize the show cause notice.

To come up on **24.09.2019 at 11.30 AM at Chandigarh.**

14.08.2019

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

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
RED CROSS BUILDING, SECTOR-16, MADHYA MARG, CHANDIGARH
Tele No. 0172-2864112, FAX No. 0172-2864125, Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com
Email:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in



Sh. Pritam Singh Mahitto,
S/o Sh. Jeeta Singh,
R/o Back Side Civil Hospital,
Malerkotla, Distt Sangrur.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Block Development and Panchayat Officer,
Malerkotla-1, Distt Sangrur.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o District Development and Panchayat Officer,
Sangrur.

Respondents

Appeal Case No. 3518/2018

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA	Date of Second Appeal/ Complaint
13.03.2018	Nil	10.07.2018	Nil	13.09.2018

Present: Appellant- Sh. Pritam Singh Mahitto.
Respondents- Sh. Dharam Singh, Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat Sarwarpur.

ORDER

The case has been heard through video conferencing.

The following order was made on 09.01.2019:

“Sh. Dharma Singh, Panchayat Secretary, is present on behalf of respondents. He has not come up with valid reason in having failed to supply the information within the stipulated period. They are directed to file a written reply before next date of hearing.”

The case has come today. Sh. Dharam Singh, Panchaya Secretary, adheres to his stand that no record is available with them. He rather says that the record in contention is only available with the office of BDPO and since it is beyond 20 years old, it cannot be provided.

BDPO, Sangrur, is directed to comment on the issue and give the appellant a definite response under intimation the Commission. An unsatisfactory explanation shall be deemed as a willful denial of the information and shall be taken as a violation of section 7 (1)

Contd....page...2



-2-

Appeal Case No. 3518/2018

of the RTI Act, 2005.

To come up on **23.10.2019 at 11.30 AM** through video conference at

Sangrur.

14.08.2019

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



Sh. Hari Ram,
S/o Sh. Kaka Singh,
Village-Muhala, P.O-Baghria,
Tehsil-Malerkotla.
Distt. Sangrur.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Block Development and Panchayat Officer,
Malerkotla-I, Distt. Sangrur.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o District Development and Panchayat Officer,
Sangrur.

Respondents

Appeal Case No.2376/2018

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA	Date of Second Appeal
20.12.2017	Nil	06.03.2018	Nil	

Present: Appellant - Sh. Hari Ram.
Respondents- Sh. Sukhbir Singh, Panchayat Secretary.

ORDER

The case has been heard through video conferencing.

The appellant had requisitioned a copy of the documents pertaining to proceeding books, cash book, APRs and muster roll of works done under NREGA scheme by the gram panchayat of the village Muhala for a period from 2013 to 2017. The respondents say that they have made sincere efforts in transmitting the record to the appellant unsuccessfully.

Sh. Sukhbir Singh, Panchayat Secretary, representing the respondents, submits that he has brought along the copies of entire record duly certified, which has been arranged to be handed over to the appellant during the course of video conference. The

Contd....page...2

Appeal Case No.2376/2018

appellant may like to go through it and report back in writing about its sufficiency.

Meanwhile the Commission finds that the respondents have shown indifference and callousness in dealing with the RTI application. They had failed to deliver him the information even after the directions passed by the First Appellate Authority on 12.03.2018. There is a delay of almost one and a half year. The BDPO, Sangrur, is hereby issued a show cause notice to explain in a self- attested affidavit as to why a penalty @ Rs.250/- per day of delay subject to maximum of Rs.25,000/- till the complete information is furnished, be not imposed under Section 20(1) of RTI Act, 2005 on him for causing willful delay / denial of the information to the RTI applicant and why the compensation be not awarded to the Complainant under Section 19 (8) (b) of the Act for the detriment suffered by him.

In addition to the written reply, the PIO is also given an opportunity under Section 20 (1) proviso thereto, for a personal hearing before the imposition of such penalty on the next date of hearing. He may take note that in case he does not file his written reply and does not avail himself of the opportunity of personal hearing on the date fixed, it will be presumed that he has nothing to say and the Commission shall proceed to take further proceedings against him ex parte.

To come up on **23.10.2019 at 11.30 AM through video conference at Sangrur.**

14.08.2019

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



Sh.Rakesh Kumar Gupta, Advocate
R/o 8/237, Jagraon Road,
Mandi Mullanpur, Distt. Ludhiana

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Senior Superintendent of Police (Rural),
Jagraon, District Ludhiana.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Deputy Inspector General of Police,
Ludhiana Range, Near Old Courts
Ludhiana.

Respondents

Appeal Case No.2596/2019, 2598/2019, 2599/2019 & 2600/2019
(Life and Liberty)

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA	Date of Second Appeal/ Complaint
06.07.2019	Nil	11.07.2019	Nil	15.07.2019

Present:

Appellant- Sh. Rakesh Kumar Gupta.

**Respondents- SI Jarnail Singh, APIO, O/o SSP (Rural), Jagraon.
HC Parshotam Kumar, O/o DGP, Punjab.**

ORDER

The case has been heard through video conferencing.

The following order was passed on 05.08.2019:

02.08.2019

"The appellant has filed the afore mentioned appeals to the Commission invoking the provisio to Section 7(1) of RTI Act under the clause of Life & Liberty, to provide him the information within 48 hours of filing the application. Having failed to procure response from the field formation, he has approached the Commission. As the information sought is the same, and the required action is to be initiated at the field level, these appeals shall be disposed with a single order.

It shall be pertinent to reproduce the information sought in these appeals:-

- i) Certified details of records of policy of Punjab Govt. and Punjab Police to provide security to RTI Activist, General person and Press Reporters against attack or death perception.
- ii) Certified details of records of policy of Punjab Govt. and Punjab Police to provide security to RTI Activist, General person and press reporters fatally attacked and survived with perception of another attack.
- iii) Certified details of records of policy of Punjab Govt. and Punjab Police to provide security to

Contd...pg...2



Appeal Case No.2596/2019, 2598/2019, 2599/2019 & 2600/2019

RTI Activist against harassment perception and actual perception.

- iv) *Certified record of consideration by the Police Department of advisory No.24012/39/Misc./2013-CSR.III, Govt. of India, Ministry of Home Affairs dt.14.06.2013.*
- v) *Certified record of police protection or any other type of protection given to the applicant who is a RTI Activist, Press Reporter and Advocate who was attacked on 1.6.2019 and a FIR No.90 against the accused U/S 307, 379B, 120B IPC was registered at P.S. Dakha and who is still facing death threat from the accused gang and their accomplices.*
- vi) *Since the information pertains to attack on RTI Activist and Journalists (complainant), the complainant is facing threat of life and liberty from the accused and the police itself, the same be provided within 48 hours from the receipt of this application as prescribed U/S 7(1) that states "where the information sought for concerns the life or liberty of a person, the same shall be provided within forty eight hours of the receipt of the request."*
- vii) *In case part of the information sought by the applicant pertains to some other PIO, the application be transferred to him U/s 6(3) of RTI Act, 2005.*
- viii) *Kindly provide an appointment to verify the original records pertaining to information sought after providing the information*

The Commission has heard the appellant. SI Jarnail Singh, APIO is present. It transpires from the discussion that the appellant apprehends threat to his life as he was assaulted by some miscreants and suffered severe injuries and had remained hospitalized for 17 days. He submits that he has taken it upon himself to expose a land Mafia operating in the area. The Mafia is out to eliminate him.

The respondents admit that an FIR no.90 dated 01.06.2019 has been registered at Police Station, Dakha. The assailants have been identified and Police claims to apprehend them soon. The Commission having considered the aforesaid facts, believes that he is entitled to the information in 48 hours. The respondents have failed to provide him the information despite



-3-

Appeal Case No.2596/2019, 2598/2019, 2599/2019 & 2600/2019

seriousness of the issue.

The Commission directs the respondent-PIO to provide him the information within 48 hours from today positively. they shall take immediate steps to assess the threat perception to appellant and take immediate appropriate action under intimation to the Commission.”

05.08.2019

The case has come up today.

The respondents have submitted a copy of a letter dated 04.08.2019 which suggests that the appellant has been supplied with the information asked for. The Commission has also perused a notification dated 11.01.2013 issued by the department of Home Affairs and Justice on the subject of providing security to the Whistle Blowers/RTI activists. Clause 3(a) of the notification reads as under:

“The Whistle Blowers/RTI activists/Complainants/Witnesses in cases who have a threat perception of danger to his/her life or liberty may approach the District Magistrate or the Commissioner of Police as the case may be. The concerned authority shall make an Enquiry into the threat perception within 48 hours of the receipt of the application and if it is found that the threat perception is genuine, he/she shall be provided security forthwith.”

As intimated by the DSP, Dakha, the Deputy Commissioner Ludhiana, who heads the committee, has been requested to assess the threat perception to the appellant so that the follow up action can be taken accordingly. The respondents are advised to act according to the dictate of aforesaid notification, since the appellant claims to be an RTI Activist and it is incumbent upon the



-4-

Appeal Case No.2596/2019, 2598/2019, 2599/2019 & 2600/2019

respondents to ensure the safety of the citizens.”

The case has again come up today. SI Jarnail Singh, who is representing the respondents, states that due to some pressing reasons the committee could not meet to assess the threat perception to the appellant. He states that the matter is under their active consideration. They propose to take the action expeditiously. The Commission observes that the information sought has been provided to the appellant.

It is incumbent upon the respondents to take requisite action as envisaged under policy referred to above. The Commission hopes that they will do it without further delay. The Commission underlines that the respondents takes appropriate action expeditiously, in view of the fact that the appellant has been assaulted and inflicted injuries upon and an FIR stands registered. With these observations matter is **disposed**.

14.08.2019

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

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
RED CROSS BUILDING, SECTOR-16, MADHYA MARG, CHANDIGARH
Tele No. 0172-2864112, FAX No. 0172-2864125, Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com
Email:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in



Sh. Bhavkhandan Singh,
S/o Sh. Kapoor Singh,
V.P.O- Lalton Kalan, Distt. Ludhiana.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Panchayat Secretary,
Gram Panchayat Kalakh,
Ludhiana.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Block Development and Panchayat Officer,
Dehlon, Ludhiana.

Respondents

Appeal Case No.4246/2018

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA	Date of Second Appeal/ Complaint
09.07.2018	Nil	31.08.2018	Nil	12.11.2018

Present:

Appellant- None;

Respondents- Sh. Rupinder Kaushik, Panchayat Secretary.

ORDER

The case has been heard through video conferencing.

Sh. Rupinder Kaushik, Panchayat Secretary, representing the respondents says that he had asked the appellant to come present in the office and procure the information. The Commission is not inclined to accept the contention of the respondents. The obligation lies on them to deliver the information to the appellant. They should do it without further delay. Meanwhile, Sh. Rupinder Kaushik, Panchayat Secretary shall explain the delay and show cause as to why penalty should not be imposed on him.

To come up on **23.10.2019 at 11.30 AM through video conference at**

Ludhiana.

14.08.2019

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

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
RED CROSS BUILDING, SECTOR-16, MADHYA MARG, CHANDIGARH
Tele No. 0172-2864112, FAX No. 0172-2864125, Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com
Email:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in



Sh. Satnam Singh Dhawan,
R/o House No.7, GK Vihar,
Manakwal, Ludhiana.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Block Development and Panchayat Officer,
PAU (Ludhiana 1), Ludhiana.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o District Development and Panchayat Officer,
Mini Secretariat, Ludhiana.

Respondents

Appeal Case No.4303/2018

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA	Date of Second Appeal/ Complaint
31.08.2018	Nil	16.10.2018	Nil	13.12.2018

Present:

Appellant- None;
Respondents- Sh. Hardeep Singh, Panchayat Secretary.

ORDER

The case has been heard through video conferencing.

The respondents represented by Sh. Hardeep Singh, Panchayat Secretary, submit that on being offered the appellant had refused to accept the information on the plea that the same is not certified by the BDPO. The appellant is not justified in this demand as the Panchayat Secretary is custodian of record and is competent to certify it. He is desired to send it across by the registered post under intimation to the Commission.

To come up on **23.10.2019 at 11.30 AM through video conference at Ludhiana.**

14.08.2019

Sd/-
(Yashvir Mahajan)
State Information Commissioner



Sh. Bagga Singh,
S/o Sh. Lal Singh,
R/o Village Ghudani Khurd,
Distt. Ludhiana.

Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Assistant Executive Officer,
Zila Parishad, Ludhiana.

Respondent

Complaint Case No.1255/2018

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA	Date of Second Appeal/ Complaint
30.03.2018	Nil	Nil	Nil	07.12.2018

Present:

Appellant- Sh. Bagga Singh;
Respondent- Sh. Charanjit Singh, Secretary.

ORDER

The case has been heard through video conferencing.

The complainant had desired to know the outcome of an enquiry made against the Sarpanch, Ghudani Khurd, Block-Doraha, District-Ludhiana, alleging misappropriation of the funds. It transpires that the matter is being looked into by the Secretary, Zila Parishad, who himself is present in the video conference. He submits that enquiry is at advanced stage of completion and is likely to be clinched soon. He assures that as and when the same is completed, the copy of the same shall be delivered to the complainant. The Commission has no reason to disbelief the above contentions. The matter is **disposed** with the direction to do the needful as mentioned above.

14.08.2019

Sd/-
(Yashvir Mahajan)
State Information Commissioner



Sh. Gurmail Singh,
S/o Sh. Mahinder Singh,
R/o #68/1, Village-Jaito Dihati,
Tehsil Jaiton, Distt. Faridkot.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Block Development and Panchayat Officer,
Bathinda Road, Jaiton, Distt. Faridkot.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o District Development and Panchayat Officer,
Faridkot.

Respondents

Appeal Case No.2288/2018

Date of RTI application: 27.03.2018
Date of First Appeal : 01.05.2018
Date of Order of FAA or Reply: Nil
Date of 2nd Appeal/complaint: 28.06.2018

Present: Appellant- Sh. Gurmail Singh.
Respondents- None.

ORDER

The case has been heard through video conferencing.

The Commission had made following observations on 03.10.2018:

“The appellant had sought to know the details of the grants received by the gram panchayat of village Kothe Dihati Jaito for a period commencing from January, 2013 to April, 2018.

Sh. D.C.Singh, Panchayat Secretary appearing on behalf of the respondents submits that the information as was not collected by the appellant in person has been dispatched to him through registered post. The appellant seeks time to go through the same and represent the case by his counsel who is away.”

The case has come up today. The appellant denies having received the

Contd...pg ...2



-2-

Appeal Case No.2288/2018

information despite the communication of BDPO, Jaiton. The Panchayat Secretary namely Sh. Charanjit Singh is not present, despite having been directed by the BDPO. He is desired to explain his conduct and provide proof of having dispatched the information to information seeker before next date of hearing.

To come up on **30.10.2019 at 11.30 AM through video conference at Faridkot.**

14.08.2019

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



Sh. Sukhvir Singh,
S/o Sh. Dilbag Singh,
VPO-Sadiq,
Distt.- Faridkot.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Block Development and Panchayat Officer,
Distt. Faridkot.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o District Development and Panchayat Officer,
Distt. Faridkot.

Respondents

Appeal Case No.2340/2018

Date of RTI application: 10.01.2018
Date of First Appeal : 07.03.2018
Date of Order of FAA or Reply: Nil
Date of 2nd Appeal/complaint: 09.07.2018

Present: Appellant- Sh. Sukhvir Singh.
Respondents- Sh. Gursahib Singh, Panchayat Secretary.

ORDER

The case has been heard through video conferencing.

The Commission had made following observations on 03.10.2018:

“The appellant vide his application dated 10.01.2018 had asked for an information relating to various activities of the gram panchayat during its tenure from 2013 to 2018. An appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority in March, 2018 as well. Having failed to procure the information the appellant has been constrained to file the second appeal with the Commission.

Sh. Gursahib Singh, Panchayat Secretary appearing on behalf of the respondents submits that the then jurisdictional Panchayat Secretary had proceeded on ex.India Leave without giving the charge to anybody. That he has been entrusted with the charge in the last 7 – 8 days and assures to provide the information expeditiously.

The BDPO, Faridkot should have given the charge to someone in the absence of Panchayat Secretary. The appellant was to be furnished with the information in the stipulated time.

Contd...page...2



-2-

Appeal Case No.2340/2018

Having failed to do so, he has rendered himself liable for penal consequences.

Sh. Ashok Kumar who reportedly is holding the charge of the post of Block Development & Panchayat Officer, Faridkot and is PIO in the instant case is issued a show cause notice to explain in a self- attested affidavit as to why a penalty @ Rs.250/- per day of delay subject to maximum of Rs.25,000/- till the complete information is furnished, be not imposed under Section 20(1) of RTI Act, 2005 on him for causing willful delay / denial of the information to the RTI applicant and why the compensation be not awarded to the Appellant under Section 19 (8) (b) of the Act for the detriment suffered by him.

In addition to the written reply, the PIO is also given an opportunity under Section 20(1) proviso thereto, for a personal hearing before the imposition of such penalty on the next date of hearing. He may take note that in case he does not file his written reply and does not avail himself of the opportunity of personal hearing on the date fixed, it will be presumed that he has nothing to say and the Commission shall proceed to take further proceedings against him ex parte.”

The matter has come up today. Sh. Gursahib Singh, Panchayat Secretary, submits that he has been able to lay hand to the record only today, which informally has already been shown to the appellant. The Commissions directs the respondents to have it duly inspected by the appellant and provide him the certified copies of the documents, which

Contd...page...3



-3-

Appeal Case No.2340/2018

should be relevant to the information seeker, but not beyond one hundred pages. He should also ensure that the documents related to the muster roll as mentioned in his application shall also be arranged to be provided immediately.

The matter shall be reheard on **30.10.2019 at 11.30 AM through video conference at Faridkot.**

14.08.2019

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



Sh. Sanjiv Kumar,
S/o Sh. Ruldu Ram,
R/o Jodhu Colony, Street No.5
Sri Muktsar Sahib-152026.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Senior Superintendent of Police
SAS Nagar (Mohali).

First Appellate Authority
O/o Inspector General of Police,
Roopnagar.

Respondents

Appeal Case No.1320/2019

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA	Date of Second Appeal/ Complaint
17.12.2018	Nil	22.01.2019	Nil	05.04.2019

Present: Appellant- None.
Respondents- HC Rajesh Chauhan, O/o SSP, Mohali.

ORDER

HC Rajesh Chauhan, representing the respondents, has produced before the Commission an acknowledgement from the appellant of having received the information to his satisfaction. No further intervention of the Commission seemingly is called for. The appeal is **disposed**.

14.08.2019

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