



Sh Baldev Singh, S/o ShGurdiyal Singh,
Village Bhaini, Tehsil Dharmkot.
Distt Moga.

... Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o DFSC,
Moga.

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 138 of 2021

PRESENT: Sh.Baldev Singh as the Complainant
Sh.Dev Rattan Singh AFSO for the Respondent

ORDER:

The complainant through an RTI application dated 27.11.2020 has sought information regarding reasons for suspending the ration card of the cardholders who were issued cards during the Akali Govt under the National Food Security Act 2013 but discontinued during the present Govt in respect of cardholders Manjit Kaur, Sukhvinder Kaur-Sarabjit Kaur-Harjinder Kaur-Sarabjit Kaur –Raj Kaur and the details of new cards issued during the present Govt. and other information as enumerated in the RTI application from the office of District Food Supply Controller, Moga. The complainant was not provided with the information after which the complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 25.01.2021.

The case first came up for hearing on 07.05.2021 video conferencing at DAC Moga. As per the respondent, the information had been sent to the complainant on 19.04.2021, with a copy to the commission through email.

The PIO in the reply had mentioned that a re-verification-2017 survey was conducted and since the concerned cardholders did not deposit the re-verification survey form, their ration cards were suspended and thereafter from April 2017 to Nov.2020, no new ration cards were issued by the department.

It was decided that the information stands provided to the best possible extent.

However, being a complaint case, the Commission was more inclined to look into the conduct of the PIO in handling this RTI Application. Since there had been a delay of more than five months in providing the information, the PIO was issued a show-cause notice **under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 for not supplying the information within the statutorily prescribed period of time and directed to file a reply on an affidavit.**

The case last came up for **hearing on 10.08.2021** through video conferencing at DAC Moga. The Respondent present pleaded that the information has already been provided.

The PIO was absent nor had filed a reply to the show-cause notice.

Complaint Case No. 138 of 2021

Since the responsibility to ensure the timely transmission of the information to the appellant lies on the PIO, the PIO-District Food Supply Controller, Moga was held guilty for not providing the information on time as prescribed under section 7, which is within 30 days of the receipt of the request and defying the orders of the commission, a penalty of **Rs.10,000/-** imposed on the PIO- District Food Supply Controller, Moga, and directed to submit a copy of the challan as evidence of depositing the penalty in the Govt Treasury.

Further, since the appellant had to suffer undue inconvenience to get the information, the PIO was directed to pay an amount of **Rs.3000/-** via demand draft through Govt. Treasury as compensation to the appellant and submit proof of having compensated the appellant.

Hearing dated 14.12.2021:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Moga. The respondent present pleaded that the penalty amount of Rs.10000/- has been deposited in the Govt treasury on 03.09.2021 and the compensation amount of Rs.3000/- has been paid to the complainant through bank transfer in his bank account No.00655000102196252 on 19.10.2021. The respondent has sent a copy of the challan and a copy of the pay order receipt as proof of having deposited the penalty amount in the Govt treasury and compensation amount paid to the complainant which has been taken on the file of the Commission.

The complainant has received the compensation amount.

Since the information stands provided, the penalty has been deposited and compensation has been provided, no further course of action is required.

The case is **disposed of and closed.**

Chandigarh
Dated:14.12.2021

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh.Jagjit Singh,
R/o VPO Sekha kalan, Tehsil
Bagha Purana,
Distt.Moga .

...Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o DC, Moga.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o DC,
Moga.

Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1683 of 2020

PRESENT: None for the Appellant

Sh.Vikas Kumar, Patwari O/o Tehsildar Rampuraphul for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 11.09.2019 has sought information regarding ownership of bir on both sides of the main road from Bhagta to Barnala road before coming into the jurisdiction of the Forest Department – the year of including into forest department – total land in name of Sohan Singh and Sahib singh and other information concerning the office of DC Moga. The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the first appellate authority on 16.03.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case was first heard on 06.10.2020. The respondent present pleaded that as per report collected from the Naib Tehsildar Sambalpur, the information that has been sought by the i.e. jamabandi of the land relating to Sohan Singh s/o Kasuria Singh of village Dayalpura Bhaika Tehsil Rampura Phul, relates to Tehsil Rampura Phul, District Bathinda.

The PIO however, did not transfer the RTI application to the concerned PIO. As per the appellant, the RTI application was filed to Director Land Records, Jalandhar and since the information was not provided, the appellant filed the first appeal before the First Appellate Authority which transferred the same to First appellate Authority-DC Moga and the DC Moga further transferred the RTI application to Tehsildar Baghapurana but the Tehsildar Baghapurana had not transferred it to the concerned PIO.

The Tehsil Office Baghapurana in spite of identifying and transferring the RTI application to the concerned public authority, would possibly hold this information and got the signature of the appellant asking him to state that this information does not pertain to them but pertains to Rampuraphul, District Bathinda. The Commission had taken a very serious view of this anomaly of the PIO and PIO-Tehsildar Baghapurana was directed to explain the reasons for holding the information and not identifying and transferring the RTI application to the concerned public authority within the time prescribed under the RTI Act.

The appellant pleaded that this information lies with the Director of Land Records Jalandhar. The Commission accepted the plea of the appellant and impleaded the PIO-Land Records, Jalandhar the original office where the appellant had filed RTI application and directed the PIO-Director Land Records to provide the information and if the information does not exist, to identify the correct public authority and transfer the same to that particular authority.

On the date of hearing on 28.01.2021, as per the respondent, the information did not pertain to them and they had already replied to the appellant.

The Commission also received a letter from the PIO-cum-Tehsildar Baghapura stating that as per the report of Naib Tehsildar Samalpur, the information that has been sought by the appellant relates to village Dayalpura under Tehsil Rampura Phul, Bathinda.

As per the appellant, the information lies with the Director of Land Records, Jalandhar. The PIO-Land Records was absent.

The PIO-Director of Land Records, Jalandhar was given one more opportunity to look at the RTI application(a copy of which was attached with the order) and provide the information to the appellant. The PIO-Land Record was also directed to appear on the next date of hearing and explain the reasons for not complying with the order of the Commission.

On the date of hearing on **07.05.2021**, Sh.Amarjit Singh, Suptd. a present from the office of Director Land Record informed that since the information that has been sought by the appellant relates to village Dayalpura under Tehsil Rampura Phul, Bhatinda and Forest Department, the RTI application has been transferred to them vide letter dated 16.03.2021. The Commission also received a reply of the PIO-Director Land Record on 23.03.2021 which was taken on the file of the Commission.

The PIO-Punjab State Forest Development Corporation Ltd. Mohali and PIO-Tehsildar Rampuraphul were impleaded and directed to look at the RTI application transferred by Director Land Records on 16.03.2021 and provide information to the appellant as per the RTI Act. A copy of the RTI application was attached with the order for the benefit of both PIOs.

On the date of the last hearing on **10.08.2021**, the respondent present from the Forest Department brought the information and handed it over to the appellant.

The respondent present from the office of Tehsildar Rampuraphul informed that the information concerning them has already been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 29.04.2021.

The appellant was still not satisfied.

Since there was a disagreement of what had been provided and what was sought, the appellant was directed to inspect the record by visiting the office of PIO-Tehsildar Rampuraphul and contacting Sh.Badaldin on 02.09.2021 at 11.00 AM and get the relevant information. The PIO was directed to assist the appellant in every way to inspect the record relating to the information that he has sought and provide the relevant information.

Hearing dated 14.12.2021:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Moga. The respondent present pleaded that as per the order of the Commission, the appellant was to inspect the record by visiting the office of the PIO on 02.09.2021 but the appellant did not turn up on the said date. The appellant was again asked to vide letter dated 09.09.2021 to inspect the record by visiting the office of the PIO on any working day but he did not turn up.

The appellant is absent.

The same order stands. If the appellant still wants information, he may inspect the record by visiting the office of the PIO and get the relevant information.

With the above order, the case is **disposed of and closed**.

Chandigarh
Dated: 14.12.2021
CC to:1. PIO-Tehsildar, Rampuraphul,
District Bathinda

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh.Tejinder Singh,
Civil Court Tehsil Complex,
Backside Sanjh Kender,
Phillaur.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o SDM, Dharamkot,
District Moga.

First Appellate Authority,
SDM, Dharamkot,
District. Moga.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 2327 of 2020

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 01.05.2020 has sought information regarding vehicle numbers of vehicles registered from Nov.2019 to Jan.2020 alongwith the fee collected – detail of record vintage numbers re-issued for vehicles during 2017 to Jan.2020 – date submitted in SAARTH/PARIVAHAN software and other information from the office of SDM Dharamkot. The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 28.06.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

On the date of the first hearing on 28.01.2021, the respondent present pleaded that the appellant was asked to vide letter dated 03.07.2020 to specify the vehicle numbers for which the information is required since the details of registration copies cannot be obtained from the system till a specific number is fed to the software, but the appellant did not respond.

The Commission agreed with the plea of the respondent and directed the appellant that if he wants further information, he should specify the number of vehicles.

Regarding point-4, the Commission saw no reasons for providing so many registration copies of third parties unless there is a compelling public interest. No public interest had been brought to my notice as evidence for me to allow the revelation of this information.

The appellant was absent. The appellant was directed to appear personally on the next date of hearing to plead his case, otherwise, it will be decided ex parte.

On the date of the hearing on **07.05.2021**, the respondent present reiterated his plea as taken at the last hearing.

The appellant was absent and vide letter received in the Commission on 20.04.2021 sent his reply which was taken on the file of the Commission. The appellant was given one more opportunity to appear before the Commission on the next date of hearing and pursue his case.

Appeal Case No. 2327 of 2020

On the date of the last hearing on **10.08.2021**, the appellant was absent and vide email has sought exemption on medical grounds.

Hearing dated 14.12.2021:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Moga. Both the parties are absent.

Having gone through the record, the Commission observes that on the date of hearing on 28.01.2021, the respondent informed that the appellant was asked to specify the vehicle numbers for which the information is required since the details of registration copies cannot be obtained from the system till a specific number is fed to the software, but the appellant did not respond.

The Commission was agreeable with the plea of the respondent and directed the appellant to specify the number of vehicles and appear personally on the next date of hearing to plead his case. But despite providing sufficient opportunities (two more opportunities on 07.05.2021 & 10.08.2021), the appellant has preferred not to appear but has chosen to send emails.

Since the appellant has been constantly absent and has only chosen to rely on emails, the case is closed for non-pursuance of the case by the appellant.

The case is **disposed of and closed**.

Chandigarh
Dated: 14.12.2021

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh. Trilochan Singh,
H No-848-A, M.I.G, Jamalpur Colony,
District Ludhiana.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o SDM-cum-
Licensing and Registration,
Dharamkot, Distt Moga.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o SDM,
Dharamkot, Distt Moga.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 2551of 2020

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
None for the respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 10.05.2020 has sought information regarding details of PB-76 series allotted after giving charge of the registration authority to SDM Dharamkot –details of bids for VIP/fancy numbers – series allotted to commercial and noncommercial vehicles along with the vehicles being used for agriculture purpose – NOC obtained from outstate vehicles while issuing these series – details relating to reassignment to outstate vehicles and other information as enumerated in the RTI application from the office of SDM Dharamkot. The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the first appellate authority on 20.06.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case was first heard on 26.02.2021. The respondent present pleaded that since the information sought by the appellant is in question form, it cannot be provided and the reply has been sent to the appellant. The appellant was absent.

The Commission, however, made it clear that the information if exists in the custody of the public authority, even though it is sought in question form, it be provided.

The PIO was directed to relook at the RTI application and provide point-wise information to the appellant within 15 days. However, NOC regarding point-4 be not provided. If the information is not available, give an appropriate point-wise reply on an affidavit.

The case was again heard on **07.05.2021**. The appellant was absent and vide letter received in the Commission on 20.04.2021 informed that the PIO has not provided the information.

The respondent present pleaded that the point-wise information/reply has been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 03.05.2021 with a copy to the Commission.

Appeal Case No. 2551 of 2020

A copy of the reply was sent to the appellant with the order and the appellant was directed to point out the discrepancies if any, in writing to the PIO with a copy to the Commission, and the PIO was directed to remove the same. The appellant was also directed to appear personally at the venue of the video conferencing on the next date of hearing and pursue his case.

On the date of last hearing on **10.08.2021**, as per the respondent, the information has already been provided to the appellant.

The appellant was absent on 3rd consecutive occasion and vide email informed that the PIO has not supplied the complete information. As per the appellant's email, the information that was sought was in the custody of the SDM office.

The appellant was given one last opportunity to appear on the next date of hearing and pursue his case otherwise it will be decided ex parte.

The case was marked to the PIO-SDM Dharamkot to relook at the RTI application and provide all the information that is accessible and in the custody of the department.

Hearing dated 14.12.2021:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Moga/Ludhiana. Both the parties are absent.

Having gone through the record, the Commission observes that on the date of hearing on 07.05.2021, the appellant was absent and vide letter received in the Commission on 20.04.2021 informed that the PIO has not provided the information.

The respondent present informed that the point-wise information/reply has been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 03.05.2021 with a copy to the Commission.

A copy of the reply was sent to the appellant with the order and the appellant was directed to point out the discrepancies if any, in writing to the PIO with a copy to the Commission, and the PIO was directed to remove the same. The appellant was also directed to appear personally at the venue of the video conferencing on the next date of hearing and pursue his case.

The appellant is absent on the 4th consecutive hearing nor is represented.

Since the appellant has been constantly absenting himself despite being provided sufficient opportunities to appear before the Commission to pursue the case, the case is closed for non-pursuance of the case by the appellant.

The case is **disposed of and closed**.

Chandigarh
Dated:14.12.2021

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh Parshotam Lal,
O/o Sub Magistrate, Nihal Singh Wala,
Moga.

... Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Director,
Health and Family Welfare,
Sector-34, Chandigarh.

..Respondent

Complaint Case No. 559 of 2021

PRESENT: Sh.Parshotam Lal as the Complainant
Sh.Rajesh Kumar, Suptd. and Sh.Shaminder Singh, SA for the Respondent

ORDER:

The complainant through RTI application dated 16.02.2021 has sought information regarding a copy of the medical bill sent by DC Moga vide letter dated 17.03.2020 – a copy of action taken on the bill – the name of dealing officer/official –rules/instruction regarding medical bill – the name of the first appellate authority and other information as enumerated in the RTI application from the office of Director Health and Family Welfare, Pb Chandigarh. The complainant was not satisfied with the reply of the PIO dated 05.03.2021 after which the complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 03.05.2021.

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Moga. The complainant informed that the PIO has not supplied the information.

The respondent is present at Chandigarh and pleaded that since the medical bill as claimed by the complainant to have been sent by DC Moga vide letter dated 17.03.2020 was not found in their record, the complainant was asked to vide letter dated 05.03.2021 to send a copy of the bill for further processing of the bill. After receipt of a copy of the bill from the complainant, the bill was processed and approved in April 2020 and the matter was resolved. Thereafter, no communication was received from the complainant.

Having gone through the RTI application, reply of the PIO dated 05.03.2021 and hearing both the parties, the Commission observes that since it is a complaint case and the RTI application has been sufficiently replied by the PIO within the time prescribed under the RTI Act (Letter dated 05.03.2020 informing that there was no bill in their records), no further interference of the Commission is required.

The case is **disposed of and closed.**

Chandigarh
Dated: 14.12.2021

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commission



Sh. Inderjeet Singh, S/o Sh Kirpal singh,
R/o L-1/112, Gali NO-3, New Kapoor Nagar,
Sultanwind Road, Amritsar.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Deputy Commissioner of Police,
Macleod Road, Amritsar.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Commissioner of Police,
Opposite Saroop Rani Govt Girls School,
Macleod Road, Amritsar.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 2847 of 2021.

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
Sh.Prem Singh, SI for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 09.02.2021 has sought information regarding DDR No.46 dated 29.11.2019 under section 107/151 CPC – statement of the parties – court orders – documents produced in the court – current status of the case and other information as enumerated in the RTI application from the office of DCP Amritsar. The appellant was not satisfied with the reply of the PIO dated 11.02.2021 after which the appellant filed a first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 04.04.2021 which disposed of the appeal on 24.04.2021.

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Amritsar. The respondent present pleaded that since the appellant did not attach his ID proof with the RTI application, the information was not provided. After receipt of ID proof from the appellant, the information was supplied to the appellant vide letter dated 05.04.2021. The Commission has also received a reply from the PIO on 11.10.2021 which has been taken on the file of the Commission.

The appellant is absent nor is represented as well not communicated any discrepancies. It is presumed that the appellant has received the information and is satisfied.

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

Chandigarh
Dated: 14.12.2021

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commission

