



Sh. Sanjiv Goyal s/o (9814197689)

Appellant

Sh. Ashok Kumar,
H.No.148, Model Town,
Phase-I, Bathinda 151001.

Versus

Public Information Officer
O/o SDM, Bathinda

First Appellate Authority
O/o SDM, Bathinda

Respondent

Appeal Case No.: 903 of 2021
Heard Through CISCO WEBEX

Present: (i) Sh. Sanjiv Goyal, Appellant
(ii) Nobody on behalf of the respondent

ORDER

1. This order may be read with the previous order dated: 9.9.2021 vide which respondent, Sh. Varinder Pal appeared from department and requested for an adjournment as he has joined the present posting only a few days back and needs time to go through the record file.
2. Request of the adjournment was granted; and directs to supply the information within 10 days under the intimation to the Commission, otherwise, it will be viewed seriously and on the next hearing the Higher Authority will be called in person. Matter was adjourned for further hearing on 15.03.2022 i.e. today.
3. In today's hearing, appellant is present and states that incomplete information has been supplied to him.
4. Respondent PIO is absent in-spite of knowing about the date, which shows his causal approach towards the Orders of the Commission.
5. After hearing the appellant and examining the case file, it is observed that requisite information is voluminous in nature. Respondent department had already sent a point-wise reply and information (of the points which relate to the respondent department) to the appellant vide letter no. 60 dated 21.09.2021 through which respondent mentioned as under regarding point no. 1,4,8,9,11, 15 and 16:

Point no. 1 relates with O/o Nagar Nigam, Bathinda.

Point no. 4 relates with O/o Civil Surgeon, Bathinda.

Point no. 15 relates with O/o Sadar Office, Bathinda.

Point No. 8, 9, 11 & 16 relates with O/o The Deputy Commissioner, Bathinda.

6. *The Bench, as per observations made above, is of the view that the appellant cannot seek information on single RTI application from multiple public authorities. A Full Bench of State Information Commission, Punjab in Complaint Case No.2903 of 2011 has decided on 13.01.2012, ruled as under:- "We hold that under Section (3) of the Act ibid, the legal obligation of a PIO who receives a request for information under Section 6(1) of the Act is limited to transfer this request to only one public authority that holds the information. This obligation does not extend to transfer the request to multiple authorities.*
7. The Bench further observes that the concerned department replied point-wise to the appellant but there is no such provision under the RTI Act to collect the information from different offices of a public authority and then to compile and supply to the appellant.

The Hon'ble Supreme Court in matter of CBSE vs. Aditya Bandopadhyay, (2011) 8 SCC 497, held as under:- "67. Indiscriminate and impractical demands or directions under the RTI Act for disclosure of all and sundry information (unrelated to transparency and accountability in the functioning of public authorities and eradication of corruption) would be counterproductive as it will adversely affect the efficiency of the administration and result in the executive getting bogged down with the nonproductive work of collecting and furnishing information.

The 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. The nation does not want a scenario where 75% of the staff of public authorities spends 75% of their time in collecting and furnishing information to applicants instead of discharging their regular duties. The threat of penalties under the RTI Act and the pressure of the authorities under the RTI Act should not lead to employees of a public authorities prioritizing "information furnishing", at the cost of their normal and regular duties.

In view of the above, it is does not seem to be appropriate for the appellant to seek information which may entail engaging 75% of the employees of a public authority to collect and compile the information for furnishing the same to the appellant. The Bench advises the appellant to go for seeking information by filing RTI application before a specific public authority who has its separate PIO.

8. In view of the aforesaid observations, the instant appeal case is **disposed off and closed**.
Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Dated: 15.3.2022 (11:00 AM)

(Anumit Singh Sodhi)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100
Email: - psic22@punjabmail.gov.in
Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Appellant

Sh. Ram Gopal Singla(9467745333)

s/o Sh. Amar Nath,
H.No.236, DC, Colony,
Sirsa

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o MC, Bathinda.

First Appellate Authority

O/o MC, Bathinda.

Respondent

Appeal Case No.: 926 of 2021
Through CISCO WEBEX

Present:

- (i) Sh. Ram Gopal Singla, appellant
- (ii) For the respondent. Ravi Loona, Supdt (9646215300).

Order

1. This order may be read with the previous order dated : 9.9.2021 vide which respondent PIO was directed to supply the proper reply/requisite information to the appellant within fifteen days after receipt of order under the intimation to the Commission. The case was adjourned to 15.3.2022 i.e. today.
2. In today's hearing after hearing of the both the parties, it is observed that respondent PIO supplied information on 11.01.2022 but the appellant is not satisfied with the supplied information. Accordingly, respondent PIO, Sh. Pragat Singh, Superintendent (M: 9814843423) is directed to supply point-wise affidavit duly attested by the competent authority to the appellant in original with a copy to the Commission within one week from today.
3. In view of supply of affidavit by the department, there is no cause of action required in the present case and the case stands **disposed of/closed**. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Dated: 15.3.2022

(Anumit Singh Sodhi)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100
Email: - psic22@punjabmail.gov.in
Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Sh. George Shubh (9814100191)

S/o Sh. Rustam Masih
R/o Begowal, Ward No. 12,
Tehsil Bholath, Distt. Kapurthala-144621

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer
O/o SSP, Mansa

First Appellate Authority
O/o IGP, Bathinda Range,
Bathinda

Respondent

Appeal Case No.: 3694 of 2020
Heard Through CISCO WEBEX

Present: (i) Sh. George Shubh, the appellant – not present.
(ii) For the respondent: Sh. Amritpal Singh, (ASI) (9780009839)

ORDER

1. This order may be read with the previous order dated: 09.09.2021 vide which respondent PIO was directed either to supply the information or supply point-wise affidavit to the appellant. The case was adjourned to 15.03.2022.
2. In today's hearing the appellant is not present.
3. Respondent, Sh. Amarjit Singh, ASI states that the requisite information has already been provided twice to the appellant on 20.11.2021 & 01.12.2021.
4. The court while taking suo moto cognizance orders, keeping in view that ample time has elapsed but the appellant had not pointed out the deficiency in the supplied information, therefore, it is considered that the appellant has nothing to say on the supplied information and the Commission does not see any further course of action required in the present case. Hence, this instant appeal case stands **disposed off & closed**. Copy of the order be sent to the parties

Dated: 15.03.2022

(Anumit Singh Sodhi)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab