

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden, Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in
Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Sh. Ashok Kumar Sharma,
H No-2356/1, Mohalla Lal Bagh,
Patiala.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o General Manager,
PRTC, Patiala Depot,
Patiala.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Chief Accounts Officer,
PRTC, Head Officer,
Patiala.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 141 of 2019

Present: Sh.Sh.Ashok Kumar as the Appellant
Mrs. Rajesh Sharma, Superintendent, O/o PRTC Patiala for the
Respondent

ORDER: The case was last heard on **09.04.2019**. The appellant claimed that the information has not been provided to him. The respondent present pleaded that since the dealing officials were deputed in a fair festival, the information could not be prepared and sought adjournment.

Having gone through the RTI application, the Commission observed that the appellant had not specified the date of information and directed the appellant to specify from which date the information is sought.

The Commission also observed that there is an enormous delay in providing the information and directed the PIO to provide complete information within 10 days and explain the reasons for delay in attending to the RTI application within the time prescribed under the RTI Act. The reply be submitted on an affidavit.

Hearing dated 15.05.2019:

The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant has received the information and is satisfied. The appellant does not want to pursue the case further.

Since the information has been provided, no further course of action is required. The case is **disposed off and closed**.

Chandigarh
Dated 15.05.2019

(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh. Prem Chand, S/o Sh.Gurmeet Ram,
R/o VPO Mamu Kheda,
Tehsil &Distt. Fazilka.

... Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
DSP, Sub Division,
Jalalabad

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 919 of 2018

Present: Sh.Surjit S/o Sh.Gurmit Ram representative of the Appellant
None for the Respondent

Order:

The case was first heard on **14.11.2018**. The respondent was absent. The PIO was directed to relook at the RTI application and provide the information to the complainant in accordance with the RTI Act. The PIO was also directed to be present personally or through his representative on the next date of hearing and explain the reasons for not attending to the RTI application within the time prescribed under the RTI Act.

Sh.Rangdev Singh, ASI Police Station, Khuikhera Distt.FAzilka appeared late and submitted a letter dated 27.09.2018 stating that the complainant was asked to appear before him for enquiry but he did not turn up. The ASI also brought the information. The respondent was directed to send the information to the complainant through registered post and intimate the Commission.

The case was last heard on **22.01.2019**. The appellant informed that the information has not been provided. The respondent was absent. The PIO was directed to send the information within 15 days and appear on the next date of hearing otherwise the Commission will be constrained to take action against the PIO under the RTI Act 2005.

The case was last heard on **13.03.2019**. The appellant claimed that despite order of the Commission, the PIO has not provided the information.

The respondent was absent on 3rd consecutive hearing and nor sent any communication whether the PIO complied with the order of the Commission or not. 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 for not complying with the orders of the Commission**. The PIO was directed to file an affidavit in this regard.

The PIO-DSP Sub Division Jalalabad was again directed to provide the information to the appellant within 10 days.

Hearing dated 15.05.2019:

The representative present on behalf of the appellant informed that no information has been provided by the PIO.

In the last hearing, the PIO-DSP Sub Division, Jalalabad was issued a show cause notice for not providing the information within the statutorily prescribed period of time and for not complying with the orders of the Commission. The letter has been received back with the remarks of the postal authorities that the addressee refused to accept it.

The PIO-DSP Sub Division, Jalalabad is given one more opportunity to appear before the Commission on the next date of hearing alongwith reply to the show cause on an affidavit otherwise the Commission will be constrained to take action as per RTI Act. The PIO is also directed to provide the information to the appellant within 10 days. A copy of the order is being sent to the SSP, Fazilka to ensure compliance of the order of the Commission by the PIO.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **16.07.2019 at 11.00 AM.**

Chandigarh
Dated: 15.05.2019

(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

CC to : SSP Fazilka

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden, Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - sicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in
Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Sh. Nonihal Singh,
Ward No-13, Sodhi Farm,
Zirakpur.

... Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Chief Administrator,
GMADA, Mohali.

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 949 of 2018

Present: Sh.Jagjit Singh on behalf of the Complainant
None for the Respondent

Order:

The case was first heard on **14.11.2018**. The respondent present pleaded that since the information is voluminous, the complainant was asked to specify the information he wants vide letter dated 04.09.2018 but he did not turn up. The appellant was absent to plead his case. The respondent was also directed to bring proof of dispatch of this letter.

The case was again heard on **08.01.2019**. Since both the parties were absent, the case was adjourned.

The case was again heard on **25.02.2019**. The respondent pleaded that since the complainant had sought information regarding unauthorized colonies in the jurisdiction of MC Zirakpur and the information pertains to the office of Deputy Director, Local Bodies, Patiala, they transferred the RTI application to the Dy Director, Local Bodies, Patiala, on 25.10.2018.

The appellant informed that he has not received the information. The PIO-MC-Zirakpur and the PIO-Dy.Director, Local Bodies Patiala were directed to look at the RTI application and provide the information that is under their custody. Should information be voluminous, the respective authority shall allow inspection of the record by fixing mutually convenient date and time and provide the appellant with the relevant information of not more than 50 pages.

The case was last heard on **25.03.2019**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The respondent present from the office of GMADA informed that they have already transferred the RTI application to the office of Dy.Director, Local Bodies Paiala. The respondent present from the office of Dy. Director, Local Bodies pleaded that since the information is voluminous in nature, as per order of the Commission, the appellant was asked vide letter dated 18.11.2018 to inspect the record but the appellant did not turn up.

Complaint Case No. 949 of 2018

Having gone through the file, the Commission directs the PIO Local Bodies, Patiala to provide the information regarding points 1, 2 & ,3 and allow the appellant to inspect the record regarding points 5 to 9 on the date fixed i.e. 29.05.2018. The PIO to provide the appellant with the relevant information of not more than 50 pages as per earlier order which still stands.”

Hearing dated 15.05.2019:

The representative present on behalf of the appellant informed that the PIO has not provided the information.

The respondent is absent. The PIO is given one more opportunity and directed to comply with the earlier orders of the Commission which still stands. The PIO is also directed to appear on the next date of hearing.

To come up on **16.07.2019 at 11.00 AM** for further hearing.

Chandigarh
Dated: 15.05.2019

(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

CC to 1. PIO-MC-Zirakpur
2. PIO-Dy.Director, Local Bodies Patiala



Sh. R.K Verma,
431-C, Street No-4, Gurbax Colony,
Patiala.

Complainant.

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o EO, Patiala Urban Planning and Development Authority,
Patiala.

First Appellate Authority,

O/o Addl, Chief Administrator,
Patiala Urban Planning and Development Authority,
Patiala.

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 1056 of 2018

Present: None for the Complainant

Sh.Jeewan Singh, Clerk O/o PUDA Patiala for the Respondent

Order:

The case was first heard on **28.01.2019**. The respondent present informed that the information regarding point-1 has been provided. Regarding point-2, the respondent pleaded that the case is sub-judice in the Hon'ble High Court and since appellant is not a petitioner in the writ petition and the PDA having fiduciary relationship with the allottees as per section 8(1)(e) of the RTI Act, the information cannot be provided. The information regarding point-3 is available on the website of the Hon'ble High Court.

The Commission observed that the exemption sought by the PIO was not in order and directed the PIO to explain in detail the rationale behind taking this exemption since the claim made under section 8(1)(e) is against the plaintiffs(allottees) who have filed a writ petition against the department (PUDA) which is the defendant.

The case was last heard on **19.03.2019**. The PIO submitted a reply stating that there has been an error in the judgment and he be pardoned. The appellant asked for lenient view and to pardon that time. The plea was accepted. The respondent pleaded that the information on 1 & 3 has been provided and that since the case is sub-judice, the information on point-2 cannot be provided. The Commission observed that section 8(1)(b) of the RTI Act exempts from disclosure "information which has been expressly forbidden to be published by any court of law or tribunal or the disclosure of which may constitute contempt of court". From a plain reading of Section 8(1)(b) of the RTI Act, it is clear that it does not include sub-judice matters. So mere pendency of a case cannot become a ground to deny the information. The information be provided within 3 days.

Hearing dated 15.05.2019:

The respondent present pleaded that in compliance with the order of the Commission, the information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant has acknowledged having received the information and is satisfied.

Since the information has been provided, no further course of action is required. The case is **disposed off and closed**.

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden, Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in
Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Smt.Sukhvinder Kaur, W/o Lt. Sh.Baldev Singh,
VPO HardoJhande, Tehsil Batala.
Distt.Gurdaspur.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
SDO, PSPCL,
Batala.

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 1143 of 2018

Present: None for the Complainant
None for the Respondent

Order: The case was first heard on **04.02.2019**. The representative present on behalf of the complainant informed that no information has been provided by the PIO so far.

The respondent was absent without intimation to the Commission and neither has sent any reply to the RTI application in the last 9 months whereas as per section 7(1) of the RTI Act, the information has to be provided within 30 days. 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 for not appearing before the Commission despite notice of the Commission. The PIO was directed to file reply on an affidavit and if there are other persons responsible for the delay in providing the information, the PIO was directed to inform such persons of the show cause and direct them to appear before the Commission along with the written replies. The PIO was also directed to provide information to the complainant within 10 days of the receipt of order.

The case was last heard on **19.03.2019**. No information had been provided. According to the complainant, the person about whom the information was sought was allegedly picked up by the Punjab police in 1989 and after which there has been no trace of him. The information is required to set in motion a process of his service benefits to his legal heirs. The PIO was granted last opportunity to explain why the information was not provided and was directed to be present personally on the next date of hearing alongwith a reply to the show cause, on an affidavit.

Hearing dated 15.05.2019:

Since both the parties are absent, in the interest of justice, one more opportunity is granted and the case is adjourned. The PIO is directed to comply with the earlier order which still stands and be present on the next date of hearing alongwith a reply to the show cause notice. A copy of the order is being sent to the Xen-PSPCL, Batala to determine the PIO under whose custody the information exists and direct the concerned PIO to provide the information and appear before the Commission on the next date of hearing.

To come up for further hearing on **17.07.2019 at 1100 AM.**

Chandigarh
Dated: 15.05.2019

(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

CC to The Xen, PSPCL, Batala.



ShJaswinder Singh, S/o ShKartar Singh,
Village ChakBhaike, Tehsil Budhlada,
Distt Mansa.

.... Appellant.

Versus

Public Information Officer,
EO, Nagar Council,
Budhlada, Distt Mansa.

First Appellate Authority,
Deputy Director, Local Bodies,
Bathinda.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1521 of 2018

Present: None for the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on **09.07.2018**. The respondent was absent. The appellant informed that against the deposit of fee of Rs.2000/-, he received only one page of information. The PIO was directed to be present personally on the next date of hearing and explain that why the appellant was asked to deposit Rs.2000/- at the first instance and also to explain the rationale behind Rs.2000/- fee for one page of information.

The case was again heard on **07.08.2018**. Sh.Amrit Pal Singh Accountant was present on behalf of the PIO. The respondent pleaded that the information has been provided and the amount has been refunded to the appellant. The appellant pleaded that the information is incomplete as in point No.2, qualification has not been mentioned.

The Commission found that the information has been provided as per RTI. However, the respondent was not able to explain the reason why the appellant was asked to deposit Rs.2000/- for a single page information. It was a clear indication of harassment and malafide intention of the PIO to ask the appellant to deposit Rs.2000/-. The PIO was directed to explain why appropriate action under the RTI Act should not be taken against him and why he should not be penalized for not providing the information in time and for charging exorbitant fee in violation of the section 7(1) of the RTI Act. The reply to be submitted by way of an affidavit.

The case again came up for hearing on **23.10.2018**. Since the information had already been provided, the appellant was exempted for further hearing. The respondent was absent. The PIO was given one more opportunity to comply with the earlier orders of the Commission and submit reply by way of an affidavit for not complying with the order of the Commission.

The case was again heard on **28.11.2018**. "The respondent was absent. Despite directions of the Commission on 07.08.2018 and 23.10.2018, the PIO failed to comply with the order of the Commission for not providing the information in time and for charging exorbitant fee in violation of the section 7(1) of the RTI Act. But preferred to be absent. The PIO was issued **show cause notice and was directed to** appear before the Commission along with the written replies on an affidavit.

Appeal Case No. 1521 of 2018

The case was further heard on **21.01.2019**. The PIO was absent and neither sent any reply to the show cause notice. The PIO was given one more opportunity to appear before the Commission on the next date of hearing alongwith the written reply on an affidavit otherwise the Commission will be constrained to take action as per the RTI Act.

The case was last heard on **13.03.2019**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“This order should be read in continuation of the observations of the commission at the last hearing whereby a PIO had raised Rs.2000 without any calculation and provided only with a single piece of paper after the appellant had deposited the asked amount on the first appellate authority’s order, which incidentally had also ignored to observe whether the PIO had provided the appellant with a full break-up of the Rs.2000 that the PIO had raised.

The respondent present has submitted a reply of the PIO, which is taken on the file of the Commission. In the reply, the PIO has mentioned that he had joined as PIO in the office of NC Budhlada only on 08.03.2019 while it was the previous PIO Sh.Ravi Kumar who had raised the amount of Rs.2000/. The PIO further mentioned in the reply that the amount was raised in the assumption that the sought information might be voluminous and could take sufficient time in tracing the record. The respondent further pleaded that he information stands provided to the appellant and an amount of Rs.2000/- has been refunded vide cheque No.069261 dated 20.04.2018 since the information could be dwarfed to a single page.

During the course of the earlier hearing, the Commission had observed this bizarre raising of Rs.2000 and then providing only a single sheet of information was akin to harassment and was an attempt by the PIO to deter the appellant from seeking the information. However, having observed this, the commission had provided ample opportunities to the PIO to justify the rationale behind raising Rs.2000 for a single page information, which the respondent chose not to reply after which the PIO was show caused that why appropriate action should be not taken for raising an exorbitant fee without justifying it. The commission was also perplexed with the idea that how could 1000 (Rs.2 a page) pages of information be shrunk to one page, as is the matter in this case.

Given the observations, I find the new PIO’s plea to file this appeal flaky, and hereby implead the previous PIO Sh.Ravi Kumar ,who has been transferred as EO Nagar Panchayat, Joga, Distt.Mansa to appear personally before the commission and file a reply on an affidavit.

The commission also instructs the Deputy Director Local Bodies, the First Appellate Authority to look into its order and exercise a more diligent approach while hearing appeals.”

Hearing dated 15.05.2019:

The respondent is again absent. The PIO–Sh.Ravi Kumar is given one more opportunity and is directed to appear before the Commission on the next date of hearing and file reply on an affidavit, otherwise the Commission will take action as per the RTI Act.

To come up on **17.07.2019 at 11.00 AM** for further hearing.

Chandigarh
Dated: 15.05.2019

(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

CC to: Sh.Ravi Kumar, Estate Officer,
Nagar Panchayat, JOGA, Distt.Mansa



Sh. Jasbir Singh, S/o Sh.Harbans Singh,
Jalal Kheri, P.O Sular, Tehsil&Distt Patiala.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
Chief Engineer, Enforcement,
PSPCL, Patiala.

First Appellate Authority,
Chief Engineer, Enforcement,
PSPCL, Patiala.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 2634 of 2018

Present: None for the Appellant
Sh.Harjit Singh Gill, Dy. Chief Engineer, PSPCL and Sh.Balbir Singh,
Sr.Xen, PSPCL Khanna for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on **30.10.2018**. Sh.Balbir Singh Sr.Xen PSPCL Khanna was present. The respondent present pleaded that the enquiry is still pending. The appellant sought action taken report on his complaint. The Commission recommended that the PIO Sh.Balbir Singh to complete the enquiry within 30 days and send the enquiry report to the appellant within 7 days of the completion of the enquiry. A copy be sent to the Chief Engineer, Enforcement, PSPCL Patiala for compliance of the orders of the Commission.

The case was again heard on **04.12.2018**. The appellant informed that he has not received the action taken report. The respondent was absent and has not sent any compliance of the orders of the Commission. The PIO was directed to provide the status report of the enquiry to the Commission within 7 days and be present on the next date of hearing with explanation for not complying with the orders of the Commission.

The case was further heard on **30.01.2019**. The appellant informed that the information has not been provided. The respondent was absent. The PIO was again directed to send status of the enquiry to the Commission within 7 days and be present on the next date of hearing. A copy of the order was also sent to the Chief Engineer, Enforcement, PSPCL, Patiala with the directions to ensure the presence of the respondent otherwise the Commission will be constrained to take action as per the RTI Act.

The case was last heard on **19.03.2019**: The appellant claimed that the information has not been provided despite order of the Commission. The respondent was absent on 3rd consecutive hearing and nor had sent status report of the enquiry. The PIO was issued a **show cause notice under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005** and directed to file reply on an affidavit. The PIO-Chief Engineer, Enforcement, PSPCL, Patiala was again directed to provide the information to the appellant within 10 days.

Hearing dated 15.05.2019:

The respondent present pleaded that the enquiry was completed on 26.11.2018 and they sent the complete enquiry report alongwith related documents to the appellant vide letter dated 28.11.2018 and again on 26.04.2019. The respondent further informed that as per report of the postal authorities, the information has been delivered to the appellant on 19.12.2018 and again on 29.04.2019. The respondent has submitted a copy of the information which is being sent to the appellant alongwith the order. I have gone through the information and find that the information has been provided to the best possible extent. However, the appellant is absent to point out the discrepancies, if any.

The respondent has also submitted reply to the show cause notice which is taken on the file of the Commission.

The case is adjourned. To come up for adjudication on **03.07.2019 at 11.00 AM**.

Chandigarh
Dated: 15.05.2019

(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden, Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in
Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Sh. Naresh Kumar,
H No-2795, Street No-3,
Jammu colony, Ludhiana.

Appellant.

Versus

Public Information Officer
O/o Deputy Chief engineer,
Operational Urban (West) Division,
PSPCL, Ludhiana.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Chief Engineer, Central Zone,
PSPCL, Ludhiana.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3249 of 2018

Present: Sh.Naresh Kumar as Appellant
Sh.Brij Mohal Mittal, AAO(Revenue) O/o Sr Executive Engineer, City
Central Div/Op.(Spl) PSPCL Ludhiana for the Respondent

Order:

The case was first heard on 28.01.2019. The respondent present pleaded that the handover/takeover report is not available in their record. The respondent claimed that the concerned Police Division No.4 Ludhiana was asked vide letter dated 21.06.2018 to provide the handover/takeover list. The respondent further pleaded that as per report of the Police Division No.4, the Police Division No.4 has been changed to Police Station Daresi and they have requested the concerned SHO Police Station Daresi vide letter dated 30.07.2018 and again on 30.11.2018 to provide the information but their response is awaited.

The Commission directed the PIO to respond to the RTI application as per facts on an affidavit. The PIO, Police Station, Daresi Ludhiana was also directed to send response.

The case was last heard on **19.03.2019**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The respondent present has submitted an affidavit stating that handover/takeover report is not available in their record and the appellant has already been informed vide letter dated 25.05.2018. The respondent further pleaded that the SHO Police Station Daresi has not sent any reply.

The SHO Police Station Daresi Ludhiana is directed to look into the matter and send response as per facts of the case. The PIO Police Station Daresi Ludhiana is also impleaded as a party in the case and directed to appear before the Commission regarding this particular case on the next date of hearing.”

Hearing dated 15.05.2019:

The appellant claims that he has not received the information. The respondent present pleaded that hand-over/take-over report is not available in their record. The SHO Thana Daresi Ludhiana was again asked vide letter dated 25.02.2019 to provide hand-over/take-over report but they have not responded.

In the last hearing, the SHO, Police Station, Daresi was impleaded as a party in the case and directed to appear before the Commission regarding this case on the next date of hearing. The PIO-Police Station, Daresi is absent. The SHO Police Station, Daresi, Ludhiana is hereby again directed to provide hand-over/take-over list and be present on the next date of hearing otherwise the Commission will take action as per the RTI Act.

The PIO-PSPCL is also directed to send a certified copy of the affidavit to the appellant

To come up for further hearing on **17.07.2019 at 11.00 AM**

Chandigarh
Dated: 15.05.2019

(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

CC to :PIO, Police Station,
Daresi, Ludhiana



Sh.Ritu Raj, S/o Sh Harish Kumar,
H No-21-22, Street No-8,
Ferozepur Cantt.

.....Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o SSP,
Shri Mukatsar Sahib.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o IG, Bathinda Zone,
Bathinda.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 4231 of 2018

Present: None for the Appellant
Sh.Manjit Singh, ASI O/o SSP Sri Mukatsar Sahib for the Respondent

ORDER: The case was last heard on **18.03.2019**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The appellant through RTI application dated 21.08.2018 has sought information regarding verification report of dowry items/bills in case No.62 dated 17.06.2015 u/s 498-A, 354, 506, 406 & 34 and other information concerning the office of SSP Sri Mukatsar Sahib. The appellant was not satisfied with the reply of the PIO vide letter dated 22.09.2018 whereby the PIO denied the information stating that the case has been presented in the court after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 20.10.2018 which disposed off the appeal 25.10.2018 upholding the PIOs decision.

The respondent present pleaded that since the appellant is one of the accused in the case, the disclosure of information will hamper the process of enquiry.

Having gone through the case, the Commission finds that since the matter is already in the court, there is no reason to hold back the information that has been sought. The Commission directs the PIO to provide a legible certified copy of the list of dowry articles and verification report of documents as per RTI application within 10 days and send a compliance report to the Commission.”

Hearing dated 15.05.2019:

The respondent present pleaded that in compliance with the order of the Commission, they have sent the information to the appellant vide letter dated 20.04.2019 and a copy submitted to the Commission.

The appellant is absent to point out the discrepancies, if any. The case is adjourned.

To come up for further hearing on **23.07.2019 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of **Deputy Commissioner, Sri Mukatsar Sahib**. Copies of the order be sent to both the parties *through Registered post*.

Chandigarh
Dated: 15.07.2019.

(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh. Tejinder Singh,
R/o Village Bholapur, P.O Ramgarh,
Chandigarh Road, Ludhiana

...Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o SDM,
Fazilka.

First Appellate Authority,
O/oSDM,
Fazilka.

...Respondent

Appellant Case No. 4278 of 2018

Present: Sh.Jasbir Singh on behalf of the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER: The case was last heard on **18.03.2019**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The appellant through RTI application dated 14.06.2018 has sought information on 7 points regarding record of old series before 1986, automatic driving tack, challan issued from Feb 2018 to 15.06.2018 and and other information concerning the office of SDM Fazilka. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 12.08.2018 which took no decision on the appeal.

The respondent present pleaded that the information available with them has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 06.07.2018 and a copy of the same is submitted to the Commission. The respondent has provided the information regarding point-4 to the appellant at the hearing. The PIO in his letter has mentioned that the information regarding point 3 relates to the RTA Ferozepur and the information regarding point -7 relates to the office of STC Punjab, Chandigarh.

Since as per respondent, the information regarding point-3 is in the custody of the PIO-RTA Ferozepur and the information regarding point-7 in the custody of the PIO-STC Punjab, Chandigarh, the PIO-RTA Ferozepur and the PIO-STC Punjab, Chandigarh are impleaded as a party in the case and the PIOs are directed to provide the information concerning them. However, if the information is in the custody of any other department, the PIO-STC, Punjab Chandigarh is directed to procure the information from that department and send it to the appellant. The PIO-RTA Ferozepur and the PIO-STC are also directed to appear personally or through their representative on the next date of hearing.”

Hearing dated 15.05.2019:

The representative present on behalf the appellant informed that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent is absent. The PIO-RTA Ferozepur and PIO-STC Punjab, Chandigarh are given one more opportunity and directed to comply with the earlier order of the Commission which still stands and appear personally on the next date of hearing.

To come up for further hearing on **17.07.2019 at 11.00 AM**.

Chandigarh
Dated: 15.05.2019.

(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner