



Ms Meet Kaur, D/o Sh Jagdev Singh,  
Near Chatheyan Wala Darwaza,  
Village Ubhaval, Tehsil & Distt Sangrur.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o DFSC,  
Sangrur.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o Deputy Director,  
Food Civil Supplies and Consumer Affairs,  
Patiala.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 1659 of 2021**

**PRESENT: Ms.Meet Kaur as the Appellant**  
**Sh.Vikrant Joshi, Clerk for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant through RTI application dated 17.11.2020 has sought information on 07 points regarding a copy of the license issued to Ritu Rani depot holder along with documents attached (aadhar card, etc) with the application – under whose name license was transferred after the death of Ruldu Ram depot holder and Jarnail Singh depot holder along with documents attached with the application for getting the license transferred – number of depot holders in Ubhaewal village and other information as enumerated in the RTI application from the office of DFSC Sangrur. The appellant was not provided with the information provided after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 05.02.2021 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Sangrur. As per the appellant, the PIO has not provided the complete information.

The respondent present pleaded that since most of the sought information is personal information of the 3<sup>rd</sup> parties, they have sent the information/reply to the appellant vide letter dated 24.08.2021. As per the respondent parts of the sought information that did not violate section 11 or Section 8 of the Act have been provided.

Having gone through the RTI application and hearing both the parties, I am in agreement with the PIO's view that the sought information is largely personal information and there is nothing on the file to establish any public interest in disclosing all of the sought information.

The appellant who is present at the hearing has been unable to establish a larger public interest for the commission to order disclosure of information that is third party as enumerated in section 11 or falls under section 8(1).

I find the RTI application has been suitably replied to and no further course of action is required.

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

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 15.09.2021**

**Sd/-**  
**(Khushwant Singh)**  
**State Information Commissioner**



Sh Prem Kumar Rattan,  
H No078/8, Park Road,  
Navi Mandi, Dhuri,  
Distt Sangrur.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o Sav Bhartiya Sewa Samiti Regd,  
Satte Wala Pull, Dukan No-1,  
Dhuri, Distt Sangrur.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o Manager Sarv Bhartiya Sewa Samiti Regd,  
Satte Wala Pull, Dukan No-1,  
Dhuri, Distt Sangrur.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 1412 of 2021**

**PRESENT: Sh.Prem Kumar Rattan as the Appellant**  
**None for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant through RTI application dated 28.09.2020 has sought information regarding details Sarv Bhartiya Sewa Samiti Dhuri – a copy of resolution vide which the Durga Mandir Committee handed over the institution – details of ownership of shops surrounding the mandir – details of income and expenditure accounts of Durga Mandir handed over during handing over the charge - income for last 10 years and other information as enumerated in the RTI application from the office of Sarv Bhartiya Sewa Samiti Regd. Dhuri. The appellant was not provided with the information provided after which the appellant filed the first appeal on 03.01.2021 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Sangrur. The appellant claims that the PIO has not supplied the information.

The respondent is absent. The Commission has received the reply of President Sarv Bhartiya Sewa Samiti Dhuri on 23.08.2021 which has been taken on the file of the Commission. In the said reply, the president- Sarv Bhartiya Sewa Samiti Dhuri has stated that since their's is a private body and no grant is being received from the Govt., their organisation does not fall within the ambit of the public authority and is not covered under the RTI Act. Further Durga Mandir Committee has handed over the premises of the Mandir to Sarv Bhartiya Sewa Samiti Dhuri for maintenance purposes and no record of the said committee was handed over to Sarv Bhartiya Sewa Samiti Dhuri, as such it is not in the possession of any record of Durga Mandir Committee.

I am in agreement with the reply of the President of Sarv Bhartiya Sewa Samiti, Dhuri and hence no further interference is required in the matter.

A copy of the reply of president Sarv Bhartiya Sewa Samiti Dhuri is being sent to the appellant.

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

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 15.09.2021**

**Sd/-**  
**(Khushwant Singh)**  
**State Information Commissioner**



Sh Vipin Grover,  
Fatehgarh Panjtoor,  
Moga.  
Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o DFSC,  
Moga.

...

...Respondent

**Complaint Case No. 398 of 2021**

**PRESENT: Sh.Vipin Grover as the Complainant**  
**Sh.Kamal Sharma, Asstt.Controller Food Supply for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The complainant through RTI application dated 20.01.2021 has sought information regarding details of ration cards issued/renewed after April 2017 in NC Fatehgarh Pantur under the National Food Security Act along with forms submitted for the same - details of ration distributed to the beneficiaries under this scheme from April 2017 to Dec.2020 and other information as enumerated in the RTI application from the office of DFSC Moga. The complainant was not provided with the information provided after which the complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 31.03.2021.

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Moga. As per the respondent, the information has been supplied to the complainant and the complainant has acknowledged having received the information vide his letter dated 18.08.2021. The PIO has also sent a letter dated 20.08.2021 along with acknowledgement of the complainant dated 18.08.2021 which has been taken on the File of the Commission.

The complainant is present and informed that he has received the information and his complainant case may be closed.

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

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 15.09.2021**

**Sd/-**  
**(Khushwant Singh)**  
**State Information Commissioner**



Sh Rohit Mittal, S/o Sh Thakur Dass,  
Village Lande, Tehsil Bhagapurana,  
Distt Moga.

... Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o Director,  
Food Civil Supplies and Consumer Affairs,  
Sector-39-C, Chandigarh.

...Respondent

**Complaint Case No. 360 of 2021**

**PRESENT:   None for the Complainant**  
**Sh.Yogesh Bansal, Sr.Assistant for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The complainant through RTI application dated 27.12.2020 has sought information regarding the list of rice millers blacklisted during the crop year 2018-19, 2019-20 & 2020-21 having excess/shortage of paddy/rice – a copy of the order for blacklisting the rice mills – a copy of the order for recommending police action – a copy of the order for auctioning and or sale of paddy/rice in the market and other information as enumerated in the RTI application from the office of Director Food Supplies and Consumer Affairs, Pb Chandigarh. The complainant was not satisfied with the reply of the PIO dated 15.02.2021 after which the complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 23.03.2021.

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Moga. The respondent present pleaded that since the complainant has asked for information of all districts of Punjab and there are different PIOs of each district, the appellant has been asked to vide letter dated 15.02.2020 to get the information from the concerned PIOs.

Since it is a complaint case and the complainant has come to the Commission without going to the First Appellate Authority, and there is no cause for interference by the commission, I am remanding this case to the First Appellate Authority to treat it as an appeal and conclude it with the prescribed time.

However, the PIO Office of Director, Food Civil Supplies and Consumer Affairs, Pb Chandigarh is directed to assist the applicant and send him a complete list and addresses of all the concerned PIOs(district-wise) with this RTI application.

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

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 15.09.2021**

**Sd/-**  
**(Khushwant Singh)**  
**State Information Commissioner**



Sh George Subh, S/o Sh Rustam Masih,  
R/o Begowal, Ward No-12,  
Tehsil Bholanath, Distt Kapurthala.

... Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o Senior Medical Officer,  
Moga.

...Respondent

**Complaint Case No. 344 of 2021**

**PRESENT:   None for the Complainant**  
**None for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The complainant through an RTI application dated 23.11.2020 has sought a copy of SC certificate of Sh.Parminder Singh s/o Anait Masih and Sh.Satfan s/o Karnail Masih along with their service record and other information as enumerated in the RTI application from the office of SMO Moga. The complainant was not provided with the information provided after which the complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 17.03.2021.

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

Since it is a complainant case and the complainant has come to the Commission without going to the First Appellate Authority, I hereby remand back the case to the First Appellate Authority with the direction to consider this as an appeal case and dispose of the same within a period of 30 days as per the RTI Act.

With the above order, the case is **closed**.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 15.09.2021**

**Sd/-**  
**(Khushwant Singh)**  
**State Information Commissioner**

**CC to:First Appellate Authority,**  
**Civil Surgeon, Moga.**



Sh Rachhpal Singh, S/o Sh Balwant Singh,  
R/o H No-266, Ward NO-4, Bhagat Singh Colony,  
Back Side Sacred Heart School, Dosanjh Road,  
Moga.

... Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o Director,  
Ayurveda Department,  
Sector-11, Chandigarh.

...Respondent

**Complaint Case No. 181 of 2021**

**PRESENT:   None for the Complainant**  
**Sh.Bramjot Singh, PIO for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The complainant through an RTI application dated 12.10.2020 has sought information regarding the treatment of patients by naturopathy and yoga if approved, can the medical bills be claimed – the name of the authority to claim the reimbursement and other information as enumerated in the RTI application from the office of Director Ayurveda Department, Pb Chandigarh. The complainant was not provided the information provided after which the complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 08.02.2021.

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Moga. As per the respondent, the information has been provided to the complainant on 18.08.2021.

The complainant is absent and vide email has informed that he has received the information and is satisfied.

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

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 15.09.2021**

**Sd/-**  
**(Khushwant Singh)**  
**State Information Commissioner**



Sh Sukhchain Singh,  
Sonam Mohalla. Fatehgarh Churian,  
Tehsil Batala, Distt Gurdaspur.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o Zonal License Authority,  
O/o civil Surgeon, Gurdaspur.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o Civil Surgeon,  
Gurdaspur.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 1629 of 2021**

**PRESENT:   None for the Appellant**  
**Sh.Gurdeep Singh, PIO for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant through RTI application dated 17.02.2020 has sought information on 08 points regarding action taken against store owner Kuldeep Medical Store relating to recovery of intoxicate tablets capsules while checking – sealing period of the medical store – attendance of employees at that time – a copy of the license issued and other information as enumerated in the RTI application from the office of Civil Surgeon, Gurdaspur. The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 18.06.2020 which took no decision on the appeal. After filing of the appeal, the PIO sent information to the appellant on 25.06.2020 to which the appellant was not satisfied and filed 2<sup>nd</sup> appeal in the Commission on 31.03.2021.

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Gurdaspur. The respondent present pleaded that the information as available in the record has already been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 25.06.2020. The respondent further informed that the appellant had earlier filed appeal cases No.3438/2019 & 3439/2019 for seeking exactly the same information which was disposed of by Mrs Preety Chawla, State Information Commissioner on 30.01.2020. The respondent has also sent a copy of the RTI application and order dated 30.01.2020 which has been taken on the file of the Commission.

I have gone through the record and find that since the information has already been provided to the appellant in an earlier appeal case No.3438/2019 & 3439/2019 and again on 25.06.2020, no further course of action is required.

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

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 15.09.2021**

**Sd/-**  
**(Khushwant Singh)**  
**State Information Commissioner**





Sh Sudhir Bansal,  
Batala Office NO-23, First Floor,  
Mahasha Market, G.T Road,  
Batala, Distt Gurdaspur.

... Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o Principal Secretary,  
Deptt of Health & Family Welfare,  
Paryas Building, Sector-38, Chandigarh.

...Respondent

**Complaint Case No. 225 of 2021**

**PRESENT: Sh.Sudhir Bansal as the Complainant**  
**Sh.Inderjit Singh, Sr.Asstt.(Statistic branch) for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant through RTI application dated 08.09.2020 has sought information regarding the number of radiologists sanctioned/working/post vacant – number of ultrasound machines serviceable/unserviceable – the sex ratio of newly born children in Punjab from April 2014 to 31.03.2020 and other information as enumerated in the RTI application. The information was sought from the office of Principal Secretary, Health and Family Welfare, Pb Chandigarh. The appellant was not satisfied with the reply of the PIO dated 04.11.2020 after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 18.02.2021 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Gurdaspur. As per the respondent, complete information has been supplied to the appellant.

The appellant claims that he has received the information on point-1 on 31.08.2021 and the information on point-3 has discrepancies.

The respondent claimed that the provided information is as per record available and is also reflected in the annual statistical report of CSR for the year 2019 which was submitted to the office of Registrar General, India New Delhi and this report has been uploaded on the website of the department i.e. [pbhealth.gov.in](http://pbhealth.gov.in)

Hearing both the parties, I conclude that the information provided by the PIO is as per the available record.

Further, since there has been huge pressure on the health department due to the covid-19 epidemic, I condone the delay in providing the information.

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

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 15.09.2021**

**Sd/-**  
**(Khushwant Singh)**  
**State Information Commissioner**