Sh.Lajpat Rai, S/o Sh. Harbans Lal, B-13/287, Roman Street, Jaito, Distt. Faridkot.

... Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,

O/o Director, Local Govt Deptt, Sector-35-A, Chandigarh.

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 366 of 2020

Present: Sh.Lajpat Rai as the Appellant None for the Respondent

ORDER:

The complainant through RTI application dated 10.02.2020 has sought information copies of letters sent by Punjab Govt on 5/19, 10/19 & 01/19 including vigilance letters +ACS LG letters or compliance – approval for registering vigilance case – copy of rule of department for proceeding against employees for misplacement of record and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of Local Govt. Department, Punjab, Chandigarh. The complainant was not provided the information after which the complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 29.06.2020.

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The respondent is absent. The Commission has received a letter from the PIO on 03.12.2020 stating that the information has been provided to the complainant vide letter dated 18.09.2020.

Having gone through the record, the Commission observes that the appellant has come directly to the Commission without going to the appropriate First Appellate Authority. Since the appellant is someone who continuously files a slew of RTI applications and always prefers to come to the commission via the route of a complaint than going to the first appellate authority, it appears that he is clearly trying to circumvent the first appellant pillar of the RTI Act.

In my opinion this cannot be allowed, for if this is, it will become a practice and will undermine the institution of the first appellate authority and render the commission as a first appellate authority rather than the purpose for which the commission has been established.

Given the above, the case is remanded back to the First Appellate Authority, and the First Appellate Authority is directed to consider this as an appeal case and dispose off the same within a period of 30 days as per provisions of the RTI Act.

The case is **closed**.

Chandigarh Dated 16.03.2021 Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner

CC to : First Appellate Authority O/o Director, Local Govt Deptt, Sector-35-A, Chandigarh.



Sh. Lajpat Rai, S/o Sh. Harbans Lal, B-13/287, Roman Street, Jaito, Distt. Faridkot.

... Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer, O/o EO, MC, Jaito, Distt. Faridkot.

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 368 of 2020

Present: Sh.Lajpat Rai as the Complainant Sh.Gurdas Singh, PIO for the Respondent

ORDER:

The complainant through RTI application dated 13.02.2020 has sought information on 11 points letters issued to recover the amount as per audit report with interest from 2005 till date – copy of stock register – copies of receipts/dispatch register – copy of stock register of diesel from 1.1.2020 till date including log book and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of EO-NC Jaito. The complainant was not provided the information after which the complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 29.06.2020.

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. Having gone through the record, the Commission observes that the appellant has come directly to the Commission without going to the appropriate First Appellate Authority. Since the appellant is someone who continuously files a slew of RTI applications and always prefers to come to the commission via the route of a complaint than going to the first appellate authority, it appears that he is clearly trying to circumvent the first appellant pillar of the RTI Act.

In my opinion this cannot be allowed, for if this is, it will become a practice and will undermine the institution of the first appellate authority and render the commission as a first appellate authority rather than the purpose for which the commission has been established.

Given the above, the case is remanded back to the First Appellate Authority, and the First Appellate Authority is directed to consider this as an appeal case and dispose off the same within a period of 30 days as per provisions of the RTI Act.

The case is **closed**.

Chandigarh Dated 16.03.2021 Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner



Sh. Lajpat Rai, S/o Sh. HarbansLal, B-13/287, Roman Street, Jaito, Distt. Faridkot.

... Complainant

...Respondent

Versus

Public Information Officer,

O/o EO, MC, Jaito, Distt. Faridkot.

Complaint Case No. 369 of 2020

Present: Sh.Lajpat Rai as the Complainant Sh.Gurdas Singh, PIO for the Respondent

ORDER:

The complainant through RTI application dated 13.02.2020 has sought information on 10 points regarding proceedings done against Suresh Kumar, Ramesh Kumar employees sentenced for 3-3 years imprisonment and fine of Rs.1000-1000 each and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of Director Local Bodies, Pb Chandigarh. The complainant was not provided the information after which the complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 29.06.2020.

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. Having gone through the record, the Commission observes that the appellant has come directly to the Commission without going to the appropriate First Appellate Authority. Since the appellant is someone who continuously files a slew of RTI applications and always prefers to come to the commission via the route of a complaint than going to the first appellate authority, it appears that he is clearly trying to circumvent the first appellant pillar of the RTI Act.

In my opinion this cannot be allowed, for if this is, it will become a practice and will undermine the institution of the first appellate authority and render the commission as a first appellate authority rather than the purpose for which the commission has been established.

Given the above, the case is remanded back to the First Appellate Authority, and the First Appellate Authority is directed to consider this as an appeal case and dispose off the same within a period of 30 days as per provisions of the RTI Act.

The case is **closed.**

Chandigarh Dated 16.03.2021 Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner



Sh. Lajpat Rai, S/o Sh. HarbansLal, B-13/287, Roman Street, Jaito, Distt. Faridkot.

... Complainant

...Respondent

Versus

Public Information Officer, O/o EO, MC, Jaito, Distt Faridkot.

Complaint Case No. 370 of 2020

Present: Sh.Lajpat Rai as the Complainant Sh.Gurdas Singh, PIO for the Respondent

ORDER:

The complainant through RTI application dated 13.02.2020 has sought information on 11 points regarding employees recruited in the office of EO –NC Jaito from 2/2000 through advertisement, compassionate ground, on contract alongwith service book and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of EO-MC Jaito. The complainant was not provided the information after which the complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 29.06.2020.

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. Having gone through the record, the Commission observes that the appellant has come directly to the Commission without going to the appropriate First Appellate Authority. Since the appellant is someone who continuously files a slew of RTI applications and always prefers to come to the commission via the route of a complaint than going to the first appellate authority, it appears that he is clearly trying to circumvent the first appellant pillar of the RTI Act.

In my opinion this cannot be allowed, for if this is, it will become a practice and will undermine the institution of the first appellate authority and render the commission as a first appellate authority rather than the purpose for which the commission has been established.

Given the above, the case is remanded back to the First Appellate Authority, and the First Appellate Authority is directed to consider this as an appeal case and dispose off the same within a period of 30 days as per provisions of the RTI Act.

The case is **closed**.

Chandigarh Dated 16.03.2021 Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner



Sh. Lajpat Rai, S/o Sh. Harbans Lal, B-13/287, Roman Street, Jaito, Distt. Faridkot.

... Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer, O/o EO, MC, Jaito, Distt Faridkot.

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 371 of 2020

Present: Sh.Lajpat Rai as the Complainant Sh.Gurdas Singh, PIO for the Respondent

ORDER:

The complainant through RTI application dated 13.02.2020 has sought information on 10 points regarding educational certificates of employees Ramesh Kumar, Prem Chand, kKaushal Sharma – dudy list of all employees in NC Jaito - RTI cash register and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of EO-MC Jaito. The complainant was not provided the information after which the complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 29.06.2020.

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. Having gone through the record, the Commission observes that the appellant has come directly to the Commission without going to the appropriate First Appellate Authority. Since the appellant is someone who continuously files a slew of RTI applications and always prefers to come to the commission via the route of a complaint than going to the first appellate authority, it appears that he is clearly trying to circumvent the first appellant pillar of the RTI Act.

In my opinion this cannot be allowed , for if this is, it will become a practice and will undermine the institution of the first appellate authority and render the commission as a first appellate authority rather than the purpose for which the commission has been established.

Given the above, the case is remanded back to the First Appellate Authority, and the First Appellate Authority is directed to consider this as an appeal case and dispose off the same within a period of 30 days as per provisions of the RTI Act.

The case is **closed**.

Chandigarh Dated 16.03.2021 Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner



Sh. Lajpat Rai, S/o Sh. Harbans Lal, B-13/287, Roman Street, Jaito, Distt. Faridkot.

... Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer, O/o EO, MC, Jaito, Distt. Faridkot.

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 372 of 2020

Present: Sh.Lajpat Rai as the Complainant Sh.Gurdas Singh, PIO for the Respondent

ORDER:

The complainant through RTI application dated 11.03.2020 has sought information on 06 points regarding criminal cases pending against Ramesh Kumar, Kaushal Sharma including vigilance case against Prem Chand – copy of instruction to the EO for test and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of EO-MC Jaito. The complainant was not provided the information after which the complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 29.06.2020.

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. Having gone through the record, the Commission observes that the appellant has come directly to the Commission without going to the appropriate First Appellate Authority. Since the appellant is someone who continuously files a slew of RTI applications and always prefers to come to the commission via the route of a complaint than going to the first appellate authority, it appears that he is clearly trying to circumvent the first appellant pillar of the RTI Act.

In my opinion this cannot be allowed, for if this is, it will become a practice and will undermine the institution of the first appellate authority and render the commission as a first appellate authority rather than the purpose for which the commission has been established.

Given the above, the case is remanded back to the First Appellate Authority, and the First Appellate Authority is directed to consider this as an appeal case and dispose off the same within a period of 30 days as per provisions of the RTI Act.

The case is **closed**.

Chandigarh Dated 16.03.2021 Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner



Sh. Lajpat Rai, S/o Sh. Harbans Lal, B-13/287, Roman Street, Jaito, Distt. Faridkot.

... Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer, O/o EO, MC, Jaito, Distt Faridkot.

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 373of 2020

Present: Sh.Lajpat Rai as the Complainant Sh.Gurdas Singh, PIO for the Respondent

ORDER:

The complainant through RTI application dated 13.02.2020 has sought information on 12 points regarding misplacement of record by Ramesh Kumar, Prem Chand, Davinder Kumar, Mukhtiar Singh relating to property tax and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of EO-MC Jaito. The complainant was not provided the information after which the complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 29.06.2020.

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. Having gone through the record, the Commission observes that the appellant has come directly to the Commission without going to the appropriate First Appellate Authority. Since the appellant is someone who continuously files a slew of RTI applications and always prefers to come to the commission via the route of a complaint than going to the first appellate authority, it appears that he is clearly trying to circumvent the first appellant pillar of the RTI Act.

In my opinion this cannot be allowed, for if this is, it will become a practice and will undermine the institution of the first appellate authority and render the commission as a first appellate authority rather than the purpose for which the commission has been established.

Given the above, the case is remanded back to the First Appellate Authority, and the First Appellate Authority is directed to consider this as an appeal case and dispose off the same within a period of 30 days as per provisions of the RTI Act.

The case is **closed.**

Chandigarh Dated 16.03.2021 Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner



Sh. Lajpat Rai, S/o Sh. Harbans Lal, B-13/287, Roman Street, Jaito, Distt. Faridkot.

... Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer, O/o EO, MC, Jaito, Distt. Faridkot.

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 374of 2020

Present: Sh.Lajpat Rai as the Complainant Sh.Gurdas Singh, PIO for the Respondent

ORDER:

The complainant through RTI application dated 07.03.2020 has sought information on 10 points further action termination of Ramesh Kumar, Suresh Kumar etc. after pronouncing imprisonment by court – copy of movement/attendance register – RTI movement register – cash book and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of EO-MC Jaito. The complainant was not provided the information after which the complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 29.06.2020.

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. Having gone through the record, the Commission observes that the appellant has come directly to the Commission without going to the appropriate First Appellate Authority. Since the appellant is someone who continuously files a slew of RTI applications and always prefers to come to the commission via the route of a complaint than going to the first appellate authority, it appears that he is clearly trying to circumvent the first appellant pillar of the RTI Act.

In my opinion this cannot be allowed, for if this is, it will become a practice and will undermine the institution of the first appellate authority and render the commission as a first appellate authority rather than the purpose for which the commission has been established.

Given the above, the case is remanded back to the First Appellate Authority, and the First Appellate Authority is directed to consider this as an appeal case and dispose off the same within a period of 30 days as per provisions of the RTI Act.

The case is **closed**.

Chandigarh Dated 16.03.2021 Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner



Sh. Lajpat Rai, S/o Sh. Harbans Lal, B-13/287, Roman Street, Jaito, Distt. Faridkot.

... Complainant

...Respondent

Versus

Public Information Officer, O/o EO, MC, Jaito, Distt Faridkot.

Complaint Case No. 375of 2020

Present: Sh.Lajpat Rai as the Complainant Sh.Gurdas Singh, PIO for the Respondent

ORDER:

The complainant through RTI application dated 07.03.2020 has sought information on 11 points regarding status of enquiry against Davinder Kumar No.29/18 from 01.04.2019 to till date – action taken against Ramesh Kumar, Prem Chand, Kaushan Sharma, on the letters of higher authorities and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of EO-MC Jaito. The complainant was not provided the information after which the complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 29.06.2020.

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. Having gone through the record, the Commission observes that the appellant has come directly to the Commission without going to the appropriate First Appellate Authority. Since the appellant is someone who continuously files a slew of RTI applications and always prefers to come to the commission via the route of a complaint than going to the first appellate authority, it appears that he is clearly trying to circumvent the first appellant pillar of the RTI Act.

In my opinion this cannot be allowed, for if this is, it will become a practice and will undermine the institution of the first appellate authority and render the commission as a first appellate authority rather than the purpose for which the commission has been established.

Given the above, the case is remanded back to the First Appellate Authority, and the First Appellate Authority is directed to consider this as an appeal case and dispose off the same within a period of 30 days as per provisions of the RTI Act.

The case is **closed**.

Chandigarh Dated 16.03.2021 Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner



Sh. Lajpat Rai, S/o Sh. Harbans Lal, B-13/287, Roman Street, Jaito, Distt. Faridkot.

... Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer, O/o EO, MC, Jaito, Distt Faridkot.

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 376 of 2020

Present: Sh.Lajpat Rai as the Complainant Sh.Gurdas Singh, PIO for the Respondent

ORDER:

The complainant through RTI application dated 07.03.2020 has sought information on 08 points regarding audit report sent by Deputy Commissioner Faridkot after Ramesh Kumar, Kaushal Sharma were found liable by the Audit department and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of EO-MC Jaito. The complainant was not provided the information after which the complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 29.06.2020.

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. Having gone through the record, the Commission observes that the appellant has come directly to the Commission without going to the appropriate First Appellate Authority. Since the appellant is someone who continuously files a slew of RTI applications and always prefers to come to the commission via the route of a complaint than going to the first appellate authority, it appears that he is clearly trying to circumvent the first appellant pillar of the RTI Act.

In my opinion this cannot be allowed, for if this is, it will become a practice and will undermine the institution of the first appellate authority and render the commission as a first appellate authority rather than the purpose for which the commission has been established.

Given the above, the case is remanded back to the First Appellate Authority, and the First Appellate Authority is directed to consider this as an appeal case and dispose off the same within a period of 30 days as per provisions of the RTI Act.

The case is **closed**.

Chandigarh Dated 16.03.2021 Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner



Sh. Bharat Goyal, S/o Sh Raj Kumar, Near Telephone Exchange, Tappamandi, Distt.Bathinda.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer, O/o Tehsildar, Jaito, Distt.Faridkot.

First Appellate Authority, O/o SDM, Jaito, Distt.Faridkot.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 893 of 2020

PRESENT: None for the Appellant Sh.Gurdeep Singh,Reader to Tehsildar Jaito for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 25.11.2019 has sought information regarding income and assets certificates register from 01.01.2019 to Nov.2019 – details of post of dealing hand, year-wise detail of registered vasika and other information concerning the office of TehsildarJaito. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First appellate Authority on 19.12.2019 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case was first heard on 17.08.2020. through video conferencing facility at DAC Ferozepur. Due to Cabinet meeting in the DAC Ferozepur, the hearing could not take place.

The Commission received a letter from the PIO-cum-TehsildarJaito on 31.07.2020 stating that the information has been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 26.12.2019. The appellant vide email informed that the PIO has not provided the information. The case was adjourned.

On the date of the last hearing on **14.09.2020 which** was held through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot, both the parties were absent. The appellant vide email has sought exemption. In the said email, the appellant also informed that the PIO has not provided the complete information.

The PIO was directed to provide complete information to the appellant and send a compliance report to the Commission.

Hearing dated 16.03.2021:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The appellant is absent and vide email has informed that the PIO has not provided the information.

The respondent present pleaded that the information has already been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 26.12.2020.

Since the appellant has not appeared on any of the hearings and is continuously seeking exemption without pointing out any specific discrepancy, I see no reason to continue this case further.

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

Chandigarh Dated 14.09.2020 Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner