PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

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



Sh. Om Parkash, # 212-H/1, Sewak Colony, Delhi Plaza-PB & Sind Bank Lane, Near 21 No. Railway Crossing, Patiala.

.....Appellant

Vs

Public Information Officer,

O/o PEPSU Town Development Board, Rajpura, Distt Patiala.

First Appellate Authority,

O/o Administrator, PEPSU Town Development Board, Rajpura, Distt Patiala.

....Respondent

Appeal Case No. 363 of 2020

PRESENT: None for the Appellant Sh.Mridul Bansal for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 19.09.2019 has sought information regarding service rules governing the service conditions of appointment, promotion, punishment of various employees and other information concerning the office of the Administrator, PEPSU Town Development Board, Rajpura. The appellant was not satisfied with the reply of the PIO dated 18.10.2019 after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 30.10.2019 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case has come up for hearing today through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

The respondent present pleaded that the available information was sent to the appellant on 18.10.2019. Since the appellant was not satisfied, he filed appeal with the First Appellate Authority which asked the appellant to appear and plead his case. However, the appellant did not appear. The First Appellate Authority after having gone through the record, disposed off the appeal.

The appellant is absent and vide email has sought exemption. In the said email, the appellant has stated that the information is not as per the RTI application.

Having gone through the RTI application and the reply of the PIO, the Commission finds that the information has been supplied to the best possible extent and no further course of action is required.

The case is disposed off and closed.

Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner



Sh Vinay Sood,# 51, Phase-II, Urban Estate, Patiala.

Versus

Public Information Officer,

O/o XEN, PSPCL, Model Town, Patiala.

First Appellate Authority,

O/o Chief Engineer, Operational (South), PSPCL, Patiala.

Appeal Case No. 1965 of 2019

PRESENT: None for the Appellant None for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on 17.10.2019. The appellant informed that the PIO has not provided the information. Having gone through the record, the Commission observed that the PIO had not sent appropriate reply to the appellant and had casually stated that the record is missing. The PIO was directed to provide enquiry report that the record has been destroyed, misplaced or exhumed as per procedure. However, the respondent could not clarify that whether record has been misplaced or has been exhumed as per procedure. The PIO was directed to clarify the position at the next date of hearing.

On the last date of hearing which was held on **13.02.2020**, the respondent present pleaded that the available information has been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 31.12.2019. The appellant was absent and vide email had sought adjournment. The appellant however, did not clarify that whether he had received the information or not. The appellant was given one last opportunity to inform the Commission whether he has received the information and or not, and point out the discrepancies, if any.

Hearing dated 16.06.2020:

The case has come up for hearing today **through** video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Patiala. Both the parties are absent.

In the last hearing, the appellant was absent. The appellant was directed to clarify whether he has received the information or not and point out the discrepancies, if any.

The appellant is absent nor has communicated any discrepancy. It is presumed that the appellant has received the information and is satisfied.

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

Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner

Chandigarh Dated 16.06.2020 ...Respondent

... Appellant

A B B B C Signation

Sh Ranjeet Singh, H No-95, Maharaja Yadvindra Envlave, Nabha Road, Patiala.

... Appellant

...Respondent

ion Officer

Public Information Officer,

O/o SE, Material Services, PSPCL, Patiala.

First Appellate Authority,

O/o Chief Engineer, TA & I, PSPCL, Patiala.

Appeal Case No. 3869 of 2019

Versus

PRESENT: None for the Appellant Sh.Ravinder Pal Singh, Dy.Chief Engineer(Tech Audit)-Elec for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 13.11.2018 has sought information 13 points regarding material services wing from 01.01.2014 to 30.09.2018 – cases failed during joint verification, material accepted after imposing financial burden, disciplinary action taken, and other information concerning the office of SE Material Services, PSPCL Patiala. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 20.12.2018 which disposed off the appeal 10.01.2019 and the order was sent to the appellant on 15.01.2019. The appellant was not satisfied with the reply after which he has come to the second appeal.

The case was last heard on **19.02.2020**. The respondent said that they have sent the complete information on 17.02.2020.

The Commission observed that the information has been provided after more than one year of the order of the First appellate Authority and there is an enormous delay in providing the information. The PIO was issued a **show cause notice under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 and directed to file reply on an affidavit.** 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.

Hearing dated 16.06.2020:

The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant. The respondent has also sent his reply in the form of an affidavit through email which is taken on the file of the Commission.

The appellant is absent and vide email has informed that he does not want to pursue the case further and his appeal case be closed.

Since the appellant does not want to pursue his case and the respondent has sent reply to the show cause notice, the show cause is dropped and the case is closed.

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

Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner

Pointe Information

Sh Ranjeet Singh, H No-95, Maharaja Yadvindra Envlave, Nabha Road, Patiala.

Versus

... Appellant

Public Information Officer,

O/o Deputy Chief Engineer, Technical audit (Electrical), PSPCL, Patiala.

First Appellate Authority,

O/o Chief Engineer, Technical Audit & Inspection, PSPCL, Patiala.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3870 of 2019

PRESENT: None for the Appellant Sh.Ravinder Pal Singh, Dy.Chief Engineer(Tech Audit)-Elec for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 27.11.2018 has sought information regarding technical audit wing – documents containing order issued to Technical Audit wing by CE Technical Audit and inspection for the period of 01.01.2014 to 30.09.2018, record of checking of sanctioned estimates and other information concerning the office of Deputy Chief Engineer, Technical audit (Electrical), PSPCL, Patiala.. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 31.12.2018 which took no decision on the appeal. After first appeal, the PIO sent reply to the appellant vide letter dated 01.02.2019 stating that the information is not available in their record.

The case was last heard on 19.02.2020. The appellant was absent. In the appeal, the appellant had stated that the information that has been sent by the PIO is incomplete and vague. The respondent present pleaded that the information is not available in their record and the reply has been sent to the appellant on 01.02.2019. The PIO is directed that if the information is not available, to give this in writing on an affidavit.

Hearing dated 16.06.2020:

The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant. The respondent has also sent his reply in the form of an affidavit through email which is taken on the file of the Commission.

The appellant is absent and vide email has informed that he does not want to pursue the case further and his appeal case be closed.

Since the appellant does not want to pursue his case and the respondent has sent his reply, the case is closed.

The case is disposed off and closed.

Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner



Sh Sandeep Kumar, S/o Sh Om Parkash, R/o Street NO-2, Near Shani Dev Mandir, Patel Nagar, Malut, Distt Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

....Appellant

٧s

Public Information Officer,

O/o EO, NC, Malout, Distt Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

First Appellate Authority,

O/o Deputy Director, Local Govt, Bathinda.

....Respondent

Appeal Case .No. 4675 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Sandeep Kumar as the Appellant Sh.Jagsir Singh, EO-NC Malout for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 21.08.2019 has sought information regarding action taken on the application dated 10.06.2019 against unauthorized construction in Malout City and other information concerning the office of EO-NC Malout. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 09.10.2019 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Sri Mukatsar Sahib. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been supplied to the appellant vide letter darted 04.11.2019. The appellant claims that the information is incomplete.

The Commission has received a letter diary No.5523 on 20.04.2020 vide which the PIO has enclosed a copy of information supplied to the appellant which is taken on the file of the Commission.

Having gone through the RTI application, information provided by the PIO and hearing both the parties, the following is concluded:

- Point-1 PIO to relook and provide complete information
- Point-2 -Provided
- Point-3 -As per Point-1
- Point-4 -To provide
- Point-5 -Provided

The information be provided within 10 days of the receipt of this order and a compliance report be sent to the Commission.

To come up for further hearing on **21.07.2020 at 01.30 PM through** video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

Chandigarh Dated 16.06.2020



Sh Sandeep Kumar, S/o Sh Om Parkash, R/o Street NO-2, Near Shani Dev Mandir, Patel Nagar, Malut, Distt Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

....Appellant

Vs

Public Information Officer,

O/o EO, NC, Malout, Distt Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

First Appellate Authority,

O/o Deputy Director, Local Govt, Bathinda.

....Respondent

Appeal Case .No. 4676 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Sandeep Kumar as the Appellant Sh.Jagsir Singh, EO-NC Malout for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 01.04.2019 has sought information regarding details of shops/showrooms constructed on the National Highway Malout from 01.01.2012 to 30.03.2019 and notices issued to owners of showroom/shops for violation and and other information concerning the office of EO-NC Malout. The appellant was not satisfied with the reply of the PIO dated 06.05.2019 after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 10.06.10.2019 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Sri Mukatsar Sahib. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been supplied to the appellant vide letter darted 04.11.2019. The appellant claims that the information is incomplete.

The Commission has received a letter diary No.5522 on 20.04.2020 vide which the PIO has enclosed a copy of information supplied to the appellant which is taken on the file of the Commission.

Having gone through the RTI application, information provided by the PIO and hearing both the parties, the following is concluded:

- Point-1 PIO to relook and provide names
- Point-2 -Provided
- Point-3 -To provide

The information be provided within 10 days of the receipt of this order and a compliance report be sent to the Commission.

To come up for further hearing on **21.07.2020 at 01.30 PM through** video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner



Sh.Des Raj, S/o Sh Krishan Lal, H NO-187, Ward No-15/20, Opp Sri Guru Ravidass Mandir, Sri Guru Ravidass Nagar, Malout, Distt Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

....Appellant

Vs

Public Information Officer,

O/o EO, MC, Malout, Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

First Appellate Authority,

O/o Deputy Director, Local Bodies, Bathinda.

....Respondent

Appeal Case No. 301 of 2020

PRESENT: Sh.Des Raj as the Appellant Sh.Jagsir Singh, EO-NC Malout for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 17.10.2019 has sought information regarding details of beneficiaries of Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojna from January 2016 to Oct.2019 and other information concerning the office of EO-NC Malout. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 26.11.2019 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Sri Mukatsar Sahib. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been supplied to the appellant vide letter darted 26.11.2019. The appellant claims that the information is incomplete.

The Commission has received a letter diary No.5628 on 27.04.2020 vide which the PIO has enclosed a copy of information supplied to the appellant which is taken on the file of the Commission.

Having gone through the RTI application, information provided by the PIO, the Commission directs the PIO to provide list of beneficiaries comprising names & addresses only and not to provide Aadhar/PAN/Mobiles Numbers. The information be provided within 10 days of the receipt of this order and a compliance report be sent to the Commission.

To come up for further hearing on **21.07.2020 at 01.30 PM through** video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner



Sh.Deven Munjal, Ward No-19, Street NO-4, Roop Nagar, Gidderbaha, Distt Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,

O/o Tehsildar, Gidderbaha, Distt. Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

First Appellate Authority,

O/o SDM, Gidderbaha, Distt. Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

...Respondent

PRESENT: None for the Appellant None for the Respondent

ORDER: Facts of the case:-

- That Sh.Devan Munjal through RTI application dated 06.09.2018 sought information regarding sale/transfer deeds registered for properties falling under the MC limit of Gidderbaha alongwith copies of NOC etc. from the office of Tehsildar Gidderbaha.

Appeal Case No. 1227 of 2019

- That the appellant was not provided the information the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority and thereafter second appeal in the Commission on 02.04.2019.
- That the case came for hearing first on 31.07.2019. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent was absent.
- That having gone through the reply, the Commission observed that information is incomplete since the appellant in point-2 has asked for RTI applications which were replied within the prescribed time of 30 days. The PIO had also not replied regarding points-3 & 4. The appellant was directed to inspect the record regarding point-1 by visiting the office of PIO by fixing a mutually convenient date and time and get the relevant information. The PIO was directed to allow inspection of record and provide the information regarding point-1, in the form it exists.
- That Due to an enormous delay of 10 months in attending to the RTI application, the PIO was issued a show cause notice Section 20 of the RTI Act and directed to file reply on an affidavit. The PIO was again directed to provide the information to the appellant within 10 days.
- That on **28.11.2019.**, Sh.Rajinder Pal Singh appeared on behalf of the PIO and pleaded that the information has been supplied to the appellant vide letter dated 02.09.2019. The appellant claimed that despite order of the Commission as well as direction of the First Appellate Authority, the PIO has not allowed the inspection of record pertaining to the information regarding point-1. That the PIO had also sent wrong and misleading information regarding points-2, 3 & 4. The Commission directed the PIO to relook at the RTI application and provide complete information on points 2,3& 4. Regarding point-1, the PIO to bring original record to the Commission at the next date of hearing. The PIO was also directed to appear personally and file detailed reply to the show cause notice.

Appeal Case No. 1227 of 2019

- That on the next date of hearing which was held on **25.02.2020**, the appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information on points 2 & 3. The PIO was absent but preferred to send a representative with the record which was not as per the information sought in point-1. The Information regarding points 2 & 3 had not been provided. The PIO had also chosen not to respond to the show cause notice and appear. Despite direction of the Commission, the PIO has not provided the information.
- That since the PIO-Tehsildar Gidderbaha not only shown utter disregard for the Commission's repeated orders to provide the information but had shown willful stubbornness in not replying to the Show Cause and not appearing before the commission despite various orders, the PIO-Tehsildar Gidderbaha was issued a bailable Warrant through Senior Superintendent of Police, Sri Mukatsar Sahib for his presence before the Commission on **08.04.2020 which** date was postponed to 16.06.2020.
- That the case has come up for hearing today. The PIO- Tehsildar Gidderbaha is absent nor has sent any reply to the show cause notice. The appellant vide email has sought exemption due to an accident.
- To secure the erring PIO's presence before the Commission, a fresh bailable warrant of PIO-Tehsildar Gidderbaha, District Sri Mukatsar Sahib is hereby issued through Senior Superintendent of Police, Sri Mukatsar Sahib for his presence before the Commission on 15.07.2020.

The PIO is also directed to provide information on all three points and allow the inspection of record to the appellant regarding point-1. The First Appellate Authority, SDM, Gidderbaha is also directed to ensure compliance of this order.

To come up for further hearing on **15.07.2020 at 11.00 AM**

Chandigarh Dated:16.06.2020

BAILABLE WARRANT OF PRODUCTION BEFORE SHRI KHUSHWANT SINGH STATE INFORMATION COMMISSIONER, PUNJAB AT CHANDIGARH

In case:Devan Munjal V/s Public Information Officer, Tehsildar Gidderbaha

APPEAL CASE NO.1227 of 2019

UNDER SECTION 18 OF THE RIGHT TO INFORMATION ACT, 2005

Next Date of Hearing :15.07.2020

То

The Senior Superintendent of Police, Sri Mukatsar Sahib

Whereas the Tehsildar, Gidderbaha has failed to appear before the State Information Commissioner, Punjab despite the issuance of notice/summon in the above mentioned appeal case. Therefore, you are hereby directed to serve this bailable warrant to the Tehsildar Gidderbaha to appear before the undersigned at Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden, Sector 16, Chandigarh on **15.07.2020 at 11.00 AM.**

Chandigarh Dated: 16.06.2020



Sh.Satpal Goyal, H No 102, Model Town, Phase-1, Bathinda.

Versus

... Appellant

Public Information Officer,

O/o EO, BDA, Bathinda.

First Appellate Authority, O/o Addl, Chief Administrator, BDA. Bathinda.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 2102 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Satpal Goyal as the Appellant Ms.Saloni, Clerk O/o EO-BDA Bhatinda for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on 22.10.2019. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent was absent. The PIO was directed to provide the information to the appellant as per RTI Act within 15 days and send a compliance report to the Commission. The PIO was also directed to explain the reasons for not attending to the RTI application within the time prescribed under the RTI Act.

The case was last heard on **23.12.2019.** The appellant informed that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent was absent on 2nd consecutive hearing. 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 was again directed to provide the information to the appellant within 10 days of the receipt of this order.

Hearing dated 16.06.2020:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conference facility available in the DAC Bhatinda. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 10.01.2020. The appellant is not satisfied and stated that the information is incomplete.

Having gone through the RTI application and hearing both the parties, the following is concluded:

-	Point-1	-	To relook and reply appropriately – if the information is not
			available, to give in writing that no other reward is available.
-	Point-2	-	Provided during the hearing
			— · · · ·

- Point-3 Provided
- Point-4 PIO to relook and send complete reply
- Point-5 Provided

Regarding reply to show cause notice, the respondent has not brought any reply. The PIO is absent. The respondent pleaded that when the RTI was filed, Sh.Amarjit Singh was the PIO who has since retired.

However, the Commission is of the view that the appellant has had to suffer undue inconvenience to get the information, it is a fit case for awarding compensation to the appellant u/s 19(8)(b) of the RTI Act.

The PIO is directed to pay an amount of **Rs.5000/-** via demand draft drawn through Govt. Treasury as compensation to the appellant for the loss and detriment suffered by him of having to file the appeals and not getting information in time. The PIO is directed to duly inform the Commission of the compliance of the order and submit proof of having compensated the appellant. The PIO is also directed to provide the remaining information to the appellant within 10 days.

To come up for further hearing on 09.07.2020 at 11.00 AM

Chandigarh Dated 16.06.2020

Sh. Harmit Singh, C/o Baba Kala Finance Company, Near Truck Union, Phool Road, Rampura Phul, Bathinda.

... Appellant

PSIC

Versus

Public Information Officer,

O/o Secretary, Regional Transport Authority, Sangrur.

First Appellate Authority,

O/o State Transport Commissioner, Pb, Chandigarh.

Appeal Case No. 182 of 2019

Present: Sh.Harmit Singh as the Appellant None for the Respondent

ORDER: Facts of the case:-

- That Sh.Harmit Singh through RTI application dated 30.08.2018 sought information regarding details of new vehicle numbers allotted to the vehicles by getting NOC from other states and copies of NOC from the office of Secretary, Regional Transport Authority, Sangrur.
- That the appellant was not provided the information the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 11.10.2018 and thereafter second appeal in the Commission on 02.01.2019.
- That the case came for hearing first on 10.04.2019. Both the parties were absen. The case was adjourned.
- That on the next date of hearing on 11.06.2019, the appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information. The PIO was absent.
- That on 23.07.2019, the PIO was again absent. The PIO was directed to comply with the earlier order and appear personally or through its representative on the next date of hearing alongwith the explanation for not attending to the RTI application. A copy of the order was sent to STC Punjab, Chandigarh to get the order served to the concerned PIO and to ensure compliance of the order.
- That on 28.08.2019, the PIO was again absent . The PIO was given one more opportunity to comply with the order of the Commission and appear personally or through its representative on the next date of hearing. It was also brought to the notice of Secretary Transport that the TRA Sangrur is not attending the court and a notice may be taken of this dereliction and appropriate disciplinary action be taken against the RTA Sangrur.

...Respondent



- That on 05.12.2019, the PIO was absent nor had provided the information, the PIO was issued a **show cause notice under section 20 of the RTI Act and directed to file reply on an affidavit. The** PIO was again directed to provide the information to the appellant within 10 days.
- That on the last date of hearing which was held on **27.01.2020**, the PIO-RTA Sangrur was again absent nor had filed any reply to the show cause notice. The PIO –RTA Sangrur was given one last opportunity to appear before the Commission and file a reply to the show cause notice otherwise the Commission will be constrained to take action in terms of the provisions of section 20 of the RTI Act.
- A copy of the order was sent to Secretary, Govt of Punjab, Department of Transport with the direction to get the order served to the RTA Sangrur as well as to ensure that the concerned PIO to appear before the Commission personally or through its representative alongwith reply to the show cause notice on the next date of hearing.
- That the case has come up for hearing today. The appellant informed that the PIO has not provided the information. Sh.Gurpal Singh, O/o STC Punjab, Chandigarh appeared and informed that they have already sent instructions to the PIO_RTA Sangrur for his appearance before the Commission. The PIO-RTA Sangrur is absent.
- Keeping the above-mentioned facts of the case, it is clear that the PIO is flouting the spirit of the RTI Act continuously. The PIO has not only shown utter disregard for the Commission's repeated orders to provide the information but has shown willful stubbornness in not replying to the Show Cause and not appearing before the commission despite various orders.
- -

- To secure an erring PIO's presence before the commission, the Information Commission is empowered to issue warrants to the PIO Under Section 18(3) of the RTI Act. A bailable Warrant of the PIO- Regional Transport Authority is hereby issued through Senior Superintendent of Police, Sangrur for his presence before the Commission on **15.07.2020.** The Commission is informed that the department has changed the designation of the PIO, while filing of RTI application and subsequent hearings, the PIO was the Regional Transport Authority, Sangrur. The Warrants be issued to the Regional Transport Authority, the then PIO in this case.

The PIO is also directed to provide information to the appellant within 10 days.

To come up for further hearing on **15.07.2020 at 11.00AM**.

Chandigarh Dated 16.06.2020

- CC to :1. State Transport Commissioner, Pb, Sector 17, Chandigarh.
 - 2. Secretary, Govt of Punjab, Department of Transport, Chandigarh.

BAILABLE WARRANT OF PRODUCTION BEFORE SHRI KHUSHWANT SINGH STATE INFORMATION COMMISSIONER, PUNJAB AT CHANDIGARH

In case:Harmit Singh V/s Public Information Officer-RTA Sangrur

APPEAL CASE NO.182 of 2019

UNDER SECTION 18 OF THE RIGHT TO INFORMATION ACT, 2005

Next Date of Hearing :15.07.2020

То

The Senior Superintendent of Police, Sangrur

Whereas the Regional Transport Authority, Sangrur has failed to appear before the State Information Commissioner, Punjab despite the issuance of notice/summon in the above mentioned appeal case. Therefore, you are hereby directed to serve this bailable warrant to the Regional Transport Authority, Sangrur to appear before the undersigned at Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden, Sector 16, Chandigarh on **15.07.2020 at 11.00 AM.**

Chandigarh Dated: 16.06.2020