

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
RED CORSS BUILDING, SECTOR-16, MADHYA MARG, CHANDIGARH
Tele No. 0172-2864112, FAX No. 0172-2864125, Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com
Email: psic22@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh. Ravinder Singh,
S/o Sh. Balwant Singh,
R/o H. No. 986, Roop Vihaar,
Moga.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Assistant Commissioner (Grievances),
District Administrative Complex,
Sector 76, S.A.S Nagar.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Assistant Commissioner (Grievances),
District Administrative Complex,
Sector 76, S.A.S Nagar.

Respondents

Appeal Case No.1550/2018

Date of RTI application:	15.01.2018
Date of First Appeal :	26.02.2018
Date of Order of FAA or Reply:	23.02.2018
Date of 2 nd Appeal/complaint:	24.04.2018

Present: **None on behalf of the Appellant.**
1. Sh. Dharminder Pal, Sr. Assistant, DC Office, Mohali,
2. Sh. Devinder Singh, Jr. Assistant, DC Office, Mohali – for Respondents.

ORDER

The following order was made by this forum on 18.07.2018:

“The appellant has sought to know the outcome of an enquiry being conducted against the Naib Tehsildar for his delinquency in alleged fraudulent change of girdwari despite a notification of the Government of Punjab in the Department of Forests under Land Preservation Act. The appellant further submits that even under Village Common Land Act such a transfer is blatantly illegal. The appellant is seeking to undo the illegal transfer of girdwari besides taking the appropriate disciplinary action against the errant official. The respondents submit that the matter is under consideration and he shall be suitably informed of the same after some tangible action is taken.

The respondents are directed to apprise him of the status of the matter before the next date of hearing positively.”

The appellant is not present. The respondents have submitted a reply that the issue

Contd...page....2

Appeal Case No.1550/2018

has been duly enquired by the Sub Divisional Magistrate, Khanna and the report has been sent to the Commissioner, Patiala Division who is the disciplinary authority of the Naib Tehsildars for appropriate action. The matter is under his consideration.

The Commission finds that the appellant has been sufficiently informed. No more intervention is called for.

The appeal is **dismissed**.

16.10.2018

**Sd/-
(Yashvir Mahajan)
State Information Commissioner**

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
RED CROSS BUILDING, SECTOR-16, MADHYA MARG, CHANDIGARH
Tele No. 0172-2864112, FAX No. 0172-2864125, Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com
Email: psic22@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh. Raj Kumar Sethi,
#71-D, Rajguru Nagar,
Ludhiana

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer
O/o Executive Officer,
Nagar Improvement Trust, Ludhiana

First Appellate Authority
O/o Addl. Chief Secretary to Govt. of Punjab,
Department of Local Govt. Plot No.3, Sector-35-A,
Sathanik Sarkar Bhawan, Chandigarh.

Respondents

APPEAL CASE NO.105/2018

Date of RTI application :14.09.2017
Date of First Appeal :03.11.2017
Date of order of FAA : Reply 04.10.2017
Date of 2nd Appeal/complainant:23.12.2017

Present: **Sh. Raj Kumar Sethi, Appellant in person.**
1. Sh. Jagdeep Singh, PIO – cum – Estt. Officer officiating Superintendent, Trust Service Cell, O/o Director, Local Govt., Punjab,
2. Sh. Paramjeet Singh, Sr. Assistant, Trust Service Cell, O/o Director, Local Government, Punjab – for Respondents.

ORDER

The following order was made by this forum on 23.08.2018:

“The appellant is aggrieved with the inaction on the part of the respondents towards restoration of the cancelled plot even when the government has already taken a policy decision to do the needful following the directions of Hon’ble Punjab & Haryana High Court made in the civil writ. The respondents are evasive. They have not provided him the information sought on the above score.

Sh. Jasbir Singh Dhanoa, PIO – cum – Superintendent, Local Govt. 2 Br., Plot No. 3, Sathanik Bhawan, Sector – 35, Chandigarh, is directed to come present in person and explain the reasons of suppression of the information.”

“It transpires that the issue in hand pertains to the Trust Service Cell, O/o Director of Local Govt., Pb. Whereas LG 2 branch deals with the establishment matters only.

The Commission feels that the appellant is being put to needless harassment by

Contd...page...2

APPEAL CASE NO.105/2018

withholding the information. The PIO – cum – Superintendent, Trust Service Cell, O/o Director, Local Government, Pb. is directed to furnish the information and file a written statement before the next date of hearing positively.”

“Thereafter the matter was adjourned on a couple of occasions with the hope that the status of the action taken by the Government in the concerned branch shall be intimated to the appellant.

The case has again come up today. None is present on behalf of the respondent. The lackadaisical and non-chalant attitude smacks of defiance and willful withholding of the information. The Commission feels that the respondent has rendered liable for penal consequences.

The PIO in the Trust Service Cell, O/o Director of Local Government, Punjab, is issued a show cause notice to explain in a self- attested affidavit as to why a penalty @ Rs.250/- per day of delay subject to maximum of Rs.25,000/- till the complete information is furnished, be not imposed under Section 20(1) of RTI Act, 2005 on him for causing willful delay / denial of the information to the RTI applicant and why the compensation be not awarded to the Appellant under Section 19 (8) (b) of the Act for the detriment suffered by him.

In addition to the written reply, the PIO is also given an opportunity under Section 20(1) proviso thereto, for a personal hearing before the imposition of such penalty on the next date of hearing. He may take note that in case he does not file his written reply and does not avail himself of the opportunity of personal hearing on the date fixed, it will be presumed that he has nothing to say and the Commission shall proceed to take further proceedings against him ex parte.”

The case has again come up today. The respondents have submitted a written reply

APPEAL CASE NO.105/2018

wherein instead of apprising the status of the action having been taken on file about the restoration of a plot which has been duly recommended with resolution of the Improvement Trust, Ludhiana, the respondents are questioning the authority of this forum to look into such issues. The Commission is intrigued with receiving such a response and constrained to observe that somebody is motivatedly sitting over the file. As the Commission is convinced that information ultimately relates with the Trust Cell in the Directorate the concerned PIO is deemed PIO in this appeal. He has not come up with the satisfactory response for not dealing the file for more than one year and apprising the appellant about the status of the matter. The appellant is entitled to know as to what stops them to take action towards restoration of property and the contents thereto in the file. The Commission in exercise of its authority under Section 18(3) (d) directs the PIO to bring along the file dealing with the case in hand in the Commission so as to ascertain the reasons that prevent the respondents in providing the information to the appellant.

To come up on **29.11.2018 at 11.30 AM.**

16.10.2018

**Sd/-
(Yashvir Mahajan)
State Information Commissioner**

- CC: The PIO – cum – Superintendent, Trust Service Cell, O/o Director of Local Government, Punjab, Sathanik Sarkar Bhawan, Plot No. 3 A, Sector 35 A, Chandigarh, for n/a.**
- CC: The Director of Local Govt., Punjab, Sathanik Sarkar Bhawan, Plot No. 3-A, Sec.35 A, Chandigarh, for n/a.**

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
RED CORSS BUILDING, SECTOR-16, MADHYA MARG, CHANDIGARH
Tele No. 0172-2864112, FAX No. 0172-2864125, Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com
Email:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh. Ram Kishan Sharma,
Block B/45/507,
Chowk Arya Samaj,
Patiala.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer
O/o Executive Officer,
Nagar Improvement Trust,
Patiala.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Regional Deputy Director,
Local Government,
Mini Secretariat, Block A,
Patiala.

Respondents

APPEAL CASE NO.1833/2018

Date of RTI application: 26.02.2018
Date of First Appeal : 04.04.2018
Date of Order of FAA or Reply : 24.04.2018
Date of 2nd Appeal/complaint: 22.05.2018

Present: None is present on behalf of the Appellant.
Sh. Sanjeev Kuamr, Draftsman, O/o Improvement Trust, Patiala – for Respondents.

ORDER

The following order was made by this forum on 28.08.2018:

“Heard. What transpires is that the Regional Deputy Director, Local Government while deciding the appeal had desired the respondents to allow him the inspection of the record. Because of communication gap the inspection of the record has not matured. The respondents are directed to bring along the original record on the next date of hearing and arrange the inspection in the office of the Commission itself.”

“The case has come up today. The appellant is absent whereas the respondents are present along with the record. After hearing the respondents and perusal of the record it transpires that the appellant is aggrieved with the payment of compensation to one Sh. Sham Sunder for the acquisition of land comprising about eight acres for establishment of Urban Estate namely; S.S.T. Nagar, by the Improvement Trust of Patiala which was acquired in the year 1978.

Contd...page....2

APPEAL CASE NO.1833/2018

He claims to be the real adopted son of Smt. Bhagwanti and legitimate heir to her property. He terms Sh. Sham Sunder as an imposter and seeks redressal against the alleged impropriety of the respondents. The respondents have brought along a copy of the mutation sanctioned on 13.03.1978 by the then Circle Revenue Officer.

The respondents are directed to provide him with certified copies of the record available with them through a registered post under intimation to the Commission so that he can approach the competent authorities to seek justice.”

Sh. Sanjeev Kumar, Draftsman appearing on behalf of the respondents says that in compliance with the order of the Commission the requisite information has been re-sent to the appellant. The Commission feels that the appellant has been sufficiently informed. No more intervention is called for.

Disposed.

16.10.2018

Sd/-

**(Yashvir Mahajan)
State Information Commissioner**

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
RED CROSS BUILDING, SECTOR-16, MADHYA MARG, CHANDIGRH
Tele No. 0172-2864112, FAX No. 0172-2864125, Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com
Email: psic22@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh. Sandeep Khattri,
R/o # 130/B6, Gulmohar City, Dera Bassi
Distt. S.A.S.Nagar

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Municipal Council,
Zirakpur, Distt. S.A.S. Nagar

First Appellate Authority
O/o Deputy Director,
Local Govt. Mini Sectt.,
Patiala.

Respondents

APPEAL CASE NO.2 of 2018

Date of RTI application : 24.08.2017
Date of First Appeal : Nil
Date of Order of FAA : Nil
Date of 2nd Appeal/complaint : 19.12.2017

Present: **Sh. Sandeep Khattri, Appellant along with his counsel Adv. Tarurag Gaur.
Adv. Gulshan Mehta, Counsel for the 3rd Party – M/s Hotel Ramada, VIP Road,
Zirakpur.
Sh. Victor Sandhu, JE, MC Office, Zirakpur and
Sh. Gurpreet Singh, Building Inspector, MC Office, Zirakpur – for Respondents.**

ORDER

The following order was passed by this forum on 03.07.2018:

“The appellant had sought the information concerning the site plan of Hotel Ramada situated on Zirakpur – Chandigarh road along with the concomitant documents relating to its approval given by the Local Bodies Department.

The respondents cite a ‘third party’ information to deny him the same. The appellant expresses his apprehensions about the encroachments of a public land besides diversion in execution of the works from the approved building plan. The Commission is of the view that it is incorrect to invoke the provisions under Section 11 of the Act in the instant case as the property is being used for commercial purposes and its alleged deviation from the approved building bye-laws is

APPEAL CASE NO.2 of 2018

a matter of public interest as well. Overruling the plea taken by the respondents the Commission directs the respondents to allow him the inspection of the relevant record. For doing so the respondents shall specifically send him a written memo fixing the date and time for the inspection of the record and provide him the certified copies of the documents thus identified by him free of cost but not beyond fifty pages.”

“The respondents have failed to comply with the order as much as in conveying the specific date and time to the appellant for inspection of the record. The Commission takes a serious note of it. A final opportunity is afforded to them to do the needful in letter and spirit without further loss of time. It need not be underlined that the respondents have already defaulted in timely providing the information and have rendered themselves liable for penal consequences.”

“The case has again come up today. Despite the serious observations as made up above, no tangible action has been taken by the respondents. The PIO seems a hard nut to crack and renders himself liable for penal consequences. He is hereby issued a show cause notice to explain in a self- attested affidavit as to why a penalty @ Rs.250/- per day of delay subject to maximum of Rs.25,000/- till the complete information is furnished, be not imposed under Section 20(1) of RTI Act, 2005 on him for causing willful delay/denial of the information to the RTI applicant and why the compensation be not awarded to the appellant under Section 19 (8) (b) of the Act for the detriment suffered by him and why his appointing authority should not be directed to take disciplinary action against him.

In addition to the written reply, the PIO is also given an opportunity under Section 20(1) proviso thereto, for a personal hearing before the imposition of such penalty on the next date of

APPEAL CASE NO. 2 of 2018

hearing. He may take note that in case he does not file his written reply and does not avail himself of the opportunity of personal hearing on the date fixed, it will be presumed that he has nothing to say and the Commission shall proceed to take further proceedings against him ex parte.”

“The case has come up today. Adv. Gulshan Mehta, counsel for the 3rd Parties has put up his presence to represent the third parties with regard to whom the information has been sought. He has filed a written statement in terms of exercise of his right under Section 19(4) of the Act. A copy of the pleadings submitted by him has been handed over on spot to the appellant. The appellant may like to file a replication if he desires so. Meanwhile, the PIO who was issued a show cause notice should also file a written reply so that the things can be taken to logical ends.”

The respondents have quoted an order of this bench wherein they have taken the plea that the appellant is habitually seeking voluminous information from the public authority. In the instant case they say that the building plan is an intellectual property which has been submitted to the Public Authority in keeping with the requirement of law. However, the same has to be maintained in confidentiality by it and cannot be shared publicly. The counsel for the third party has also cited an order of the Hon'ble Gujarat High Court in which it has been held that the information which has been bracketed as confidential should not be allowed to be disclosed which can cause irredeemable damage to the third party. The Commission accepts the argument of the third party. However, it shall hasten to add that a citizen is entitled to know as to whether a structure raised for the use of public meets the statutory requirements.

Having considered the respective submissions the Commission holds that the respondents should provide the approved lay-out plan of the building in question so as to ascertain

APPEAL CASE NO. 2 of 2018

that it meets the requirement of building bye-laws. The coverage of floor area ratio with the requisite setbacks having been maintained should also be intimated. The respondents shall also provide the inspection report of the concerned technical official along with the approval of the competent authority within fifteen days.

To come up on **11.12.2018 at 11.30 AM.**

16.10.2018

**Sd/-
(Yashvir Mahajan)
State Information Commissioner**

**CC: Sh. Gulshan Mehta, Advocate, # 58, Green Enclave, Zirakpur, Distt. Mohali.
CC: Sh. Manvir Singh, PIO – cum – E.O., Municipal Council, Zirakpur, Distt. Mohali.**

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
RED CROSS BUILDING, SECTOR-16, MADHYA MARG, CHANDIGRH
Tele No. 0172-2864112, FAX No. 0172-2864125, Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com
Email: psic22@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh. Sandeep Khattri,
R/o # 130/B6, Gulmohar City, Dera Bassi
Distt. S.A.S.Nagar

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Municipal Council,
Zirakpur, Distt. S.A.S. Nagar

First Appellate Authority
O/o Deputy Director,
Local Govt. Mini Sectt.,
Patiala.

Respondents

APPEAL CASE NO.4 of 2018

Date of RTI application : 04.09.2017
Date of First Appeal : Nil
Date of Order of FAA : Nil
Date of 2nd Appeal/complaint :21.12.2017

Present: **Sh. Sandeep Khattri, Appellant in person.**
Adv. Gulshan Mehta, Counsel for the 3rd Party – M/s Maya Garden Magnesia, on Chandigarh – Ambala Road near Singhpura village, Zirakpur.
Sh. Victor Sandhu, JE, MC Office, Zirakpur and
Sh. Gurpreet Singh, Building Inspector, MC Office, Zirakpur – for Respondents.

ORDER

The following order was passed by this forum on 03.07.2018:

“The appellant had sought the information concerning the site plan of Hotel Maya Garden Magnesia located near Singhpura village on Chandigarh – Ambala road along with the concomitant documents relating to its approval given by the Local Bodies Department.

The respondents cite a ‘third party’ information to deny him the same. The appellant expresses his apprehensions about the encroachments of a public land besides diversion in execution of the works from the approved building plan. The Commission is of the view that it is incorrect to invoke the provisions under Section 11 of the Act in the instant case as the property is being used for commercial purposes and its alleged deviation from the approved building bye-laws is

APPEAL CASE NO.4 of 2018

a matter of public interest as well. Overruling the plea taken by the respondents the Commission directs the respondents to allow him the inspection of the relevant record. For doing so the respondents shall specifically send him a written memo fixing the date and time for the inspection of the record and provide him the certified copies of the documents thus identified by him free of cost but not beyond fifty pages.”

“The respondents have failed to comply with the order as much as in conveying the specific date and time to the appellant for inspection of the record. The Commission takes a serious note of it. A final opportunity is afforded to them to do the needful in letter and spirit without further loss of time. It need not be underlined that the respondents have already defaulted in timely providing the information and have rendered themselves liable for penal consequences.”

“The case has again come up today. Despite the serious observations as made up above, no tangible action has been taken by the respondents. The PIO seems a hard nut to crack and renders himself liable for penal consequences. He is hereby issued a show cause notice to explain in a self- attested affidavit as to why a penalty @ Rs.250/- per day of delay subject to maximum of Rs.25,000/- till the complete information is furnished, be not imposed under Section 20(1) of RTI Act, 2005 on him for causing willful delay/denial of the information to the RTI applicant and why the compensation be not awarded to the appellant under Section 19 (8) (b) of the Act for the detriment suffered by him and why his appointing authority should not be directed to take disciplinary action against him.

In addition to the written reply, the PIO is also given an opportunity under Section 20(1) proviso thereto, for a personal hearing before the imposition of such penalty on the next date of

APPEAL CASE NO. 4 of 2018

hearing. He may take note that in case he does not file his written reply and does not avail himself of the opportunity of personal hearing on the date fixed, it will be presumed that he has nothing to say and the Commission shall proceed to take further proceedings against him ex parte.”

“The case has come up today. Adv. Gulshan Mehta, counsel for the 3rd Parties has put up his presence to represent the third parties with regard to whom the information has been sought. He has filed a written statement in terms of exercise of his right under Section 19(4) of the Act. A copy of the pleadings submitted by him has been handed over on spot to the appellant. The appellant may like to file a replication if he desires so. Meanwhile, the PIO who was issued a show cause notice should also file a written reply so that the things can be taken to logical ends.”

The respondents have quoted an order of this bench wherein they have taken the plea that the appellant is habitually seeking voluminous information from the public authority. In the instant case they say that the building plan is an intellectual property which has been submitted to the Public Authority in keeping with the requirement of law. However, the same has to be maintained in confidentiality by it and cannot be shared publicly. The counsel for the third party has also cited an order of the Hon'ble Gujarat High Court in which it has been held that the information which has been bracketed as confidential should not be allowed to be disclosed which can cause irredeemable damage to the third party. The Commission accepts the argument of the third party. However, it shall hasten to add that a citizen is entitled to know as to whether a structure raised for the use of public meets the statutory requirements.

Having considered the respective submissions the Commission holds that the respondents should provide the approved lay-out plan of the building in question so as to ascertain

APPEAL CASE NO. 4 of 2018

that it meets the requirement of building bye-laws. The coverage of floor area ratio with the requisite setbacks having been maintained should also be intimated. The respondents shall also provide the inspection report of the concerned technical official along with the approval of the competent authority within fifteen days.

To come up on **11.12.2018 at 11.30 AM.**

16.10.2018

**Sd/-
(Yashvir Mahajan)
State Information Commissioner**

**CC: Sh. Gulshan Mehta, Advocate, # 58, Green Enclave, Zirakpur, Distt. Mohali.
CC: Sh. Manvir Singh, PIO – cum – E.O., Municipal Council, Zirakpur, Distt. Mohali.**

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
RED CROSS BUILDING, SECTOR-16, MADHYA MARG, CHANDIGRH
Tele No. 0172-2864112, FAX No. 0172-2864125, Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com
Email:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh. Sandeep Khattri,
R/o # 130/B6, Gulmohar City, Dera Bassi
Distt. S.A.S.Nagar

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Municipal Council,
Zirakpur, Distt. S.A.S. Nagar

First Appellate Authority
O/o Deputy Director,
Local Govt. Mini Sectt.,
Patiala.

Respondents

APPEAL CASE NO.5 of 2018

Date of RTI application : 06.09.2017
Date of First Appeal : Nil
Date of Order of FAA : Nil
Date of 2nd Appeal/complaint : 21.12.2017

Present: **Sh. Sandeep Khattri, Appellant in person.**
Adv. Gulshan Mehta, Counsel for the 3rd Party – M/s Tulip Heights, VIP Road, Zirakpur.
Sh. Victor Sandhu, JE, MC Office, Zirakpur and
Sh. Gurpreet Singh, Building Inspector, MC Office, Zirakpur – for Respondents.

ORDER

The following order was passed by this forum on 03.07.2018:

“The appellant had sought the information concerning the site plan of Hotel Tulip Heights situated on VIP road, Zirakpur along with the concomitant documents relating to its approval given by the Local Bodies Department.

The respondents cite a ‘third party’ information to deny him the same. The appellant expresses his apprehensions about the encroachments of a public land besides diversion in execution of the works from the approved building plan. The Commission is of the view that it is incorrect to invoke the provisions under Section 11 of the Act in the instant case as the property is being used for commercial purposes and its alleged deviation from the approved building bye-laws is

APPEAL CASE NO.5 of 2018

a matter of public interest as well. Overruling the plea taken by the respondents the Commission directs the respondents to allow him the inspection of the relevant record. For doing so the respondents shall specifically send him a written memo fixing the date and time for the inspection of the record and provide him the certified copies of the documents thus identified by him free of cost but not beyond fifty pages.”

“The respondents have failed to comply with the order as much as in conveying the specific date and time to the appellant for inspection of the record. The Commission takes a serious note of it. A final opportunity is afforded to them to do the needful in letter and spirit without further loss of time. It need not be underlined that the respondents have already defaulted in timely providing the information and have rendered themselves liable for penal consequences.”

“The case has again come up today. Despite the serious observations as made up above, no tangible action has been taken by the respondents. The PIO seems a hard nut to crack and renders himself liable for penal consequences. He is hereby issued a show cause notice to explain in a self- attested affidavit as to why a penalty @ Rs.250/- per day of delay subject to maximum of Rs.25,000/- till the complete information is furnished, be not imposed under Section 20(1) of RTI Act, 2005 on him for causing willful delay/denial of the information to the RTI applicant and why the compensation be not awarded to the appellant under Section 19 (8) (b) of the Act for the detriment suffered by him and why his appointing authority should not be directed to take disciplinary action against him.

In addition to the written reply, the PIO is also given an opportunity under Section 20(1) proviso thereto, for a personal hearing before the imposition of such penalty on the next date of

APPEAL CASE NO.5 of 2018

hearing. He may take note that in case he does not file his written reply and does not avail himself of the opportunity of personal hearing on the date fixed, it will be presumed that he has nothing to say and the Commission shall proceed to take further proceedings against him ex parte.”

“The case has come up today. Adv. Gulshan Mehta, counsel for the 3rd Parties has put up his presence to represent the third parties with regard to whom the information has been sought. He has filed a written statement in terms of exercise of his right under Section 19(4) of the Act. A copy of the pleadings submitted by him has been handed over on spot to the appellant. The appellant may like to file a replication if he desires so. Meanwhile, the PIO who was issued a show cause notice should also file a written reply so that the things can be taken to logical ends.”

The respondents have quoted an order of this bench wherein they have taken the plea that the appellant is habitually seeking voluminous information from the public authority. In the instant case they say that the building plan is an intellectual property which has been submitted to the Public Authority in keeping with the requirement of law. However, the same has to be maintained in confidentiality by it and cannot be shared publicly. The counsel for the third party has also cited an order of the Hon'ble Gujarat High Court in which it has been held that the information which has been bracketed as confidential should not be allowed to be disclosed which can cause irredeemable damage to the third party. The Commission accepts the argument of the third party. However, it shall hasten to add that a citizen is entitled to know as to whether a structure raised for the use of public meets the statutory requirements.

Having considered the respective submissions the Commission holds that the respondents should provide the approved lay-out plan of the building in question so as to ascertain

APPEAL CASE NO.5 of 2018

that it meets the requirement of building bye-laws. The coverage of floor area ratio with the requisite setbacks having been maintained should also be intimated. The respondents shall also provide the inspection report of the concerned technical official along with the approval of the competent authority within fifteen days.

To come up on **11.12.2018 at 11.30 AM.**

16.10.2018

**Sd/-
(Yashvir Mahajan)
State Information Commissioner**

**CC: Sh. Gulshan Mehta, Advocate, # 58, Green Enclave, Zirakpur, Distt. Mohali.
CC: Sh. Manvir Singh, PIO – cum – E.O., Municipal Council, Zirakpur, Distt. Mohali.**

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
RED CORSS BUILDING, SECTOR-16, MADHYA MARG, CHANDIGARH
Tele No. 0172-2864112, FAX No. 0172-2864125, Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com
Email: psic22@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh. Gursewak Singh,
S/o Sh. Harbhajan Singh,
Village- Bathoi Kalan, P.O Dakaala,
Teh. & Distt.- Patiala (Punjab)

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Pepsu Road Transport Corporation,
Head Office, Nabha Road,
Patiala (Punjab).

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Pepsu Road Transport Corporation,
Head Office, Nabha Road,
Patiala (Punjab).

Respondents

Appeal Case No.1892/2018

Date of RTI application:	06.03.2018
Date of First Appeal :	10.04.2018
Date of Reply :	Nil
Date of Order of FAA :	Nil
Date of 2 nd Appeal/complaint:	02.07.2018

Present: Sh. Gursewak Singh, Appellant in person.
None on behalf of the Respondents.

ORDER

The respondents are absent despite issue of notice. The Commission takes a strong exception to the apathy shown by the respondents. The PIO is hereby directed to file a written reply to the application of the appellant besides providing the information failing which serious view shall be taken.

To come up on **29.11.2018 at 11.30 AM.**

16.10.2018

Sd/-
(Yashvir Mahajan)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
RED CORSS BUILDING, SECTOR-16, MADHYA MARG, CHANDIGARH
Tele No. 0172-2864112, FAX No. 0172-2864125, Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com
Email: psic22@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh. Hardyal Singh,
S/o Sh. Sher Singh,
R/o VPO- Dhablan,
Tehsil & Distt. Patiala.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Block Development and Panchayat Officer,
Patiala.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o District Development and Panchayat Officer,
Patiala.

Respondents

Appeal Case No.1821/2018

Date of RTI application:	08.01.2018
Date of First Appeal :	22.08.2018
Date of Reply :	11.01.2018
Date of Order of FAA :	Nil
Date of 2 nd Appeal/complaint:	02.07.2018

Present: Sh. Hardyal Singh, Appellant in person.
Sh. Harinder Singh, Panchayat Secretary, O/o BDPO, Block Patiala – for Respondents.

ORDER

The appellant is aggrieved with the action of the Panchayat in recommending an action against him to settle some personal scores. He is seeking copy of documents thus entailed and the rules under which action has been proposed by the Block Development & Panchayat Officer.

The respondents are directed to file a written submission in the Commission on this score besides providing him the available information.

To come up on **29.11.2018 at 11.30 AM.**

16.10.2018

Sd/-
(Yashvir Mahajan)
State Information Commissioner