

**PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh**

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)  
[E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in)

Sh Harchand Singh,  
Inspector (Retd), H No-263, Street No-3, B/S,  
GNE College, Ishar Nagar, Ludhiana.

... Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
DM, PUNSUP,  
Ludhiana.

...Respondent

**Complaint Case No. 529 of 2018**

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

**ORDER:**

The case was first heard on 18.07.2018. The PIO was directed to provide the information to the complainant within 10 days of the receipt of order and in case the information is not available in the record, the same be stated in the affidavit form. The PIO was also directed to explain the reason of delay for not replying to the RTI within the statutorily prescribed time limit."

The case was again heard on **08.08.2018**: During hearing, the complainant informed that the information has not been provided to him. The respondent present pleaded that the delay is unintentional as the information was not available with them and they had sought information from the Head Office. The Head office vide letter dated 07.08.2018 informed that the final decision has not been taken on the departmental enquiry and has sought 30 days time. The request was accepted and the PIO was directed to provide the information within 30 days."

The case was last heard on **11.09.2018**: The order is reproduced hereunder:

"The respondent present has brought the information i.e. department decision on the enquiry conducted by Sh.Lal Singh Aujla, which is handed over to the appellant. The appellant is not satisfied with the information. He stated that this is the charge sheet and the Government is obliged to file within 6 months the acceptance or rejection report when an employee is charge sheeted. He was charge sheeted in the year 1991 and he is looking for that acceptance or rejection report by the then Manager (Personnel) PUNSUP Chandigarh. The PIO is directed to relook at the RTI application and provide this information. "

**Hearing dated 17.10.2018:**

The case has come up for hearing today. The respondent present has brought the information in compliance with the previous orders of the Commission and a copy submitted to the Commission.

I have gone through the information and found that the information is in accordance with the information as sought by the appellant. The appellant is absent to point out discrepancy. A copy of the information is being attached with the orders for the appellant. The PIO is also directed to send the information to the appellant through registered post within 5 days and also send compliance to the Commission.

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

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 17.10.2018**

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

**Encl:As above**

**PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh**

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)  
[E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in)

Sh Ram Parshad,  
H No-G-3, Guru Ram Dass Nagar,  
Ram Tirath Road, Amritsar.

Appellant.

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
The President Hindu Sabha (Registered),  
I/S Hindu College, Amritsar.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
DPI (C), P.S.E.B,  
Phase-8, Mohali.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 1404 of 2018**

Present:       None for the Appellant  
                  None for the Respondent

**ORDER:**

The case was first heard on 03.07.2018. The PIO was absent. He was directed to provide complete information and be present on the next date of hearing. The appellant was also directed to be present on the next date of hearing failing which the case will be decided in his absence."

The case was again heard on **08.08.2018**. "Ms.Karamjit Kaur from the office of DPI (C) pleaded that the information relates to Hindu Sabha, Amritsar and they have already transferred the RTI to them. The PIO of Hindu Sabha was absent on two consecutive dates. The PIO was directed to provide the information to the appellant and be present personally on the next date of hearing failing which action under the RTI Act will be taken. He was also directed to explain the reasons for not providing the information and his absence on the date of hearings.

The case was last heard on **30.08.2018**. Since both the parties were absent, the case was adjourned.

**Hearing dated 17.10.2018:**

The case has come up for hearing today. During the course of hearing, it came to the notice of the Commission that the Hindu Sabha is not covered under the RTI Act. as per their letter received in the Commission diary No.19258 dated 20.09.2018. In the letter, the President, Hindu Sabha (Regd) Amritsar has stated that they being a private society, do not come directly under the RTI Act as they are not getting any grant/aid from any end. Their plea is accepted.

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

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 17.10.2018**

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

**PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh**  
**Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)**  
**[E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in)**

Sh. Karan Singh, S/o Sh. Shyam Singh,  
# 79, High Land Society, Baltana, Zirakpur.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
State Transport Commissioner,  
Sector-17, Chandigarh.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
State Transport Commissioner,  
Sector-17,  
Chandigarh.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 1751 of 2018**

**Present:        Sh.Karan Singh as Appellant**  
**Sh.Gurpal Singh, APIO for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The case was last heard on 29.08.2018. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The appellant through an application dated 23.01.2018 has sought information from the PIO, Punjab State Transport Commissioner about the government vehicles attached with former Punjab Minister Sh. Vikram Majithia (to be read as Bikram) from the period April 2008 to April 201 and the name of official/officials under whom a car no PB-31-E-0203 (Toyota Camry) was attached from December 2011 to December 2012.

Through the same RTI, the appellant has asked that the above mentioned information should be provided month wise, with month wise expenses of each of the attached vehicle, the per month distance covered by each vehicle (start and end reading of the odometer), details of drivers of each of the attached vehicles. The appellant has asked that the information provided be certified.

The appellant was not provided the information within the stipulated time after which he filed a first appeal with the first appellate authority,(6.3.18) which also took no notice of the appeal. Aggrieved at not being provided the information the appellant filed a second appeal with the Punjab State Information Commission on 10.05.2018, which came up for hearing today. In the appeal, the appellant has petitioned for the information, as well as appropriate action against the PIO in accordance with the RTI Act for the delay in tending to his RTI application.

The respondent is present at the hearing and has claimed that the record pertaining to the information sought is missing. The respondent has pleaded that more time should be given to the department to trace the record.

**Interim Order**

The commission accepts the plea of the department and the case is adjourned with the instructions that the department makes a diligent effort to trace the file.”

**Hearing dated 17.10.2018:**

The case has come up for hearing today and should be read in continuation with the last hearing. The respondent in the last hearing had denied the appellant the information on the pretext that the file pertaining to information being sought is untraceable. The Commission at the last hearing had directed the respondent to trace the file diligently.

At today's hearing the APIO, Gurpal Singh has changed the earlier stand of the missing file to deny information, to a different reason. According to the PIO even though the file has been traced, the office of the State Transport Commissioner cannot part with the information.

1)The respondent at this hearing has submitted a memo dated 15.10.2018 from the office of State Transport Commissioner, Punjab which states that the cars and drivers allocated to the Chief Minister, Cabinet Minister, MLA/MPs by the Ministers Car Branch, are as per the norms prescribed by the Motor Vehicle Board.

2)That it is the Chief Minister's Security Wing that deploys vehicles/drivers with the Chief Minister.

3)That due to the above reasons, the RTI Act is not applicable to the Chief Minister's Security and Vehicles. They have attached an order of the Government of Punjab dated 23.02.2006 whereby it had notified exempting certain organizations from the Act.

On close scrutiny of the reply submitted by the PIO, it is observed that the PIO's reply is not in accordance with the RTI sought. The information sought is about usage of official vehicles attached with a former Minister, and hence has nothing to do with the Chief Minister's security. The reasoning provided to seek exemption is bereft of any logic and no section of the RTI Act has been invoked to seek exemption.

It appears to be an attempt to willfully stonewall flow of information on one pretext or the other.

The appellant is present. He has pleaded that his RTI application pertains to the expenditure and names of drivers attached to former Minister's vehicles and has nothing to do with the security cover provided to the minister, Chief Minister or the Minister concerned.

The appellant has sought an adjournment due to ill health as well as to prepare and file his reply to the exemption that the respondent has sought.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing **on 13.12.2018 at 11.00AM.**

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 17.10.2018**

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

**PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh**  
Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)  
[E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in)

Sh Karan Singh, S/o Sh. Shyam Singh,  
# 79, High Land Society, Baltana, Zirakpur.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
State Transport Commissioner,  
Sector-17, Chandigarh.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
State Transport Commissioner,  
Sector-17, Chandigarh.

... Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 1752 of 2018**

**Present:**        **Sh. Karan Singh as Appellant**  
                      **Sh. Gurpal Singh, APIO for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The case was last heard on 29.08.2018. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The appellant through RTI application dated 23.01.2018 has sought information regarding fuel consumption per day of different vehicles as mentioned in the RTI application, distance covered, name of the drivers and name of Ministers with whom the vehicles were attached from period 2008 to April 2014 and other information concerning the office of State Transport Commissioner, Punjab, Chandigarh. The appellant was not provided the information after which he filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 06.03.2018 which took no decision on the appeal.

The respondent present has pleaded that the information has already been sent to the appellant on 17.04.2018. The appellant pleaded that he has not received the information. The respondent has again brought the information and handed over to the appellant.

The appellant is asked to go through the information and inform the discrepancy, if any, to the PIO. The PIO is directed to remove the discrepancy.”

**Hearing dated 17.10.2018:**

The appellant informed that no information has been provided to him since the information that was handed over to him at the last hearing was only a reply to the application.

The respondent at this hearing has changed his stand from providing the information to not providing the information.

1) The respondent at this hearing has submitted a memo dated 15.10.2018 from the office of State Transport Commissioner, Punjab which states that the cars and drivers allocated to the Chief Minister, Cabinet Minister, MLA/MPs by the Ministers Car Branch, are as per the norms prescribed by the Motor Vehicle Board.

2) That it is the Chief Minister's Security Wing that deploys vehicles/drivers with the Chief Minister.

3) That due to the above reasons, the RTI Act is not applicable to the Chief Minister's Security and Vehicles. They have attached an order of the Government of Punjab dated 23.02.2006 whereby it had notified exempting certain organizations from the Act.

On close scrutiny of the reply submitted by the PIO, it is observed that the PIO's reply is not in accordance with the RTI sought. The information sought is about usage of official vehicles attached with a former Minister, and hence has nothing to do with the Chief Minister's security. The reasoning provided to seek exemption is bereft of any logic and no section of the RTI Act has been invoked to seek exemption.

It appears to be an attempt to willfully stonewall flow of information on one pretext or the other.

The appellant is present. He has pleaded that his RTI application pertains to the expenditure and names of drivers attached to former Minister's vehicles and has nothing to do with the security cover provided to the minister, Chief Minister or the Minister concerned.

The appellant has sought an adjournment due to ill health as well as to prepare and file his reply to the exemption that the respondent has sought.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing **on 13.12.2018 at 11.00AM.**

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 17.10.2018**

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

**PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh**

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)  
[E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in)

Sh Karan Singh, S/o Sh.Shyam Singh,  
# 79, High Land Society, Baltana, Zirakpur.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
State Transport Commissioner,  
Sector-17, Chandigarh.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
State Transport Commissioner,  
Sector-17,  
Chandigarh.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 1753 of 2018**

**Present:**        **Sh.Karan Singh as Appellant**  
                      **Sh.Gurpal Singh, APIO for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The case was last heard on 29.08.2018. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The appellant through an RTI application dated 23.01.2018 has sought information regarding one Mr. Davinder Singh (Belt number 833) and Mr. Bawa Singh (Driver). The appellant vide his application has sought details that with which minister/ official were these two persons attached respectively from 2002-2012 and on which vehicle/vehicles.

The appellant has also sought information regarding one Kamal Kishor (Driver) that with which minister/ official and government vehicle was he attached as a driver from 2010-2012. The appellant in his application has asked that all the information mentioned above be provided month wise along with the monthly expenditure of each of the vehicles. He has further clarified he be afforded the monthly reading of every vehicle's odometer along with certified copies of record files and registers.

The appellant was not provided the information within the stipulated time after which he filed the first appeal with the first appellate authority on 06.03.2018, which also took no notice of the appeal. Aggrieved at not being provided the information the appellant filed a second appeal with the Punjab State Information Commission on 10.05.2018, which came up for hearing today. In the appeal, the appellant has petitioned for the information, as well as appropriate action against the PIO in accordance with the RTI Act for the delay in tending to his RTI application.

The respondent claims that the appellant was sent a communication whereby it was stated that points 1,2, & 3 of the RTI application did not come under the preview of the RTI Act since they were in the question form and hence information cannot be created for the appellant. In the communication, which is on the file of the commission the PIO has also cited an order of Chief Information Commissioner on 21/4/2006 whereby it is stated that the PIO is not obliged to provide information if it is in question form. The respondent, at the hearing, has also cited security reasons for denial of information. The respondent stated that since the sought information pertained to the security of a former minister, information cannot be divulged.

The matter before the commission to adjudicate is-

- 1) That whether the reasons for denial of information hold any ground under the RTI Act, 2005 or are mere pretexts to deny information.
- 2) That if the RTI application appears to be in question form, can it become a ground for denial of information, even though the information may be available with the Public Authority?
- 3) That whether the appellant has applied for information in a coherent form?

**Interim Order-**

- 1) The commission finds that the reason that divulging information about security men and drivers of a former minister can become a security hazard is rather far-fetched. A mere assumption cannot become a basis to deny information unless backed by material evidence. The PIO is hereby directed to cite the appropriate RTI Act rule, which exempts such information to be shared.
- 2) The PIO is also directed to mention the sections of the RTI Act under which the information has been denied in the letter (No-3631 dated 24/8/18) since denial of information has to be based on exemptions granted under the RTI Act and not arbitrarily.
- 3) The appellant is also hereby directed to be more specific with the identities of the persons about whom the information is being sought. Just writing two names and asking which minister they were attached to as drivers, and assuming that the public authority should know exactly that whom the appellant is referring to, is an unseemly way of seeking information. For example, if the appellant is seeking information about driver Kamal Kishor he should be more elaborate to identify the Kamal Kishor he is asking about. If not, then he should identify the Minister with whom he was attached to seek information about him. Obviously, there can be more than one Kamal Kishore and there can be many who are not attached with a minister. The appellant is hereby ordered to be more specific with the information that he seeks and bring the clarification at the next date of hearing.”

**Hearing dated 17.10.2018:**

The case has come up for hearing today. The respondent at this hearing has changed the reasons to not provide information.

In the last hearing, it was observed that the PIO had denied the information on the ground that points 1,2, & 3 of the RTI application did not come under the preview of the RTI Act since they were in the question form. However, at this hearing, the PIO has claimed that the office of the State Transport Commissioner cannot part with the information.

1)The respondent at this hearing has submitted a memo dated 15.10.2018 from the office of State Transport Commissioner, Punjab which states that the cars and drivers allocated to the Chief Minister, Cabinet Minister, MLA/MPs by the Ministers Car Branch, are as per the norms prescribed by the Motor Vehicle Board.

2)That it is the Chief Minister's Security Wing that deploys vehicles/drivers with the Chief Minister.

3)That due to the above reasons, the RTI Act is not applicable to the Chief Minister's Security and Vehicles. They have attached an order of the Government of Punjab dated 23.02.2006 whereby it had notified exempting certain organizations from the Act.



On close scrutiny of the reply submitted by the PIO, it is observed that the PIO's reply is not in accordance with the RTI sought. The information sought is about Mr. Davinder Singh (Belt number 833), Mr. Bawa Singh (Driver) and one Kamal Kishor (Driver) that with which minister/ official and government vehicle was he attached as a driver and hence has nothing to do with the Chief Minister's security. The reasoning provided to seek exemption is bereft of any logic and no section of the RTI Act has been invoked to seek exemption.

It appears to be an attempt to willfully stonewall flow of information on one pretext or the other.

The appellant is present. He has pleaded that his RTI application pertains to the expenditure and names of drivers attached to former Minister's vehicles and has nothing to do with the security cover provided to the minister, Chief Minister or the Minister concerned.

The appellant has sought an adjournment due to ill health as well as to prepare and file his reply to the exemption that the respondent has sought.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing **on 13.12.2018 at 11.00AM.**

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 17.10.2018**

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

**PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh**

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)  
[E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in)

Sh Karan Singh, S/o . Singh,  
# 79, High Land Society, Baltana, Zirakpur.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
State Transport Commissioner,  
Sector-17, Chandigarh.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
State Transport Commissioner,  
Sector-17, Chandigarh.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 1754 of 2018**

**Present:      Sh.Karan Singh as Appellant**  
**Sh.Gurpal Singh, APIO for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The case was last heard on **29.08.2018**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The appellant through RTI application dated 23.01.2018 has sought information regarding fuel consumption per month of different vehicles as mentioned in the RTI application, distance covered, name of the drivers and name of Ministers with whom the vehicles were attached from 01.03.2017 to 31.12.2017 and other information concerning the office of State Transport Commissioner, Punjab, Chandigarh. The appellant was not provided the information after which he filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 06.03.2018 which took no decision on the appeal.

The respondent present pleaded that the information has already been sent to the appellant on 01.06.2018. The appellant is not satisfied. The respondent has further pleaded that the information is voluminous and appellant may come to their office and inspect the record on any working day.

The appellant is directed to inspect the record on the date fixed i.e. 07.09.2018 and get the specific information, he wants. The PIO is directed to provide the information as per RTI.”

**Hearing dated 17.10.2018:**

The case has come up for hearing today. The appellant informed that he visited the office of the PIO on 07.09.2018 but he was not allowed to inspect the record.

In the last hearing, it was observed that the PIO had denied the information on the ground that the information is voluminous and appellant may come to their office and inspect the record on any working day. However, at this hearing, the PIO has claimed that the office of the State Transport Commissioner cannot part with the information.

1)The respondent at this hearing has submitted a memo dated 15.10.2018 from the office of State Transport Commissioner, Punjab which states that the cars and drivers allocated to the Chief Minister, Cabinet Minister, MLA/MPs by the Ministers Car Branch, are as per the norms prescribed by the Motor Vehicle Board.

2) That it is the Chief Minister's Security Wing that deploys vehicles/drivers with the Chief Minister.

3) That due to the above reasons, the RTI Act is not applicable to the Chief Minister's Security and Vehicles. They have attached an order of the Government of Punjab dated 23.02.2006 whereby it had notified exempting certain organizations from the Act.

On close scrutiny of the reply submitted by the PIO, it is observed that the PIO's reply is not in accordance with the RTI sought. The information sought is about distance covered, name of the drivers and name of Ministers with whom the vehicles were attached and hence has nothing to do with the Chief Minister's security. The reasoning provided to seek exemption is bereft of any logic and no section of the RTI Act has been invoked to seek exemption.

It appears to be an attempt to willfully stonewall flow of information on one pretext or the other.

The appellant is present. He has pleaded that his RTI application pertains to the expenditure and names of drivers attached to former Minister's vehicles and has nothing to do with the security cover provided to the minister, Chief Minister or the Minister concerned.

The appellant has sought an adjournment due to ill health as well as to prepare and file his reply to the exemption that the respondent has sought.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing **on 13.12.2018 at 11.00AM.**

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 17.10.2018**

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

**PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh**

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)  
[E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in)

Sh Ajit Singh,  
Village Nikku Chak , P.O Hajipur, Tehsil Mukerian,  
Distt. Hoshiarpur.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
SDM, Mukerian,  
Distt. Hoshiarpur.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
SDM, Mukerian,  
Distt. Hoshiarpur.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 1802 of 2018**

Present            Sh.Ajit Singh as Appellant  
                         Sh.Surinder Kumar, Clerk, O/o SDM Mukerian for the Respondent

**ORDER:**

The case was first heard on **31.07.2018**. The respondent was absent. The respondent present informed that the information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant was not satisfied with the information except point No.3. The PIO was directed to inform the official lunch time of the employees.

The appellant further pleaded that he was not provided the information within the prescribed time limit despite his reminders and personal visits to the office of PIO as well as orders of the First Appellate Authority and the information has been supplied on 30.07.2018 i.e. after a period of 7 months.

The PIO was directed to be present personally on the next date of hearing and explain the reasons for not providing the information within the prescribed time under the RTI Act and why action should not be taken against him for such enormous delay for such a basic information.

The case was last heard on **06.09.2018**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The appellant, a senior citizen informed that he has not received the information as directed by the commission in its interim order of 31.07.2017.

He pleaded that he has asked for the prescribed lunchtime of the police officials on duty at the SDM Office and he is being denied as basic information as this. The appellant also presented before the commission a reply from the SDM's office vide letter-dated 30.07.2018 wherein it is stated that since the information sought is of a personal matter, it cannot be provided.

The PIO, who is absent, vide email has sought an adjournment citing the upcoming Zila Parishad elections as a reason for being busy with office and field work. The reason is accepted.

The Commission observes that the PIO has not sent the information as directed in the interim order. Is there not a prescribed lunchtime in the office of the SDM? Rather, lunchtime along with all office timings should be displayed on the board.

The PIO is hereby directed to send the official notification of office work timings, including the timings of the lunch break to the appellant within 5 days of the receipt of the orders of the Commission.

The PIO is directed to be present personally on the next date of hearing with an explanation as to why this information was delayed and secondly why was it denied even after the commission had ordered that the information be provided to the appellant within 7 days.”

**Hearing dated 17.10.2018:**

The PIO is absent in spite of being directed to be present personally. However, the PIO is represented via clerk Surinder Kumar in the office of the SDM. As per clerk Surinder Kumar the PIO is on leave, even though no representation has been made.

The PIO has sent a letter explaining the sequence of events and the efforts that have been made to deliver the information to the appellant as per the previous interim orders of the commission. The clerk, who represented the respondent has submitted the letter, which is taken on the file of the commission.

Via the letter, the PIO has stated that the following – That information was sent to the appellant vide letter dated 31.08.2018 which was returned as undelivered since the appellant was not available at his residence.

That the information was again sent directly to the appellant through Naib Tehsildar, Hajipur on 25.09.2018 but since the appellant was not available at his residence his wife refused to receive the information. That the information has again been sent to the appellant vide registered letter dated 05.10.2018.

The respondent present, explaining the contents of the letter further contended that the information regarding point No.3 has been sent to the appellant on 31.08.2018.

The respondent has handed another copy of the information to the appellant before the Commission.

The appellant, however, pleaded that the information regarding point No.2 has also not been provided, which the respondent has again handed over to the appellant. The appellant further pleaded that the information is not certified. The appellant also pleaded that he is a senior citizen and has been harassed unnecessarily, for which the PIO should be penalized and he compensated.

**Order:**

1)Having gone through the reply of the PIO, I see no mala-fide on the part of the PIO to provide information, thus no penalty is being imposed. However, the Commission is of the view that since the appellant 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.2000/- 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.

2) The PIO is directed to provide a certified copy of the information regarding point No.2 & 3 to the appellant and send a compliance report to the Commission.

Respondent to be present 28.11.2018 at 11.00 AM with proof of having compensated the appellant.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 17.10.2018**

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

**PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh**  
Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)  
[E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in)

Sh Amarinder Singh, S/o Lt Sh Amarjit Singh,  
R/o H.NO-1258, Sector-37-B, Chandigarh.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
GAMDA, Sector-62,  
Mohali.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
GAMDA, Sector-62,  
Mohali.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 2206 of 2018**

Present: Sh Amarinder Singh as Appellant  
None for the Respondent

**ORDER:**

The case was heard on 06.09.2018. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The appellant through RTI application dated 01.02.2018 has sought information regarding copy of application vide which M/s Hyde Park Terraces, DLF New Chandigarh, Mullanpur Master Plan Arrea, Tehsil Kharar lauched by M/s DLF Universal Limited, has sought completion certificate/partition completion certificate and other information concerning the office of GMADA Mohali. The appellant was not satisfied with the information provided by the PIO vide letter dated 01.03.2018 after which he filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 10.04.2018.

Since both the parties are absent, in the interest of justice one more opportunity is granted and the case is adjourned.”

**Hearing dated 17.10.2018:**

The appellant informed that he was asked by the PIO to deposit an amount of Rs.654/- for getting information which he has already deposited but the information has not been provided to him.

The respondent is absent on 2<sup>nd</sup> consecutive hearing. The Commission has taken a serious view of this and directs the PIO to relook at the RTI application and provide the information to the appellant within 10 days of the receipt of the orders of the Commission. The PIO is also directed to appear personally on the next date of hearing and explain the reasons for not providing the information within the time prescribed under the RTI Act.

Both the parties to be present on **28.11.2018 at 11.00 AM** for further hearing.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 17.10.2018.**

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

**PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh**

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)  
[E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in)

Sh Charanjit Singh,  
# 1202, New light HB Society,  
Sector-51-B, Chandigarh

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
Deputy, Chief Engineer, HQ, C/o CE, GGSSTP,  
Ropar.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
Chief Engineer,  
GGSSTP, Ropar

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 2225 of 2018**

Present:       None for the Appellant  
                  Sh.Joginder Pal Mahi PIO O/o CE GGSSTP Ropar for the Respondent

**ORDER:**

The case was last heard on **06.09.2018**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The appellant through through RTI application dated Nil has sought information regarding rules and regulations of PSPCL to ignore and defy the orders of the Hon’ble SIC Pb and other information concerning the office of CE GGSSTP Ropar. The appellant was not provided the information after which he filed first appeal with the First Appellate Authority on dated Nil.

The respondent present has pleaded that the application of the appellant remained pending as the RTI application was not signed and the appellant has not attached valid postal order alongwith the RTI Application.

The appellant is directed to send postal order within 5 days. Once the postal order is received by the PIO, the PIO is directed to relook at the RTI application and provide the information in accordance with the RTI Act.”

**Hearing dated 17.10.2018:**

The respondent present informed that in compliance with the orders, the information has been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 20.09.2018.

The appellant is absent to point out the discrepancy if any. I have gone through the RTI application and the reply sent by the respondent and found that the reply is as per the RTI application.

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

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 17.10.2018.**

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



**PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh**  
Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)  
[E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in)

Sh Narinder Kumar S/o Sh Rai Sahib,  
H NO-2438-A, Street No-2, Shri Guru Nanak Nagar,  
Bear 16 Acre, Barnala.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
Principal Secretary, Pb Govt,  
Freedom Fighter Department, Chandigarh.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
Principal Secretary, Pb Govt,  
Freedom Fighter Department, Chandigarh.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 2277 of 2018**

Present: Sh Narinder Kumar as Appellant  
Sh.Inderjit Singh for the Respondent

**ORDER:**

The case was last heard on **11.09.2018**. Since both the parties were absent, the case is adjourned.

**Hearing dated 17.10.2018:**

The case has come up for hearing today.

The respondent present pleaded that the information relates to the year 1998 and the concerned file is not traceable. The respondent further pleaded that the information has already been sent to the appellant in a similar case No.2004/2018 (which already stands disposed off) vide letter dated 13.04.2018 and again on 25.40.2018 containing copy of DDR, copies of letters issued to the all branches for tracing out the record and their reply received. A copy of the same is submitted to the Commission. The respondent has handed over a copy of the information again to the appellant. The Commission is satisfied with the reply of the respondent

Since the file is not available and there is full-fledged enquiry report on the record, no further course of action is required.

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

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 17.10.2018.**

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