**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

 **Red Cross Bhawan, Near Rose Garden, Madhya Marg,**

**Sector: 16, Chandigarh.**

 **Tel. No.0172-2864100-01, Fax No.0172-2864110**

 **Visit us @** [**www.infocommpunjab.com**](http://www.infocommpunjab.com/), **Email-ID** **pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in**

Shri Rajesh Kumar Sharma

s/o Shri Mehar Chand Sharma,

#446, Diamond Avenue, Majitha Road,

Amritsar. --Appellant.

 Vs.

**Public Information Officer**

**o/o Deputy Commissioner of Police,**

**Amritsar.**

**FAA-Commissioner of Police,**

**Amritsar.** -------Respondents.

**Appeal Case No. 338 of 2018**

Present:- Shri Rajesh Kumar Sharma, appellant, in person.

 Shri Hira Singh, ASI, on behalf of the respondents.

ORDER

 The RTI application is dated 3.10.2017 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter called FAA) on 3.11.2017 and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 11.01.2018 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter called RTI Act).

2. Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for today by the Commission.

3. The appellant states that information given to him is incomplete, irregular, false and arbitrary. He further requests that he wants that action be taken against the delinquent police officials or bank officials for giving misleading reports.
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4. The respondent-PIO submits a copy of inquiry report alongwith copies of other documents to be placed on the record of the case file with a copy to the appellant. He further states that with the supply of these documents, complete information has been provided to the appellant.

5. After hearing both the parties and going through the record available in the case file, it is revealed that complete information has been supplied to the appellant as available in the record of the respondents. Jurisdiction of the Commission is limited to get the information supplied to the information-seeker available in the record of the respondents. Request for taking action against delinquent police/bank officials, the appellant is advised to approach the concerned higher authority. With these observations, the present case is disposed of closed. Copies of the order be sent to the parties.

 Sd/-

Dated : 19.03.2018 ( S.S. Channy)

 Chief Information Commissioner Punjab

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

 **Red Cross Bhawan, Near Rose Garden, Madhya Marg,**

**Sector: 16, Chandigarh.**

 **Tel. No.0172-2864100-01, Fax No.0172-2864110**

 **Visit us @** [**www.infocommpunjab.com**](http://www.infocommpunjab.com/), **Email-ID** **pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in**

Shri Rajesh Kumar Sharma

s/o Shri Mehar Chand Sharma,

#446, Diamond Avenue, Majitha Road,

Amritsar. --Appellant.

 Vs.

**Public Information Officer**

**o/o Deputy Commissioner of Police,**

**Amritsar.**

**FAA-Commissioner of Police,**

**Amritsar.** -------Respondents.

**Appeal Case No. 353 of 2018**

Present:- Shri Rajesh Kumar Sharma, appellant, in person.

 Shri Hira Singh, ASI on behalf of the respondents.

ORDER

 The RTI application is dated 6.10.2017 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter called FAA) on 3.11.2017 and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 12.01.2018 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter called RTI Act).

2. Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for today by the Commission.

3. The appellant states that no information has been provided to him till date.

4. The representative of the respondents places on record letter dated 5.3.2018 mentioning therein that information has been provided to the appellant from time to time. His appeal was disposed by the First Appellate Authority-cum-
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Commissioner of Police, Amritsar on 25.12.2017. It is mentioned that documents sent to the FAA were perused and it was decided that information in question form cannot be answered according to the RTI Act, 2005. The respondents relied on the order dated 11.01.2018 passed in Appeal Case No.2905 of 2017 by Dr. S.S. Channy, Chief Information Commissioner, Punjab.

5. Keeping in view the above noted facts and to meet the ends of justice, it has been found desirable that inspection be allowed to the appellant of the relevant record. The respondents are directed to allow inspection of the record and provide copies of the documents identified by the appellant on payment basis under the RTI Act, 2005.

6. To come up on 25.04.2018 at 11.30 A.M.

 Sd/-

Dated : 19.03.2018 ( S.S. Channy)

 Chief Information Commissioner Punjab

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

 **Red Cross Bhawan, Near Rose Garden, Madhya Marg,**

**Sector: 16, Chandigarh.**

 **Tel. No.0172-2864100-01, Fax No.0172-2864110**

 **Visit us @** [**www.infocommpunjab.com**](http://www.infocommpunjab.com/), **Email-ID** **pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in**

Shri Karandeep Singh Kairon,

President, National RTI Activist,

#104-105, First Flkoor, BRM Tower,

Overlock Road, Miller Ganj,

Ludhiana-141003. --Appellant.

 Vs.

**Public Information Officer**

**o/o Chief Secretary to Government of Punjab,**

**Chandigarh.**

**FAA-Chief Secretary to Government of Punjab,**

**Chandigarh.** -------Respondents.

**Appeal Case No. 357 of 2018**

Present:- None on behalf of the appellant.

 Shri Sarabjit Singh, Senior Assistant on behalf of the respondents.

ORDER

 The RTI application is dated 31.10.2018 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter called FAA) on 05.12.2017 and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 15.01.2018 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter called RTI Act).

2. Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for today by the Commission.

3. The representative of the respondents states that complete information has been supplied to him vide their letter dated 12.12.2017, which must have been received by the appellant. After despatch of the information, nothing has been received
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from the appellant in their office. Thereafter, First Appellate Authority has also disposed of First Appeal vide their order dated 28.2.2018.

4. Since the information has been supplied in detail, while giving photocopies of complete file consisting of 145 pages. This should suffice to the appellant as there is no information which has been left out to be supplied to the appellant. However, last opportunity is afforded to him to point out specific deficiencies to the respondents with a copy to the Commission for its perusal.

5. To come up on 25.04.2018 at 11.30 A.M. for further proceeding in the matter.

 Sd/-

Dated : 19.03.2018 ( S.S. Channy)

 Chief Information Commissioner Punjab

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

 **Red Cross Bhawan, Near Rose Garden, Madhya Marg,**

**Sector: 16, Chandigarh.**

 **Tel. No.0172-2864100-01, Fax No.0172-2864110**

 **Visit us @** [**www.infocommpunjab.com**](http://www.infocommpunjab.com/), **Email-ID** **pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in**

Shri Karandeep Singh Kairon,

President, National RTI Activist,

#104-105, First Flkoor, BRM Tower,

Overlock Road, Miller Ganj,

Ludhiana-141003. --Appellant.

 Vs.

Public Information Officer

o/o Chief Secretary to Government of Punjab,

Chandigarh.

FAA-Chief Secretary to Government of Punjab,

Chandigarh. -------Respondents.

**Appeal Case No. 358 of 2018**

Present:- None on behalf of the appellant.

 Shri Sarabjit Singh, Senior Assistant on behalf of the respondents.

ORDER

 The RTI application is dated 30.10.2017 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter called FAA) on 4.12.2017 and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 15.01.2018 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter called RTI Act).

2. Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for today by the Commission.

3. The representative of the respondents states that complete information has been provided to the appellant. After the receipt of the information by the appellant, nothing has been received from him till date.

Contd…..p/2

**Appeal Case No. 358 of 2018**

**-2-**

4. After hearing the respondents and going through the record available on the case file, it is revealed that this case relates to supply of my personal information. The appellant has filed Second Appeal against the order of the First Appellate Authority. Since the matter pertains to supply of information of the undersigned, it would not be in the interest of natural justice to hear the Second Appeal. Keeping this fact in view, I recuse myself from hearing this case and it may be returned to Registry to put up for reallocation to some other Bench of the Commission, who may issue fresh notice of hearing.

 Sd/-

Dated : 19.03.2018 ( S.S. Channy)

 Chief Information Commissioner Punjab

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

 **Red Cross Bhawan, Near Rose Garden, Madhya Marg,**

**Sector: 16, Chandigarh.**

 **Tel. No.0172-2864100-01, Fax No.0172-2864110**

 **Visit us @** [**www.infocommpunjab.com**](http://www.infocommpunjab.com/), **Email-ID** **pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in**

Shri Ram Asra s/o Shri Pritam Singh,

r/o VPO Mohanpur, Tehsil Khanna,

District Ludhiana-141412. --Appellant.

 Vs.

**Public Information Officer**

**o/o Tehsildar, Khanna.**

**FAA-Sub Divisional Magistrate,**

**Khanna, Distt. Ludhiana.** -------Respondents.

**Appeal Case No. 378 of 2018**

Present:- Shri Ram Asra, appellant, in person.

 Shri Ranjit Singh, Naib Tehsildar-cum-APIO on behalf of the respondents.

ORDER

 The RTI application is dated 11.05.2017 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter called FAA) on 15.09.2017 and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 16.01.2018 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter called RTI Act).

2. Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for today by the Commission.

3. The appellant states that no information has been supplied to him till date.

4. The respondent-APIO submits letter dated 16.3.2018 (enclosing copies of relevant documents) giving point-wise reply to the queries raised in application for information under the RTI Act, 2005, the contents of which are reproduced below:-

bVh Bzpo 1 ftu nkg tb'A jbek gNtkoh dfjV{ ;aqh oSgkb f;zx tb'A fsnko ehsh rJh ;{uh ;zpzXh

Contd…….p/2

**Appeal Case No. 378 of 2018**

**-2-**

gNtkoh jbek tb'A fsnko ehsh rJh fgzv w'jBg[o d/ BzpokdkoK dh ;{uh Bkb BEh j?.

bVh Bzpo 2 ftu nkg tb'A o'iBkwuk tkfenksh dh Beb dh wzr ehsh rJh j?, o'iBkwuk tkfenksh fwsh 1H11H16 s'A 09H05H2017 se 69 g/I dh c'N'ekgh Bkb BZEh ehsh iKdh j?.

bVh Bzpo 3 ftu nkg tb'A fgzv w'jBg[o d/ BzpodkoK dh sBykj fwsh 1H11H2016 s'A 30H5H2017 se (;w/s Bkw ns/ fb;N ns/ u?e Bzpo) ;zpzXh dh wzr ehsh rJh ;h. BzpodkoK d/ Bkw ns/ sBykj dh fb;N Bkb BZEh j?.

bVh BzL 4 ftu nkg tb'A wkB:'r efw;aBo gfNnkbk ih tb'A niw/o f;zx dh Bzpodkoh d/ ;zpzX ftu ;N/n nvoK ;zpzX ftu dcaso tb'A ehsh rJh ekotkJh fog'oN dh wzr ehsh rJh j?. fJ; ;zpzXh foekov wkb ftu nwb ehsk ik u[Zek j?..

bVh Bzpo 5 ftu nkg tb'A niw/o f;zx ikoh ;zBd$gqwkD gZso dh Beb dh wzr ehsh rJh j?. ;zBd$gqwkD gZso ;zpzXs ftnesh B{z jh ikdh ehsk iKdk j?, fJ; dh e'Jh Beb fJ; dcaso ftu T[gbGd BjhA j?.

bVh Bzpo 6 ftu nkg tb'A jbchnk fpnkB niw/o f;zx dh wzr ehsh rJh j?. jbchnK fpnkB ;zpzXs ftnesh tb'A ;zpzXs ndkbs$nfXekoh B{z fdsk iKdk j?. fJ; dh e'Jh Beb fJ; dcaso ftu T[gbGd BjhA j?.

 5. The appellant is advised to go through the same and revert back to the authorities within 10 days in case of deficiencies. On receipt of the deficiencies from the appellant, the respondents are directed to remove the same before the next date of hearing, which is fixed for 25.04.2018.

6. To come up on 25.04.2018 at 11.30 A.M.

 Sd/-

Dated : 19.03.2018 ( S.S. Channy)

 Chief Information Commissioner Punjab

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

 **Red Cross Bhawan, Near Rose Garden, Madhya Marg,**

**Sector: 16, Chandigarh.**

 **Tel. No.0172-2864100-01, Fax No.0172-2864110**

 **Visit us @** [**www.infocommpunjab.com**](http://www.infocommpunjab.com/), **Email-ID** **pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in**

Shri Rohit Mohendru, H.No.2735,

Street No. 21, Nawan Kot, Amritsar. --Appellant.

 Vs.

Public Information Officer

o/o Secretary, Punjab Public Service Commission,

Patiala.

FAA-Secretary, Punjab Public Service Commission,

Patiala. -------Respondents.

**Appeal Case No. 384 of 2018**

Present:- Shri Rohit Mahendru, appellant, in person.

 Shri Navdeep Kumar Batish, clerk, on behalf of the respondents.

ORDER

 The RTI application is dated 26.11.2016 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter called FAA) on 17.04.2017 and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 17.01.2018 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter called RTI Act).

2. Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for today by the Commission.

3. The appellant states that no information has been provided to him till date.

4. The representative of the respondents submits letter dated 5416 dated 12.03.2018 alongwith judgment dated 4.2.2016 passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Civil Appeal No.823-854 of 2016 (arising out of SLP (Civil) No.5433 of 2014 ), copy of order dated 16.2.2015 passed in Appeal Case No.3330 of 2014 by Shri Parveen Kumar, Hon'ble State Information Commissioner, Punjab and a copy of proceedings regarding information to be provided or not to be provided relating to direct recruitments with a copy of each of the documents to the appellant.

Contd……p/2

**Appeal Case No. 384 of 2018**

-2-

5. The appellant is advised to go through the same and revert back to the authorities as early as possible, in case of deficiency in the information, so supplied. On receipt of the observations from the appellant, the respondents are directed to remove the same before the next date of hearing, which is fixed for 25.4.2018.

6. To come up on 25.4.2018 at 11.30 A.M.

 Sd/-

Dated : 19.03.2018 ( S.S. Channy)

 Chief Information Commissioner Punjab

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

 **Red Cross Bhawan, Near Rose Garden, Madhya Marg,**

**Sector: 16, Chandigarh.**

 **Tel. No.0172-2864100-01, Fax No.0172-2864110**

 **Visit us @** [**www.infocommpunjab.com**](http://www.infocommpunjab.com/), **Email-ID** **pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in**

Shri Ran Bahadur s/o Shri Prem Singh,

r/o Village Agampur, Tehsil Anandpur Sahib,

Distt. Ropar. --Appellant.

 Vs.

**Public Information Officer**

**o/o Secretary to Government of Punjab,**

**Department of General Administration,**

**Secretariat Administration,**

**Punjab Civil Secretariat, Chandigarh.**

**FAA-Secretary to Government of Punjab,**

**Department of General Administration,**

**Secretariat Administration,**

**Punjab Civil Secretariat, Chandigarh.** -------Respondents.

**Appeal Case No. 385 of 2018**

Present:- None on behalf of the appellant.

 Shri Parveen Kumar, Senior Assistant on behalf of the respondents.

ORDER

 The RTI application is dated 3.8.2017 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter called FAA) on 4.12.2017 and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 17.01.2018 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter called RTI Act).

2. Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for today by the Commission.

3. The appellant is absent without intimation.

4. The representative of the respondents submits letter dated 19.03.2018,
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relevant extract of which is reproduced below:-

@ nkg ih B{z p/Bsh ehsh iKdh j? fe ;aqh oB pjkdo g[Zso ;aqh gq/w f;zx tb'A wzrh rJh ;{uBk fe wkB:'r w[Zy wzsoh, e?pfBN wzsoh ;kfjpkD ih d/ fojkfJ;a ns/ dcaso fty/ o?B't/;aB$w?BNhB?A; ;zpzXh ekotkJh b'e fBowkD ftGkr ns/ ib ;gbkJh s/ ;?BhN/;aB ftGkr, gzikp tb'A ehsh iKdh j?. fJ; dk ;zpzX nkw oki gqpzX ftGkr Bkb BjhA j? ih.@

5. After hearing the representative of the respondents and going through the record available on the case file, it is revealed that Ad.O. Branch does not deal with the applications regarding any work got done at the residences of Chief Minister or Cabinet Ministers. The appellant is advised to seek information from the concerned PIO, which may be in the office of Public Works Department ( B & R) and Water Supply as disclosed by the Administrative Officer. With the above observations, the present case is disposed of and closed. Copies of the order be sent to the parties.

 Sd/-

Dated : 19.03.2018 ( S.S. Channy)

 Chief Information Commissioner Punjab

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

 **Red Cross Bhawan, Near Rose Garden, Madhya Marg,**

**Sector: 16, Chandigarh.**

 **Tel. No.0172-2864100-01, Fax No.0172-2864110**

 **Visit us @** [**www.infocommpunjab.com**](http://www.infocommpunjab.com/), **Email-ID** **pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in**

Shri Sukhdev Raj Devgan,

#D-28. Ranjit Avenue, Amritsar-143001. --Appellant.

 Vs.

**Public Information Officer**

**o/o Deputy Commissioner of Police,**

**Amritsar.**

**FAA-Commissioner of Police,**

**Amritsar.** -------Respondents.

**Appeal Case No. 406 of 2018**

Present:- Shri Sukhdev Raj Devgan, appellant, in person.

 Shri Hira Singh, ASI, on behalf of the respondents.

ORDER

 The RTI application is dated 06.09.2017 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter called FAA) on 4.11.2017 and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 19.01.2018 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter called RTI Act).

2. Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for today by the Commission.

3. The representative of the respondents hands over copies of documents pertaining to period w.e.f. 1.1.2016 to 30.07.2017 to the appellant during the hearing with a copy to the Commission for its record. He further states that complete information has been provided to the appellant.

4. On receipt of the information from the respondents, the appellant requests that he may be allowed to peruse the same.
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5. The appellant is advised to go through the same and ask specific information, in case of deficiency in the information, so provided to the appellant, within 10 days. On receipt of the deficiencies, the respondent-PIO is directed to remove the same before the next date of hearing, which is fixed for 25.04.2018.

6. To come up on 25.04.2018 at 11.30 A.M.

 Sd/-

Dated : 19.03.2018 ( S.S. Channy)

 Chief Information Commissioner Punjab

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

 **Red Cross Bhawan, Near Rose Garden, Madhya Marg,**

**Sector: 16, Chandigarh.**

 **Tel. No.0172-2864100-01, Fax No.0172-2864110**

 **Visit us @** [**www.infocommpunjab.com**](http://www.infocommpunjab.com/), **Email-ID** **pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in**

Shri Harjinder Singh

s/o Shri Ranjit Singh, r/o Khemkaran Road Chela,

Ward No.8, VPO Bhikhiwind, Tehsil Patti.

District Tarntaran-143303. --Complainant.

 Vs.

**Public Information Officer**

**o/o Director General of Police, Punjab,**

**Sector 9, Chandigarh.** -------Respondent.

 **Complaint Case No. 110 of 2018**

Present:- Shri Harjinder Singh, complainant, in person.

 Shri Prem Masih, Assistant Sub Inspector, on behalf of the respondents.

ORDER

 The RTI application is dated 19.04.2017 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the PIO and complaint was filed in the Commission on 18.01.2018 under Section 18 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter called RTI Act).

2. Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for today by the Commission.

3. The appellant states that no information has been provided to him till date.

4. The representative of the respondent-PIO submits letter dated 07.03.2018, the relevant extract of which is as under:-

 @p/Bsh j? fe gqkoEh Shri Harjinder Singh s/o Sh. Ranjit Singh r/o Khemkaran Road Chela, Ward No.8, VPO Bhikhiwind, Tehsil Patti, District Tarn Taran-143303 tb'A ;{uBk d/ gq'ckowk ftu nkgDh fe;/ th doyk;s dk fiaeo BjhA ehsk frnk. fi; ;zpzXh fJ; dcaso tb'A gZso BZL 553$nkoNhHNkJh$;hH;h, fwsh 13H06H2017 okjhA gqkoEh B{z ;{fus eo fdsk frnk ;h. fJ; s'A fJbktk gqkoEh
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tb'A wzrh rJh ;{uBk dk ;zpzX gzikp oki d/ tZy tZy fiafbnK Bkb j?. ;{uBk nfXeko n?eN dh Xkok 6(1) (iii) ns/ Gkos ;oeko dhnK jdkfJsK BzL 10$2$2008^nkJhHnko, fwsh 12H6H2008 nXhB i/eo gqkoEh tb'A wzrh rJh ;{uBk dk ;zpzX fJe s'A tZX ghHnkJhHUia Bkb j[zdk sK T[j ;zpzXs ghHnkJhHUia s'A nkgD/ gZXo s/ tyo/ tyo/ s"o s/ ngbkJh eoe/ jk;b eo ;edk j?.

5. From the perusal of the record and hearing the representative of the respondents, it is revealed that the appellant has addressed the request for information to the Director General of Police, Punjab, Chandigarh and expects that DGP, as a public authority shall procure, collate and thereafter supply the information in respect of all police offices under his control. Obviously, the appellant has not appreciated the mechanism created by RTI Act for securing information by citizens. Section 2(j) of the Act confers right on citizens to access information ‘held by or under the control of any public authority’ and thereby casts a corresponding duty on the concerned public authority to furnish the information. The term ‘public authority’ has been defined in Section 2(h) of the RTI Act. For our purposes, sub-clause

 ( c) & (d) of this Section are relevant, which read as below:-

**Section 2(h) sub-clauses (C) and (d):-**

**“Public Authority means any authority or body or institution of self government established or constituted:-**

1. **by any law made by State Legislature;**
2. **by notification issued or order made by the appropriate Government, and includes any-**
	1. **body owned, controlled or substantially financed;**
	2. **non-government organization substantially financed, directly or indirectly by funds provided by the appropriate government.”**

6. The office of DGP is an authority created by the law/notification of the State government and it is therefore a ‘public authority’. Likewise the offices of Police Stations are creation of law/notifications issued by government and therefore are ‘public authorities’ within
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the meaning of Section 2 of Act. The law provides for recognition of more than one public authority within a government department, so long they meet the criteria of Section 2. Each public authority within a department may be the custodian of an ‘information’ i.e. an information “is held by or under the control” of such a public authority. For the purpose of RTI Act each public authority is a self-contained unit and the fact that a public authority is on the administrative side subordinate to another superior office, which is also a public authority, makes no difference. An information seeker is required to access the information from the concerned public authority which holds or controls the information. If the information is held and controlled by a Head of State in capacity as ‘public authority’ then the information seeker is required to approach him. If, however, the information is held and controlled by a public authority other than the Head of State, then the information seeker is required to approach that public authority. The fact that this public authority is subordinate to Head of State on the administrative side is immaterial because under the RTI Act, there is no hierarchy of ‘public authorities’. No one public authority is subordinate to or superior than another public authority, for the purpose of RTI Act. Anybody or institution which satisfies the provisions of Section 2(h) is a public authority and there could be as many offices in a government department designated as ‘Public Authority’, as satisfy the Provisions of Section 2(h).

7. Section 6(1)(a) makes it further clear that a person who desires to obtain any information ‘shall’ make a request to the PIO “of the concerned public authority” and the concerned public authority would be the authority which ‘holds’ or ‘controls’ the information. The information must be held in capacity as ‘Public Authority’. Even from a practical point of view, if a Head of State is called upon to collect, collate and supply information held by various offices who are public authorities spread all over the State under its control on the administrative side.

8. The obligation to supply information is discharged by each public authority by designating officers as ‘ Public Information Officers’, who act as the nodal points for receiving the requests for information, procuring it from the concerned hands within the organization and
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thereafter supplying it to the information seeker. The PIO may seek the assistance of any other officer as he or she considers it necessary for the proper discharge of his/her duties. The assistance contemplated under Section 5 sub clause (4) and (5) must be construed as assistance of any officer within the public authority. This is obvious from the fact that under Sub-clause (5) of Section 5, the officer whose assistance has been sought shall be treated as a PIO. For seeking assistance of any officer under the control of another Public Authority, there is a separate provision in law. If the information sought is held by another public authority i.e. by an authority other than to which the PIO who has received the request belongs, the law creates an obligation on the part of such a PIO to, “ transfer the application or such part of it as may be appropriate to that other public authority”. This obligation under Section 6 of the Act is to transfer the application to ‘that other public authority’ and not to public ‘authorities’. The expression used in Section 6 is ‘authority’ and not ‘authorities’. Simply put, the PIO is expected to transfer a request which does not relate to him but has nevertheless been received by him, one identifiable authority. He is not expected to transfer such a request if information is held by many or a number of authorities. The rational is that a PIO is not a post office or a coordinator for forwarding requests from information seekers to various departments. Legislature has merely facilitated the information seekers by empowering PIO who inadvertently receives request pertaining to another PIO to forward it to the concerned PIO. Law, however, does not require him to deal with a multitude of public authorities; if that were so, some PIOs may end up doing nothing else!

9. From the foregoing discussion, it must be held that the appellant erred in approaching the Director General of Police, Punjab, Chandigarh, as Head of State, for seeking information from various police public authorities spread all over the district on the pretext that these public authorities are subordinate. The appellant was required under law to approach the PIO of the concerned public authority which holds or controls the information, which in the present case would mean the PIOs of the offices of Additional Director General of Police, Inspector General of Police, Commissioner of Police, Senior Superintendent of Police, Deputy Superintendent of Police, SHO’s etc. The information sought by the appellant is in public
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interest but even the cause of public good is no ground to set wrong procedural precedents which would get cited in future to short circuit the law. Consequently, it must be held that the PIO of the office of Director General of Police, Punjab, Chandigarh is under no legal obligation to collect, collate and supply information to the appellant from other public authorities spread all over Punjab. Of course, it goes without saying that PIO of the office of DGP is obligated to provide the information pertaining to the office of DGP. The appellant has sought the information of subordinate offices of the Director General of Police, Punjab, Chandigarh. He may, however, approach the concerned PIO/PIOs for seeking information with fresh application/s, if he so desires. With these observations, the present case is disposed of and closed. Copies of the order be sent to the parties.

 Sd/-

Dated : 19.03.2018 ( S.S. Channy)

 Chief Information Commissioner Punjab