



Sh.Manjit Singh
R/o # 4232, Urban Estate-02
Patiala-147002

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Punjabi University,
Patiala.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Dean Academic Affairs,
Punjabi University, Patiala.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 4182 of 2021

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
Sh.Vikran Sharma, Advocate for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through an RTI application dated 07.06.2021 has sought information regarding action taken by Dean Research office on the complaint filed relating to fraud by Harvinder Singh Sandhu Researcher Defence Studies Department alongwith notings – reply/remarks received from department of Defence Studies – annual progression report for the year 2020-21 and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of Punjabi University, Patiala. The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed a first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 22.07.2021 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 01.12.2021 before Sh.Hem Inder Singh, State Information Commissioner. Sh.Vikran Sharma, Advocate was present on behalf of the PIO and informed that the information has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 08.09.2021. As per appellant, the information was incomplete.

The appellant was directed to point out the discrepancies in writing to the respondent within 15 days and appear before the Commission on the next date of hearing to pursue the case.

Hearing dated 19.04.2022:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. As per counsel present on behalf of the PIO, the information has already been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 08.09.2021 and the appellant has not communicated any deficiencies. The respondent further informed that the decision taken on the complaint of the appellant (regarding point 1 & 2) is pending for final approval with University Academic Council. Further annual progression report for the year 2020-21 (regarding point 3 & 4) has not yet been received.

The appellant is absent nor is represented.

Having gone through the RTI application and the reply of the PIO, the Commission finds that the RTI application has been sufficiently replied and no further interference of the Commission is required.

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

Chandigarh
Dated : 19.04.2022

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commission



Sh. Yogesh Mahajan, S/o Sh. Kuldeep Raj Mahajan,
Opposite Water Tank, Municipal Market,
Mission Road, Pathankot.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o XEN,
Water Supply and Sanitation Division-1,
Patiala.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o SE,
Water Supply and Sanitation Circle,
Patiala.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3468 of 2020

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
Smt.Rajinder Kaur, Suptd. for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 01.08.2020 has sought information regarding comparative statements approved by competent authority for works under e-tendering from 01.08.2019 to 01.08/2020 and by tender works – sanction letter for work of CSR to all SDE and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of Xen Water Supply and Sanitation Division No.1, Patiala. The appellant was not provided with the information after the appellant filed the first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 10.09.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 28.07.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. Both the parties were absent.

The case was adjourned. The appellant was directed to appear personally at the VC site for the pursuance of this case.

On the date of next hearing on **28.09.2021**, due to a technical fault in the VC, the hearing could not take place. The case was adjourned.

On the date of last hearing on **04.01.2022**, the appellant was absent. Due to the non-presence of the staff in the DC office Patiala due to farmers' protest, the hearing could not take place. The case was adjourned.

Hearing dated 19.04.2022:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Patiala/Pathankot.

The appellant is continuously absent on all hearings and communicating via email that the PIO has not supplied the information.

The respondent present has brought the information. The respondent is directed to send the information to the appellant through registered post with a copy to the Commission.

With the above order, the case is **disposed of and closed**.

Chandigarh
Dated: 19.04.2022

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh. Sukhdev Singh,
Village Chahal, P.O Bhadson,
Tehsil Nabha, Distt Patiala.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o NaibTehsildar, Bhadson,
Tehsil & Distt Patiala.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o SDM, Nabha,
Distt. Patiala.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 2882 of 2020

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
Smt.Rajpal Kaur, PIO O/o SDM Nabha for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 18.06.2020 has sought information regarding notices issued for demarcation fixed on 17.06.2020, 09.09.2019 & 20.07.2018 to the persons responsible for unauthorized encroachment of panchayat land as per the order of DC Patiala for getting the panchayat land vacated and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of Naib Tehsildar Bhadson, Distt.Patiala. The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed a first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 22.07.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 23.03.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information.

The respondent present pleaded that the notice dated 17.06.2020 & 20.07.2018 was marked by the DC Patiala to the Kanoongo and the report received from Kanoongo, was sent to BDPO, and the reply was sent to the appellant. The respondent further informed that the information presently is in the custody of BDPO Nabha.

The BDPO Nabha was absent.

Since there had been an enormous delay in providing the information and dilly-dallying regarding the custody of the information, the Commission appointed the SDM, Nabha as the deemed PIO in this case.

SDM, Nabha was directed to procure the information from whoever has the custody of the sought information and provide the same as per the RTI Act.

On the date of the next hearing on **09.06.2021**, the appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information.

SDM Nabha who was made deemed PIO under section 5 (5) of the RTI Act 2005 and directed to procure the information from the concerned authority and provide the same to the appellant, was absent nor had sent any communication.

There has been an enormous delay in providing the information. The PIO-SDM, Nabha was given one last opportunity to procure the information from the authority under whose custody the information lies, and provide it to the appellant as per the RTI Act otherwise the Commission will be constrained to initiate action under the provisions of section 20 of the RTI Act.

On the date of the hearing on **28.09.2021**, as per the appellant, the information was not supplied by the PIO.

The respondent present from the office of Naib Tehsildar, Bhadson informed that he appeared on the order of SDM office but he did not bring the sought information,

At the hearing on 09.06.2021, SDM-Nabha was made deemed PIO under section 5 (5) of the RTI Act 2005 and directed to procure the information from the authority under whose custody the information lies and provide to the appellant.

The PIO-SDM Nabha was again absent and had passed on the buck to provide information to some other officer, which prima-facie was a violation of the Commission's order whereby the SDM had been made the deemed PIO. The PIO-SDM Nabha was given one last opportunity to comply with the earlier order of the commission and procure the information from the custody of the concerned authority and provide it to the appellant within 10 days otherwise the commission will be constrained to issue show cause notice under section 20 of the RTI Act and take action accordingly.

On the date of last hearing on **04.01.2022**, due to the non-presence of staff in the DC office Patiala because of the farmers' protest, the hearing could not take place.

The appellant vide email informed that he has received the information but with a delay of more than 16 months and pleaded for action against the PIO under the provisions of the RTI Act.

Hearing dated 19.04.2022:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. As per respondent, the information has already been provided.

The appellant is absent. During last hearing, the Commission received an email from the appellant stating therein that he has received the information.

Since the information has been provided, no further course of action is required. The case is **disposed of and closed**.

Chandigarh
Dated 19.04.2022

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

CC to: 1. BDPO-Nabha

2. PIO-SDM, Nabha



Ms. Mandeep Kaur, D/o Sh Baljinder Singh,
R/o village Meerpur, P.O Kheri Naudh Singh,
Tehsil Khamanoo, Distt Fatehgarh Sahib.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Director of Education,
SGPC, Bahadurgarh, Patiala.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Director of Education,
SGPC, Bahadurgarh, Patiala.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1893 of 2021

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through an RTI application dated 14.12.2020 has sought information regarding recruitment of ad hoc Assistant Professor(History) in Mata Gujri College Fatehgarh Sahib by SGPC Committee Bahadurgarh – detail of marks obtained by candidate Pritpal Singh along with his educational qualification – merit list of eligible candidates – criteria for recruitment and other information as enumerated in the RTI application from the office of SGPC Bahadurgarh. The appellant was not provided with the information provided after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the first appellate authority on 15.01.2021 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 04.10.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Fatehgarh Sahib/Patiala. As per the appellant, the information was not provided by the PIO.

The respondent was absent nor was represented. There has been an enormous delay of more than nine months in attending to the RTI application. The PIO was issued a **show cause notice under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 and directed to file reply on an affidavit.** The PIO was again directed to provide information to the appellant within 15 days of the receipt of the order.

On the date of last hearing on **03.01.2022**, both the parties were absent.

The appellant vide email informed that she has received the information and his appeal case be closed.

The PIO however, did not file reply to the show cause notice. The PIO was given one last opportunity to file reply to the show cause notice otherwise it will be presumed that the PIO has nothing to say on the matter and the Commission will take decision ex-party.

The PIO was also directed to inform who was the PIO at the time of filing of RTI application and on the date of issue of show cause notice.

Hearing dated 19.04.2022:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. Both the parties are absent.

The Commission has received a reply to the show cause notice from PIO which has been taken on record. In the said reply, the PIO has mentioned that he has just joined as PIO on 09.11.2021 and Sh.Prabhjot Singh was the PIO at the time filing of RTI application who was transferred on 05.08.2021 and thereafter, there is no PIO posted in the Directorate of Education Bahadurgarh in order to deal with the RTI applications, hence there was no PIO on the date of issue of show cause notice.

Since the information in this case stands provided and the appellant does not want to pursue the case further, the show cause is dropped and the case is closed.

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

Chandigarh
Dated: 19.04.2022

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh.Lajpat Rai, S/o Sh Harbans lal,
H no-B-3/287, Romana Street,
Jaitho, Distt Faridkot.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Chief Vigilance Officer,
Local Govt. Deptt, Sector-35-A,
Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Director,
Local Govt, Sector-35-A,
Chandigarh

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1703 of 2020

PRESENT: **Sh.Lajpat Rai as the Appellant**
 Sh.Rajeev Saggar PIO-CVO for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 20.01.2020 has sought information regarding a copy of letters dated 28.10.2017 & 1.09.2017 sent to DDLG Ferozepur by CVO with an enquiry report on the action taken – a copy of the letter dated 03.06.2019 forwarded by DC Faridkot for action against employees – details of staff working in the office of CVO – complaints received in NC from 01.01.2006 and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of Chief Vigilance Officer, Local Govt. Department Punjab Chandigarh. The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the first appellate authority on 20.02.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 02.11.2020 through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The respondent was absent. The case was adjourned.

On the date of the next hearing on **04.01.2021**, both the parties were absent.

Having gone through the file, the Commission observed that there has been an enormous delay in attending to the RTI application and the PIO was absent on 2nd consecutive hearing, the PIO was issued a **show-cause notice under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 and directed to file reply on an affidavit**. The PIO was again directed to provide the information within 10 days of the receipt of this order.

On the date of the hearing on **16.08.2021**, the respondent was present at Chandigarh and informed that the appellant has inspected the record and the information as specified by him has been sent to the appellant on his WhatsApp. The respondent also brought a set of information that was taken on the file of the Commission.

A copy of the information was sent to the appellant along with the order with the direction to point out the discrepancies to the PIO with a copy to the Commission and the PIO was directed to remove the same. The PIO was also directed to file a reply to the show-cause notice otherwise it will be construed that the PIO has nothing to say on the matter and a decision will be taken accordingly.

On the date of last hearing on **03.01.2022**, the respondent present pleaded that in compliance with the order of the Commission, the information has already been provided to the appellant but the appellant had not communicated any discrepancies.

The appellant was present and claimed that the information is incomplete.

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

- Point-1 - Respondent has submitted information which is being sent to the appellant.
- Point-2,3 & 4 - Information provided
- Point-5 - As per the respondent, the information relates to the Admn wing. The PIO is directed to transfer the RTI application under section 6(3) to the Admn Wing and the PIO-Admn Wing is directed to provide information on point-5.
- Point-6 - As per the respondent, the information is voluminous and the appellant be asked to specify the complaint or inspect the record and get the relevant information.

The appellant was directed to specify the complaint or inspect the record and get the relevant information.

The PIO was also directed to file a reply to the show-cause notice.

Hearing dated 19.04.2022:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The respondent present pleaded that in compliance with the order of the Commission, the RTI application for providing information on point-5 was transferred to the Admn wing under section 6(3) of the RTI Act on 03.01.2022 and the Admn wing vide a copy of letter dated 24.01.2022 has informed that they have already provided the information on point-5 to the appellant on 14.12.2021.

The information stands provided. No further course of action is required. The case is **disposed of and closed.**

Chandigarh
Dated 19.04.2022

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

CC to PIO-Admn Wing,
Local Govt. Pb Chandigarh



Sh Lajpat Rai S/o Sh. Harbans Lal,
R/o Romana Street, Jaito,
Tehsil Jaito, Distt Faridkot.

... Appellant

Versus

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

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

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1763 of 2021

PRESENT: Sh.Lajpat Rai as the Appellant
Sh.Gurdeep Singh, Clerk O/o Tehsildar Jaitu for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 11.03.2020 has sought information regarding document as registered vasika done by Kartar Kaur in favour of Tarsem Chand – a copy of record given to DSP vigilance in enquiry No.29/18 – certificate issued by MC Jaito connected with legal property on behalf of vasika registered and other information as enumerated in the RTI application from the office of Tehsildar Jaito. The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 20.01.2021 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 08.09.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. Due to a technical fault in the VC, the hearing could not take place. The case was adjourned.

On the date of last hearing on **03.01.2022**, the respondent present pleaded that the information has already been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 03.11.2020.

As per the appellant, the information was incomplete.

The PIO was directed to relook at the RTI application and provide whatever information is available as per the record. If the information is not available, give it in writing on an affidavit.

Hearing dated 19.04.2022:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. As per respondent, the information as available in the record has already been provided to the appellant.

The appellant is not satisfied with the information relating to point-2 & 3 and stated that the vasika No.2430 & 2052 in point 2 are of different dates and the document/certificate provided in point-3 is also not as sought in the RTI application.

Hearing both the parties, the PIO is directed to sort out the discrepancies as pointed out by the appellant during the hearing and provide complete information. If the document is not available in the record, to provide an affidavit mentioning that the information that has been provided is true, complete and no other information is available in the record relating to this RTI application. The information be provided within 15 days and send a compliance report to the Commission.

With the above order, the case is **disposed of and closed**.

Chandigarh
Dated: 19.04.2022

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner