



Sh. Paramjeet Chand ,
S/o Shri Ramesh Chand,
R/o Baghe ke Hithar,
Tehsil Jalalabad, Distt Fazilka.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Panchayat Secretary,
Gram Panchayat, Baghe ke Hithar,
Tehsil Jalalabad, Distt Fazilka.

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

Respondents

Appeal Case No. 2751/2018

Date of RTI application: 26.03.2018
Date of First Appeal : 23.04.2018
Date of Order of FAA or Reply: Nil
Date of 2nd Appeal/complaint: 09.08.2018

Present: Sh. Paramjeet Chand, Appellant in person.
Sh. Jagpal Singh, Panchayat Secretary – for Respondents.

Order

The case has been heard through video conferencing.

The following order was made by this forum on 28.11.2018:

“Sh. Paramjeet Chand, Appellant is present. None is present on behalf of the respondents. The Commission takes strong exception to the neglectful and dismissive attitude of the respondents.

The PIO –cum – BDPO, Jalalabad, Distt. Fazilka 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.



-2-

Appeal Case No. 2751/2018

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 come up today. The information sought pertains to ten years. Obviously, it will be a humongous information. Its provision shall divert their resources disproportionately. The Commission directs the Panchayat Secretary to allow him inspection of the record on a mutually agreed date and time. The respondents shall provide him the certified copies of the documents identified by him not beyond one hundred fifty pages.

To come up on **01.05.2019 at 11.30 AM through video conference at Fazilka.**

Sd/-

20.02.2019

**(Yashvir Mahajan)
State Information Commissioner**

CC: The Block Dev. & Panchayat Officer, Jalalabad, Distt. Fazilka for n/a.



Sh. Sandeep Singh,
S/o Sh. Malkit Singh,
R/o Village-Khanpur,
Block-Malerkotla, Distt.-Sangrur.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Block Development and Panchayat Officer,
Malerkotla-1, Sangrur.

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

Respondents

Appeal Case No. 2754/2018

Date of RTI application: 09.05.2018
Date of First Appeal : 14.06.2018
Date of Order of FAA or Reply: Nil
Date of 2nd Appeal/complaint: 06.08.2018

Present: Sh. Sandeep Singh, Appellant in person at Commission's office, Chd.
None on behalf of the Respondents.

Order

The following order was made by this forum on 28.11.2018:

"The appellant is present in the Court itself. He rues the dismissive attitude of the respondents in having refused to respond to his original application, first appeal and even the second appeal in the Commission.

None is present on behalf of the respondents. No reply has also been filed to the notice issued by the Commission. The Commission takes serious note of it.

The PIO – cum – BDPO, Malerkotla - 1 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



Appeal Case No. 2754/2018

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 come up today for hearing. Despite the express and clear instructions, the BDPO has chosen to ignore the show cause notice of the Commission. A final opportunity is afforded to Smt. Amardeep Kaur, PIO – cum – BDPO, Malerkotla – 1 to arrange the inspection of the record by the appellant and provide him certified copies of the documents to an extent of one hundred fifty pages only. She will also explain the delay having taken place in dealing with this case of providing information.

To come up on **01.05.2019 at 11.30 AM through video conference at Sangrur.**

20.02.2019

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



Smt Gurjeet Kaur,
W/o Shri Prabhdyal Singh,
R/o VPO Khamra, Jalandhar.
M: 9914552002

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Panchayat Secretary,
Gram Panchayat, Khamra,
Distt Jalandhar.

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

Respondents

Appeal Case No. 2815/2018

Date of RTI application: 19.02.2018
Date of First Appeal : 27.04.2018
Date of Order of FAA or Reply: Nil
Date of 2nd Appeal/complaint: 14.08.2018

Present: Adv. Ravinder Kumar, Counsel for the appellant.
Sh. Charanjit Singh, Panchayat Secretary, Village, Khamra, Distt. Jalandhar –
for Respondents.

Order

The case has been heard through video conferencing.

The following order was made by the Commission on 28.11.2018:

“The appellant had sought the certified copies of the documents relating to various resolutions passed, works having been executed by the Gram Panchayat and other connected information relating to the years 2013-18. Adv. Ravinder Kumar, Counsel for the appellant submits that they were desired to deposit a fee of Rs.9500/- as cost of information in response to which an irrelevant information comprising the bank statements in about 100 pages has been provided. The respondent Panchayat Secretary has failed to explain the demand of such a hefty amount and supply of the relevant information. It is a clear case of violation of the provision of RTI Act. Prima facie he has rendered himself liable for penal consequences.

Sh. Charanjit Singh, PIO – cum – Panchayat Secretary, Village Khamra, O/o BDPO, Jalandhar is issued a show cause notice to explain in a self- attested affidavit as to why a penalty @



-2-

Appeal Case No. 2815/2018

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 Complainant 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 come up today. The parties are adhering to the respective stands. They are again advised to sit together and sort it out before the next date of hearing.

To come up on **01.05.2019 at 11.30 AM through video conference at Jalandhar.**

20.02.2019

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

CC: The Block Dev. & Panchayat Officer, Jalandhar, for n/a.



Shri Gurlal Singh,
S/o Shri Dev Singh,
R/o Village Dhandial ,
PO Shadihari,
Tehsil Sunam, Distt Sangrur.

Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Village Development and Panchayat Officer,
Dirba, (Rural), Sangrur.

Respondent

Complaint Case No. 905/2018

Date of RTI application: 14.05.2018
Date of First Appeal : Nil
Date of Order of FAA or Reply: Nil
Date of 2nd Appeal/complaint: 23.08.2018

Present: Sh. Gurlal Singh, Complainant in person.
Sh. Sanjeev Kumar, BDPO, Dirba – for Respondent.

Order

The case has been heard through video conferencing.

The following order was made on 28.11.2018:

“The complainant had sought an information about the resolution passed by the panchayat of village Dhandial, block Dirba and the bills & vouchers against various development works that are taken up by the gram panchayat.

Sh. Sanjeev Kumar, BDPO who is present in the video conferencing informs that the concerned Panchayat Secretary was dismissed for his various acts of omissions and commissions. He is still in possession of some of the record and has not yet handed over to his successor. He submits that the department is trying to retrieve it from him. He assures the Commission that the available information with the office shall be transmitted to the complainant early. While accepting his plea the Commission observes that in case the Panchayat Secretary fails to provide the official record he should be criminally proceeded against under intimation to the Commission. The matter shall be reheard on 20.02.2019 at 11.30 AM through video conference at Sangrur.”



-2-

Complaint Case No. 905/2018

The case has again come up today for hearing. The respondent submits that the information has been conveyed. The complainant expresses his satisfaction. The Commission does not see any further requirement of intervention.

Disposed.

20.02.2019

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



Sh. Avtar Singh,
S/o Shri Kanan Singh,
R/o Village Chahadpur,
PO Gangomahal, Tehsil Ajnala, Distt Amritsar.

Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Block Development and Panchayat Officer,
Ajnala, Distt Amritsar.

Respondent

Complaint Case No. 909/2018

Date of RTI application: 30.05.2018
Date of First Appeal : Nil
Date of Order of FAA or Reply: Nil
Date of 2nd Appeal/complaint: 23.08.2018

Present: Sh. Avtar Singh, Complainant in person.
None on behalf of the Respondent.

Order

The case has been heard through video conferencing.

The original application had been filed by the complainant on 30.05.2018. Having failed to receive the information he had approached the Commission with a complaint. Neither the respondent has filed a written reply to the notice issued by the Commission nor has he come present. The Commission takes it as a defiance in violation of Section 7(1) of the RTI Act which renders him liable for penal consequences.

The PIO – cum – Block Development & Panchayat Officer, Ajnala 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 Complainant under Section 19 (8) (b) of the Act for the detriment suffered by him.



-2-

Complaint Case No. 909/2018

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.

To come up on **08.05.2019 at 11.30 AM through video conference at Amritsar.**

20.02.2019

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



Shri Ajmel Singh,
S/o Shri Surjeet Singh,
R/o Village Sangatpura,
Tehsil Jagraon, Distt Ludhiana.

Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer – cum –
Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat,
Sangatpura, Tehsil Jagraon,
Distt Ludhiana.

Respondent

Complaint Case No. 915/2018

Date of RTI application: 18.05.2018
Date of First Appeal : Nil
Date of Order of FAA or Reply: Nil
Date of 2nd Appeal/complaint: 23.08.2018

Present: Sh. Ajmel Singh, Complainant in person.
None on behalf of the Respondent.

Order

The case has been heard through video conferencing.

The following order was passed by this forum on 28.11.2018:

“The respondents are absent. The Commission takes a serious note of it and issues a show cause notice to the PIO – cum – Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat Sangatpura 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 Complainant under Section 19 (8) (b) of the Act for the detriment suffered by him.

In addition to the written reply, the PIO – cum – Panchayat Secretary 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



-2-

Complaint Case No. 915/2018

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 for hearing. Despite the clear instructions of the Commission none is present on behalf of the respondent. A final opportunity is afforded to the respondent to provide the information to the complainant and explain the conduct for having violated the provisions of the RTI Act. Be it noted that he has already been served a show cause notice.

To come up on **01.05.2019 at 11.30 AM through video conference at Ludhiana.**

Sd/-

20.02.2019

(Yashvir Mahajan)
State Information Commissioner

CC: The Block Dev. & Panchayat Officer, Jagraon, for n/a.

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



Shri Prem Chand,
S/o Shri Gurmeet Ram,
R/o VPO Mamu Khera,
Tehsil & Distt Fazilka.

Complainant

Versus

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

Respondent

Complaint Case No. 918/2018

Date of RTI application: 04.07.2018
Date of First Appeal : Nil
Date of Order of FAA or Reply: Nil
Date of 2nd Appeal/complaint: 23.08.2018

Present: **None on behalf of the Complainant.**
Sh. Bawandeep, Clerk, BDPO Office, Arniwala – for Respondents.

ORDER

The case has been heard through video conferencing.

The following order was made by the Commission on 28.11.2018:

“The complainant is aggrieved with an alleged action of former sarpanch towards demolition of a structure in the village. He seeks to know the authority under which the private property is being demolished by the gram panchayat. The respondent who is present in the Bathinda studio has brought along the reply which obviously cannot be handed over in person as the complainant is present in the Court at Chandigarh.

The respondent in the BDPO office, Fazilka submits that since the issue relates to another block they had forwarded the application to the BDPO, Arniwala under Section 6(3) of the Act. The BDPO, Arniwala is advised to deliver him the information by post under intimation to the Commission as well.”

The case has come up again today. The appellant is absent. The respondent represented by Sh. Bawandeep, Clerk submits that umpteen attempts have been made to approach him but he has been evasive. He has been directed to apprise him of the provisions authorizing the sarpanches under the Panchayati Raj Act to take tangible action in such a scenario in writing within seven days from today. As no information materially available with the respondent has been withheld it shall not be purposeful to keep the matter alive.

The complaint is **disposed**.

Sd/-

20.02.2019

(Yashvir Mahajan)
State Information Commissioner

PS: Sh. Surjit, brother of the Complainant has arrived in the Commission's office, Chandigarh after the hearing was over. He has been apprised of the above order.



Sh. Manjit Singh Sekhon,
S/o Late Sh. Charan Singh Sekhon,
Vill. Tandi, P.O- Laroya,
Distt. Jalandhar, Pin-144201.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o District Development and Panchayat Officer,
Jalandhar.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Additional Deputy Commissioner (Development),
Jalandhar.

Respondents

Appeal Case No.2989/2018

Date of RTI application: 12.06.2018
Date of First Appeal : 16.07.2018
Date of Order of FAA or Reply: Nil
Date of 2nd Appeal/complaint: 04.09.2018

Present: Sh. Manjit Singh Sekhon, Appellant in person.
Sh. Ajay Kumar, DDPO, Jalandhar – for Respondents.

Order

The case has been heard through video conferencing.

The following order was passed by this forum on 28.11.2018:

“This should be read in continuation of order passed by this forum on 23.10.2018.

The appellant intends to have a certified copy of the page on which the dispatch number and date has been assigned to the forwarding letter of enquiry report which was sent to the Director, Rural Development and Panchayats, Punjab, Chandigarh.

The Commission understands that the enquiry report has already been provided to the appellant. The respondents are advised to look into the dispatch register and arrange to provide him a certified copy of the page on which the number and date was assigned.”

The case has come up today. Sh. Ajay Kumar, DDPO, Jalandhar, submits that in compliance with the order of the Commission the information relating to the dispatch register has been provided to the appellant. The Commission finds no malafide on the part of the respondents. No intervention of the Commission is called for.

Disposed.

Sd/-

20.02.2019

(Yashvir Mahajan)
State Information Commissioner



Sh. Jasbir Singh Sekhon,
S/o Sh. Kartar Singh Sekhon,
Vill. Tandi, P.O- Laroya,
Distt. Jalandhar, Pin-144201.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o District Development and Panchayat Officer,
Distt. Jalandhar

First Appellate Authority
O/o Additional Deputy Commissioner (Development),
Distt. Jalandhar,

Respondents

Appeal Case No.3009/2018

Date of RTI application: 11.06.2018
Date of First Appeal : 13.07.2018
Date of Order of FAA or Reply: Nil
Date of 2nd Appeal/complaint: 04.09.2018

Present: Sh. Jasbir Singh Sekhon, Appellant in person.
Sh. Ajay Kumar, DDPO, Jalandhar – for Respondents.

Order

The case has been heard through video conferencing.

“The following order was passed by this forum on 28.11.2018:

The appellant is seeking the action having been taken on a complaint filed by him to the then Deputy Chief Minister, Punjab on its online porter.

Sh. Vikas Sharma, Superintendent says that the same was forwarded to the District Development & Panchayat Officer, Jalandhar for appropriate action under intimation to the appellant. He further says that as the issue pertains to the DDPO he has already requested him to do the needful. The District Development & Panchayat Officer, Jalandhar is hereby advised to apprise him of the status of the matter under intimation to the Commission before the next date of hearing.”

Sh. Ajay Kumar, DDPO, Jalandhar is present in the video conferencing. He submits that he has recently joined and is unaware of the issue. This stance of the DDPO is not appreciable. He is advised to look into it immediately and arrange to provide him the information failing which this forum shall be constrained to draw the adverse inference and proceed to impose penalty.”

The case has come up today. Sh. Ajay Kumar, DDPO had assured this forum to look into the matter and apprise him of the status of action having been taken on his complaint. The DDPO says that he has been duly provided with the information through DDPO concerned. The DDPO further says that he is only



-2-

Appeal Case No.3009/2018

only seeking action taken on the issue. The Commission is not a forum to act as a grievance cell. He should approach the higher authorities in the department. No information in the material shape has been sought. The Commission does not see any reason to keep the matter alive and interfere into the matter.

Disposed.

Sd/-

20.02.2019

**(Yashvir Mahajan)
State Information Commissioner**



Sh. Inderjeet Singh, Ex- Panch,
Village Sattowali, Block Adampur,
Distt Jalandhar.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o District Development and Panchayat Officer,
Jalandhar.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Additional Deputy Commissioner (Development),
Jalandhar.

Respondents

Appeal Case No.3527/2018

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA	Date of Second Appeal/ Complaint
26.05.2018	Nil	01.08.2018	Nil	15.10.2018

Present: Sh. Inderjeet Singh, Appellant in person.
Sh. Ajay Kumar, DDPO, Jalandhar – for Respondents.

ORDER

The case has been heard through video conferencing.

Sh. Ajay Kumar, DDPO, Jalandhar says that the information sought pertains to the quasi-judicial adjudication and he should have applied with the copying agency of the concerned department. The appellant, on the other hand, denies it. He says that he has sought the information during the month of August, 2018 when the same was in the custody of the respondents. They should have provided it within the stipulated period. Having failed to do so, they have violated the provisions of Section 7(1) of the RTI Act.

Be that as it is, the respondents are directed to file a written reply to the averments made by the appellant as mentioned above.

The matter shall be reheard on **08.05.2019 at 11.30 AM through video conference at Jalandhar.**

20.02.2019

Sd/-
(Yashvir Mahajan)
State Information Commissioner



Sh. Ram Kumar,
S/o Sh. Ram Partap,
R/o Village Daulatpura,
Tehsil-Abohar, Distt. Fazilka.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o District Development and Panchayat Officer,
Fazilka, Punjab.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Deputy Commissioner,
Fazilka, Punjab.

Respondents

Appeal Case No.3210/2018

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA
21.05.2018	Nil	19.07.2018	Nil

Present: **None on behalf of the Appellant.**
1. Sh. Rakesh Kumar, Clerk, DDPO office, Fazilka,
2. Sh. Dalip, BDPO office – for Respondents.

Order

The case has been heard through video conferencing.

The proxy for the appellant has submitted in writing that they have received the information to their satisfaction. Thus being the case no further action is called for.

Disposed.

Sd/-

20.02.2019

(Yashvir Mahajan)
State Information Commissioner



Sh. Charanjeet Singh,
S/o Sh. Harbhajan Singh,
R/o Village Bhullerian,
Tehsil- Malout, Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib.

Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Block Development and Panchayat Officer,
Malout, Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib.

Respondent

Complaint Case No.736/2018

Date of RTI application: 11.05.2018
Date of First Appeal : Nil
Date of Order of FAA or Reply: Nil
Date of 2nd Appeal/complaint: 09.07.2018

Present: **None is present on behalf of the Complainant.**
Sh. Jasbir Singh, Panchayat Secretary, BDPO Office, Malout – for Respondent.

ORDER

The case has been heard through video conferencing.

The Commission had made the following order on 26.12.2018:

“The respondents submit that the information is old and could not be traced as they had been busy with the conduct of Zila Parishad and Panchayat Samiti Elections. They assure to trace the information and provide it to the complainant before the next date of hearing.”

“The case has come up today. The complainant is present in the studio of the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Sri Muktsar Sahib. None is present on behalf of the respondent. No reply has also been filed by them. The Commission understands that the poll process for the conduct of Panchayat elections in the State of Punjab is on and their absence may be attributable to their occupation with the same. However, the Commission takes strong exception on their part for having failed to even file a reply or seek exemption. A final opportunity is afforded to them to comply with the instructions passed in the order reproduced above under intimation to the Commission.”

The case has again come up for hearing today. Sh. Jasbir Singh, Panchayat Secretary has come present on behalf of the respondent. He says that the available information has

Contd....page...2



-2-

Complaint Case No.736/2018

been provided to him. The complainant is absent. Nothing has been heard from him also. The Commission presumes that he is satisfied with the information stated to have been provided to him. No further action is called for.

Disposed.

20.02.2019

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



Sh. Sri Ram,
S/o Sh. Sahib Ram,
R/o Dhani Chetu Wali ,
Gram Panchayat Dhani Mandla,
Tehsil Abohar, Distt. Fazilka.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Block Development and Panchayat Officer,
Block- Abohar, Tehsil- Abohar,
Fazilka.

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

Respondents

Appeal Case No.1952/2018

Date of RTI application: 12.03.2018
Date of First Appeal : 16.04.2018
Date of Order of FAA or Reply: Nil
Date of 2nd Appeal/complaint: 28.05.2018

Present: Sh. Sri Ram- Appellant
Sh. Gurwinder Singh, Panchayat Officer-for Respondents.

ORDER

The case has been heard through video conferencing.

The Commission has made the following observations on 09.01.2019:

"The appellant has sought information pertaining to various grants received by Panchayat and development works executed by it. The respondents say that the entire record has been provided. The appellant refuse its contention and alleges some shortfalls as copies of various bills and vouchers pertaining to a year have not been provided. The respondents are directed to make good information, thus, reported to have not been supplied under intimation to the Commission."

The case has come up today for hearing. As has been mentioned above most of the information was provided to the appellant. It is averred that quantum of information sought is massive. Sh. Gurwinder Singh appearing on behalf of the respondents submits that despite having

Contd.....page...2



-2-

Appeal Case No.1952/2018

been sent the appellant refused to accept the information. The appellant admits in the Court that he refused to accept it before examining it. The respondent says that even so they had sent him the information under a registered cover. The Commission feels that the appellant is not acquitting himself appropriately in receiving the information. The Commission is of the view that the sufficient information has been supplied. No more intervention is called for.

Disposed.

Sd/-

20.02.2019

**(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. Bhupinder Kumar,
S/o Sh. Rai Singh,
R/o Dhani Chetu Wali,
Gram Panchayat Dhani Mandla,
Tehsil- Abohar, Distt.- Fazilka.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Block Development and Panchayat Officer,
Block- Abohar, Tehsil- Abohar,
Fazilka.

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

Respondents

Appeal Case No.1962/2018

Date of RTI application: 12.03.2018
Date of First Appeal : 16.04.2018
Date of Order of FAA or Reply: Nil
Date of 2nd Appeal/complaint: 28.05.2018

Present: Sh. Bhupinder Kumar, Appellant in person.
Sh. Gurwinder Singh, Panchayat Officer-for Respondents.

ORDER

The case has been heard through video conferencing.

The Commission has made the following observations on 09.01.2019:

"The appellant has sought information pertaining to various grants received by Panchayat and development works executed by it. The respondents say that the entire record has been provided. The appellant refuse its contention and alleges some shortfalls as copies of various bills and vouchers pertaining to a year have not been provided. The respondents are directed to make good information, thus, reported to have not been supplied under intimation to the Commission."

The case has come up today for hearing. As has been mentioned above most of the information was provided to the appellant. It has been averred that quantum of information sought is massive. Sh. Gurwinder Singh appearing on behalf of the respondents submits that despite having

Contd.....page...2



-2-

Appeal Case No.1962/2018

been sent the appellant refused to accept the information. The appellant admits in the Court that he refused to accept it before examining it. The respondent says that even so they had sent him the information under a registered cover. The Commission feels that the appellant is not acquitting himself appropriately in receiving the information. The Commission is of the view that the sufficient information has been supplied. No more intervention is called for.

Disposed.

20.02.2019

**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.Manohar Lal,
S/o Sh. Bali Ram,
R/o Village- Kangar, Block- Nurpur Bedi,
Tehsil- Anandpur Sahib, Rupnagar.

Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Block Development and Panchayat Officer,
Nurpur Bedi, Tehsil- Sh. Anandpur Sahib,
Rupnagar.

Respondent

Complaint Case No.1247/2018

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA	Date of Second Appeal/ Complaint
13.09.2018	Nil	Nil	Nil	28.11.2018

Present: None is present on behalf of the Complainant.
 Sh. Sukhpal Singh, Panchayat Secretary, BDPO Office, Nurpur Bedi – for Respondent.

ORDER

Sh. Sukhpal Singh, Panchayat Secretary appearing on behalf of the respondent has submitted a receipt issued by the complainant as a token of acknowledging the receipt of information to his satisfaction. No further intervention is called for. The complaint is **disposed**.

20.02.2019

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. Ripu Sudan Sharma,
S/o Sh. Bujja Ram Sharma,
R/o Ward No. 02, House No. 818,
Garhshankar, Distt. Hoshiarpur.

Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Block Development and Panchayat Officer,
Garhshankar, Distt. Hoshiarpur.

Respondent

Complaint Case No.1241/2018

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA	Date of Second Appeal/ Complaint
24.07.2018	Nil	Nil	Nil	29.11.2018

Present: None.

ORDER

Due to technical glitch the video conferencing could not mature.

The matter shall be reheard on **08.05.2019 at 11.30AM through video conference**
at Hoshiarpur.

20.02.2019

Sd/-
(Yashvir Mahajan)
State Information Commissioner