



Sh. D.S Dhillon,
192-C, Rajguru Nagar,
Ludhiana.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Guru Nanak Dev Engineer College,
Ludhiana.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Guru Nanak Dev Engineer College,
Ludhiana.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 145 of 2019

Present: None for the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on **09.04.2019**. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 06.11.2018 regarding point-1. The respondent also handed over information regarding point-2 to the appellant. The appellant stated that the PIO has not provided the latest accreditation status. The respondent informed that it was in process. The PIO was directed to provide supporting documents which determine the status of the information regarding point-1. The information be provided within a week.

Hearing dated 20.05.2019:

The respondent is absent. The Commission has received an email from the PIO stating that in compliance with the order of the Commission, the information regarding point-1 has been sent to the appellant on 03.05.2019. The appellant is absent and has not pointed out any discrepancy. It is presumed that the appellant has received the information and is satisfied.

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

Chandigarh
Dated 20.05.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh Krishan Gopal Singla,
Ward No-16-B/190, Sangrur Road,
Dhuri, Distt Sangrur.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
Chairman, PSPCL,
Lower Mall, Patiala.

First Appellate Authority,
Chief Engineer, Distribution, (West),
Bathinda.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 2577 of 2018

Present: None for the Appellant
 Sh.Uttam Kumar Bansal, Sr.Xen and Sh.Naveen Jindal, UDC O/o PSPCL
 Budhlada for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on **31.10.2018**. Sh.Prem Kumar Rattan representing the appellant informed that no information has been provided. The respondent was absent. The PIO was directed to provide the information to the appellant in accordance with the RTI Act and be present personally or through his representative on the next date of hearing alongwith explanation for not attending to the RTI application within the time prescribed under the RTI Act.

The case was last heard on **11.12.2018**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The respondent present has pleaded that the information sought is ambiguous and in question form, thus the information cannot be provided and they have already sent a reply to the appellant vide letter dated 25.04.2018. As per the respondent, the appellant has sought information that whether the internal audit party of the department has brought to the notice of the concerned division of PSPCL that the service tax should be deducted from the payment made to the contractor. The appellant is absent and vide email has sought adjournment.”

Hearing dated 20.05.2019:

The respondent present pleaded that the information is in question form and they have already sent reply to the appellant. The respondent further informed that they have not deducted any service tax and as such no information is available in their record.

The appellant is absent. I have gone through the RTI application and the reply of the PIO and find that though the information is in question form, the PIO has sufficiently replied to the RTI. No further course of action is required.

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

Chandigarh
Dated: 20.05.2018

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



through registered post

Sh Jai Chand,
H No-3/130, Street No-1,
Ram Sharnam Colony,
Fazilka.

Appellant.

Versus

Public Information Officer
O/o MC,
Fazilka.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Regional Deputy Director,
Local Govt, Ferozepur.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3217 of 2018

Present: Sh.Jai Chand as the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER: The case was first heard on **05.12.2018**. The respondent was absent. The Commission received a letter on 20.11.2018 from the PIO stating therein that the information has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 30.06.2018 and a copy of the same is submitted to the Commission. The appellant was not satisfied with the information provided except information regarding point 2(a) & 2(b). The appellant further stated that he has received the information only on 17.11.2018 after the submission of second appeal with the Commission.

Having gone through the RTI application and the reply of the PIO, the Commission directed the PIO to relook at point 2 (c) & 2(d) and provide the complete information within a week. The PIO was also directed to submit proof of sending information on 30.06.2018 and produce dispatch register.

The case was last heard on **11.02.2019** through video conference facility available in the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Fazilka. Since both the parties were absent, the case was adjourned.

Hearing dated 20.05.2019:

The appellant pleaded that he has received the information on point-2(c) which is incomplete since the PIO has provided the information from 01.04.2018 onwards whereas he had sought information from 01.04.2014. The PIO has also not supplied the information on point-2(d).

The respondent is absent and vide email has sought exemption stating that the PIO alongwith other staff is on election duty. It may be mentioned here that the PIO was absent on earlier two occasions and this time has taken excuse on the plea of election duty. The Commission observes this as a delaying tactic by the PIO and directs the PIO to explain the reasons for late reply as well as not providing the complete information. The PIO is also directed to provide complete information to the appellant as per earlier order which still stands. The information be provided within a week and send a compliance report to the Commission.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **23.07.2019 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Fazilka. Copies of the order be sent to the parties ***through registered post***

Chandigarh
Dated: 20.05.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh.Satnam Singh,
R/o Village Sadakwala 2FDM, PO-3FDM,
Panchayat Smiti Suratgarh,
Distt.Shri Ganga Nagar.

Appellant.

Versus

Public Information Officer
O/o SSP,
Fazilka..

First Appellate Authority,
O/o IGP, Ferozepur Zone,
Ferozepur..

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3246 of 2018

Present: Sh.Satnam Singh as the Appellant
Sh.Dalip Singh, ASI O/s SSP Fazilka for the Respondent

ORDER: The case was first heard on **05.12.2018**. The respondent present pleaded that the reply was sent to the appellant vide letter dated 29.05.2018 and the appellant was asked to specify for which branch of the SSP office, he has sought information but the appellant has not specified.

The appellant was absent. The appellant was directed to specify the particular branch from where he wants information and be present on the next date of hearing otherwise the case will be decided ex-parte.

The case was last heard on **11.02.2019** through video conference facility available in the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Fazilka. The respondent present informed that the appellant has not specified the information that he wants. The appellant absent and vide email that he wants the copy of dak dispatch register containing the entry of dak sent from SP Office Abohar to SSP Fazilka. The appellant was directed to inspect the record and specify the information of maximum 5 pages. The PIO was directed to allow the appellant to inspect the record and provide the information of maximum 5 pages.

Hearing dated 20.05.2019:

The respondent present pleaded that as per order of the Commission, the appellant has not come to inspect the record. The appellant says that he has asked for the copy of that register which contains the entry of dak sent from the office of SP Fazilka to the office of SSP Fazilka.

The respondent further pleaded that the dak register maintained for the entry of dak also contain the dak received from other offices/public and no separate dak register is maintained for the entry of dak received from the office of SP Fazilka. The plea is accepted. The appellant is directed to inspect the record and specify the information for not more than 25 pages. The PIO is directed to allow the appellant to inspect the record on the date fixed i.e. **27.05.2019 at 11.00 AM**. The respondent also to ensure that if he has to be present else-where, a substitute be available with the document for inspection and provide the information.

The case is adjourned. To come up for compliance on **17.07.2019 at 11.00 AM**.

Chandigarh
Dated: 20.05.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden, Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in
Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Sh Prem Kumar Rattan,
H o-78/8, Park Road,
New Mandi, Dhuri,
Dist Sangrur.

...Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Deputy Chief Engineer,PSPCL,
Distribution Circle,
Bathinda.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Chief Engineer,
Distribution West Zone,PSPCL,
Bathinda.

...Respondent

Appellant Case No. 3373 of 2018

Present: None for the Appellant
Sh.Urram Kumar Bansal, Sr.Xen and Sh.Naveen Jindal, UDC O/o PSPCL
Budhlada for the Respondent

Order:

The case was last heard on **07.01.2019**. The respondent present pleaded that the information has already been provided to the appellant. The respondent further claimed that 2 points of the RTI application have already been addressed in appeal case No.3534 of 2017 which was disposed off by Sh.Avtar Singh Kler,SIC vide their office letter No.19012 dated 24.05.2018 when the appellant had expressed his satisfaction. Regarding point No.3, the appellant was asked to come for inspection since the record is of fragile nature and cannot be Xeroxed again and again being on thin & old paper.

The appellant was absent to plead his case and sought exemption for personal appearance. The appellant vide email also denied having received the information earlier.

Hearing dated 20.05.2019:

The respondent present pleaded that the information on two points has already been provided and the appellant has not come for inspection of the record regarding point-3 since the information is voluminous and is of fragile nature. The appellant is absent and vide email has informed that the record is only 8 years old, it cannot be said to be the old record and that the PIO is not providing the information.

The appellant is directed to inspect and specify the record that he wants since the PIO has claimed that the information is voluminous. The PIO is directed to allow inspection of the record to the appellant by fixing a mutually convenient date and time and provide the information.

With the above order, the case is **disposed off and closed**. The Commission, however, makes it clear that if the appellant is not satisfied with the information, he is free to come to the Commission.

Chandigarh
Dated: 20.05.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh Prem Kumar Rattan,
H o-78/8, Park Road,
New Mandi, Dhuri,
Dist Sangrur.

....Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Deputy Chief Engineer,PSPCL,
Distribution Circle,
Bathinda.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Chief Engineer,
Distribution West Zone, PSPCL,
Bathinda.

...Respondent

Appellant Case No. 3383 of 2018

Present: None for the Appellant
Sh.Urram Kumar Bansal, Sr.Xen and Sh.Naveen Jindal, UDC O/o PSPCL
Budhlada for the Respondent

Order:

The case was last heard on **07.01.2019**. The respondent present pleaded that the information has already been provided to the appellant. The respondent further claimed that 2 points of the RTI application have already been addressed in appeal case No.3531 of 2017 which was disposed off by Sh.Avtar Singh Kler,SIC 17.04.2018 when the appellant had expressed his satisfaction. Regarding point No.3, the appellant was asked to come for inspection since the record is of fragile nature and cannot be Xeroxed again and again being on thin & old paper.

The appellant was absent to plead his case and sought exemption for personal appearance. The appellant vide email also denied having received the information earlier.

Hearing dated 20.05.2019:

The respondent present pleaded that the information on two points has already been provided and the appellant has not come for inspection of the record regarding point-3 since the information is voluminous and is of fragile nature. The appellant is absent and vide email has informed that the record is only 7 years old, it cannot be said to be the old record and that the PIO is not providing the information.

The appellant is directed to inspect and specify the record that he wants since the PIO has claimed that the information is voluminous. The PIO is directed to allow inspection of the record to the appellant by fixing a mutually convenient date and time and provide the information.

With the above order, the case is **disposed off and closed**. The Commission, however, makes it clear that if the appellant is not satisfied with the information, he is free to come to the Commission.

Chandigarh
Dated: 20.05.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden, Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - psic30@punjabmail.gov.in
Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Lt Col Hardev Singh,
506, Army Base Workshop,
C/o 56 APO.

....Appellant.

Versus

Public Information Officer
O/o District Magistrate,
Amritsar.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Deputy Commissioner,
Amritsar.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3288 of 2018

Present: None for the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER: The case was last heard on **18.12.2019**. The respondent present informed that they have sent fresh information to the appellant vide letter dated 11.12.2018. The appellant was absent. The Commission could not arrive at a decision whether the appellant had got complete information or not. The appellant was afforded one more opportunity to point out the discrepancies if any in the information provided on 11.12.2018, a copy of which was sent to the appellant alongwith the order.

Hearing dated 20.05.2019:

The respondent is absent. In the last order, the respondent informed that they have sent the information to the appellant on 11.12.2018. The appellant was absent. The appellant was directed to point out the discrepancies, if any.

The appellant is absent and vide email has informed that he has not received the information.

The PIO is directed to resend the information to the appellant through registered post and send a compliance report to the Commission.

To come up for further hearing **on 17.07.2019 at 11.00 AM**

Chandigarh
Dated: 20.05.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden, Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - sicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in
Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Sh Suba Singh,
Village Gawalia, P.O Dinanagr,
Distt Gurdaspur.

.... Appellant.

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Addl SE, Operational,
(Rural Circle), PSPCL, Pathankot.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o SE, PSPCL,
Pathankot.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3393 of 2018

Present: None for the Appellant
None for the Respondent

Order:

The case was first heard on 07.01.2019. Since both the parties are absent, in the interest of justice, one more opportunity is granted and the case is adjourned

The case was last heard on **25.02.2019**. The appellant through RTI application dated 11.05.2018 had sought information regarding action taken on the applications dated 22.11.2016, 9.12.2016, 09.02.2017, 03.04.2017, 08.05.2017 & 10.05.2017 and other information concerning the office of Addl. SE (Operational), Rural Circle, PSPCL, Pathankot. The appellant was not provided the information after which he filed first appeal with the First appellate Authority on 13.06.2018 which took no decision on the appeal.

The appellant informed that no information has been provided. The respondent was absent. The PIO was directed to respond to the RTI application and provide the information. The PIO was also directed to be present personally or through representative on the next date of hearing and explain the reasons for not attending to the RTI application within the time prescribed under the RTI Act 2005.

Hearing dated 20.05.2019:

The respondent is absent. The Commission has received an email from the PIO stating that the information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant has acknowledged having received the information and is satisfied. The PIO has also sent a copy of the acknowledgement to the Commission which is taken on the file of the Commission.

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

Chandigarh
Dated: 20.05.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden, Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864114, Email:- psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in
Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Sh Gurdeep Singh, S/o Sh Harman Singh,
R/o Block No-1, H No-390, Dharampura Mohalla,
Dhuri, Distt Sangrur.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Asst, XEN, PSPCL,
Distribution, Sub Division,
Lehra Gaga.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Chairman, PSPCL,
Patiala.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3745 of 2018

Present: **None for the Appellant**
 Sh.Balwinder Singh, Addl. SDO, PSPCL Lehragaga for the Respondent

Order: The case was first heard on **06.02.2019**. The respondent present pleaded that the file containing the particular notices has been misplaced during shifting of the office from old building to the new building and so the information cannot be provided. The PIO was directed to initiate a full enquiry and submit an enquiry report ascertaining that the file is missing and the responsibility has been fixed on the person under whose custody the file went missing.

The case was last heard on **25.03.2019**. The respondent present pleaded that they have traced out the file and provided the information to the appellant.

The Commission finds it strange that how a file was missing and subsequently traced once the Commission directed an enquiry into the matter. This matter needs to be investigated further whether the information was denied with a malafide intention to the appellant or not?

The respondent present stated that he only joined on 10.3.2019 and the case was handled by the previous PIO, Sh.Balwinder Singh who is now posted in City Sub Division, PSPCL Lehragaga. Sh.Balwinder Singh-PIO was directed to appear personally on the next date of hearing with a reply on an affidavit, establishing the entire sequence of the events from the denial of information on the basis of missing file to the locating of the file and providing the information.

Hearing dated 20.05.2019:

The respondent present pleaded that the information has already been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 25.02.2019 and a copy sent to the Commission. The appellant is absent on two occasions and has not pointed out any discrepancies. It is presumed that the appellant has received the information and is satisfied.

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

Chandigarh
Dated: 20.05.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

CC to Sh.Balwinder Singh, City Sub Division,
PSPCL, Lehragaga