



Sh. Karamjit Singh, S/o Sh Maghar Singh,
1169, Khanna Nagar, Bye Pass road,
Lehra Gaga, Distt Sangrur.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Director Administrator,
PSPCL, Patiala.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Chief Engineer, H.O,
PSPCL, The Mall, Patiala.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3285 of 2019

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 24.04.2019 has sought information on 11 points regarding rules/regulations for taking decision of issuing charge sheet No.25,26,27,28 & 29 relating to providing unauthorized AP connection and other information concerning the office of Director Administration, PSPCL Patiala. The appellant was not satisfied with the reply of the PIO dated 29.05.2019 from after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 04.06.2019 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case was first heard on 24.12.2019. Sh.Nachattar Singh, SDO PSPCL Lehra Gaga was present who pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant was not satisfied.

Having gone through the file and hearing both the parties, the PIO-Director Administration, PSPCL Patiala was directed to provide the information as per available record within 10 days. The PIO was also directed to be present on the next date of hearing.

The case was last came up for hearing on 28.05.2020 through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. Both the parties were absent. The case was adjourned.

Hearing dated 20.07.2020:

The case has come up for hearing through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. The respondent is absent and vide email has sought adjournment due to announcement of protests by various Kissan Unions. The appellant is also absent and vide email has sought adjournment.

The earlier order stands. The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **21.09.2020 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Patiala.

Chandigarh
Dated 20.07.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh Karamjit Singh, S/o sh Maghar Singh,
1169, Khanna Nagar, Bye Pass Road,
Lehra Gaga, Distt Sangrur.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Director Administrator,
PSPCL, Patiala.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Chief Engineer, H.O,
PSPCL, Patiala.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3286 of 2019

PRESENT: **None for the Appellant**
 None for the Respondent

ORDER:

This order may be considered in continuation to the earlier order.

The case was first heard on 24.12.2019. The respondent pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant was not satisfied and stated that the reply has not been given from the PIO of the office from which he has sought the information.

The PIO-Director Administration, PSPCL Patiala was directed to relook at the RTI application and respond all the points of the RTI application and provide the information as per available record. The PIO was also directed to be present on the next date of hearing.

The case came up for hearing again on 29.05.2020 through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Patiala. Both the parties were absent. The case was djourned.

Hearing dated 20.07.2020:

The case has come up for hearing through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. The respondent is absent and vide email has sought adjournment due to announcement of protests by various Kissan Unions. The appellant is also absent and vide email has sought adjournment.

The earlier order stands. The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **21.09.2020 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Patiala.

Chandigarh,
Dated:20.07.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

Sh.Bhupinder Singh, S/o Sh Gurjail Singh,
Village Bahmna Basti,
Tehsil Samana, Distt Patiala.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o DC,
Patiala.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Commissioner, Patiala Division,
Patiala.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 411 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Bhupinder Singh as the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER:

This order should be read in continuation to the earlier order.

During the hearing on 04.11.2019, the respondent stated that the information regarding point-1 is not available in their record and it might be available with the office of Director Land Records, Punjab, Kapurthala Road, Jalandhar. The respondent further stated that information regarding point-2 is also not available in their record and it may be available in PWD office. The PIO-Director Land Record, Kapurthala Road, Jalandhar and the PIO-PWD(B&R), Patiala were impleaded in the case and directed to look at the RTI application and provide the relevant information to the appellant.

On the date of hearing on **15.01.2020**, the appellant claimed that no information has been provided to him. The PIO-Director Land Record, Kapurthala Road, Jalandhar and the PIO-PWD(B&R), Patiala were absent. The PIO-Director Land Record, Kapurthala Road, Jalandhar and the PIO-PWD(B&R), Patiala were given one more opportunity to look at the RTI application and provide the information as per the RTI application and be present on the next date of hearing.

The case came up for further hearing on **29.05.2020** through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. The Commission received a letter diary No.2166 on 31.01.2020 from the PIO-Director Land Record stating that they have sent the available information to the appellant concerning them vide letter dated 28.01.2020 and a copy sent to the Commission.

The respondent present from the office of PWD informed that they had not received the copy of RTI application. The appellant provided a copy of the RTI application to the respondent during the hearing. The PIO-PWD(B&R) was directed to look at the RTI application and provide the information whatever available in the record to the appellant as per the RTI ACT.

Hearing dated 20.07.2020:

The case has come up for hearing through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. The appellant claims that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent from PWD is absent.

The earlier order stands. The PIO-PWD(B&R) is directed to provide the information within 10 days and send a compliance report to the Commission otherwise the Commission will be constrained to take action against the PIO under section 20 of the RTI Act.

To come up for further hearing on **21.09.2020 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Patiala.

Chandigarh
Dated:20.07.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

Note:Sh.Harinder Singh, JE O/o PWD(B&R) appeared late and informed that he has brought the information. He was directed to send the information to the appellant through registered post with a copy to the Commission.

**CC to:1. PIO-Director Land Records,
Kapurthala Road, Jalandhar**

2. PIO-PWD(B&R), Patiala

Sh.Ramdhan Singh, S/o Sh Atma Singh,
Village Todarwal, P.O Babarpur,
Tehsil Nabha, Distt Patiala..

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o SSP,
Patiala.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o IGP, Zonal-1,
Patiala.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No.457 of 2019

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER:

This order should be treated in continuation to the earlier order.

On the date of hearing of **29.07.2019**, having gone through the RTI application and hearing both the parties, the following was concluded:

- | | | |
|----------------------|---|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| - Points-1, 4, 6 & 7 | - | Provided |
| - Point-3 | - | PIO to provide investigation report |
| - Point-5 | - | PIO to provide relevant document |
| - Point-2 | - | The appellant has informed that the said tree was declared dangerous and an order was issued to cut the tree. The appellant to submit copy of that document. To be adjudicated on the next date of hearing. |

On the date of hearing on **06.11.2019**, both the parties were absent. The case was adjourned.

The case was again heard on **15.01.2020** The respondent present informed that the remaining information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant stated that he has not received the information on point-3 and is not satisfied with the reply relating to points 4 & 7. Hearing both the parties, the PIO was directed to provide/clarify the following:

- | | | |
|-----------|---|------------------------------------------------|
| - Point-3 | : | PIO to provide investigation report |
| - Point-4 | - | PIO to give in writing that no arrest was made |
| - Point-7 | - | PIO to clarify this point |

The case was last heard on **28.05.2020** through video conferencing at DAC, Patiala. The appellant informed that the PIO has not provided the information on point 3. The respondent pleaded that the investigation report has been presented in the court and the information cannot be provided as it is no longer in their custody.

The appellant pleaded that they have verified from the court whether their challan has been presented and as per them, the court records, which they checked, it indicates that the record is yet to be submitted.

The Police was asked to recheck its record. If the record is found, the police should file a reply stating what information it can provide and what it cannot, by citing the relevant exemptions of the RTI Act. The PIO was directed to procure an affidavit from the SSP stating the correct position of the status of the case file once it is submitted in the court.

Whether the custody of the file is no longer with the police and that it does not have any duplicate document in its custody.

Hearing dated 20.07.2020:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC, Patiala

Both the parties are absent. The earlier order stands. The case is adjourned.

To come up for further hearing on **21.09.2020 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Patiala.

Chandigarh
Dated:20.07.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh Rachana Devi,
127, Phulkian Enclave,
Patiala.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o EO, BDA,
Bathinda.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Addl, Chief Administrator,
BDA, Bathinda.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 2018 of 2019

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER: The case was first heard on 21.10.2019. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been supplied to the appellant vide letter dated 18.03.2019. The appellant was not satisfied on points a, c & d. The respondent further pleaded that the concerned dealing person is on medical leave due to illness. The appellant stated that he filed RTI application on 31.12.2018 and even after a lapse of nine months, he has not been provided the complete information.

Having gone through the record, the Commission observed that the information stands provided on points b, c & e. However, there was an enormous delay in providing the information, the PIO was issued **show cause notice and directed to file reply on an affidavit**. The PIO was again directed to provide the information on points a & d within 10 days and send a compliance report to the Commission.

The case was last heard on **08.01.2020**. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant. The PIO however, did not respond to the show cause notice. At the hearing, the representative of the PIO stated that at the time of filing RTI application, Sh.Amarjit Singh was the PIO who has since retired. The PIO at the time of issue of show cause was Sh.Vinod Bansal in the capacity of EO-BDA Bathinda. The EO-BDA has not responded to the show cause.

A last opportunity was given to the PIO to file written reply to the show cause notice issued for delay in providing the information, otherwise the Commission would be constrained to take a view that the PIO has nothing to say in the matter and would take decision as per the RTI Act.

The case last came up for hearing on **28.05.2020** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Patiala. The PIO was absent. Sh.Gurpreet Singh representing the PIO on Mobile W/S video sent a reply via email on behalf of the PIO which was taken in the file of the Commission. The reply was not from the PIO.

In the reply, the respondent mentioned that at the time of RTI application, Sh.Udaydeep Singh Sidhu, PCS was the EO-cum-PIO for the period from Jan.2019 to July, 2019 and Sh.Vinod Bansal, PCS was PIO-cum-EO from Oct 2019 to Dec.2019 and at present the post of PIO-cum-EO BDA is lying vacant after the transfer of Sh.Vinod Bansal. The respondent had not informed the present posting of these officers.

The respondent was directed to clarify –

- Who was the PIO when the RTI application was filed;
- Who was the PIO when the show cause notice was issued.

Appeal Case No. 2018 of 2019

Hearing dated 20.07.2020:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. Both the parties are absent. The appellant vide email has informed that she has received the information but with a delay of more than one year.

The Commission has received a letter diary No.6607 on 15.06.2020 from APIO-cum-Assstt.Estate Officer, BDA regarding period of stay of the officers as PIO-cum-Estate officer from the date of filing of RTI which is taken on the file of the Commission. Having gone through the letter, it is observed that Sh.Udaydeep Singh was the PIO for maximum period when the RTI application was filed and Sh.Vinod Bansal was the PIO receiving the Commission's orders to provide the information.

As per information given by the APIO-cum-AEO,BDA, Sh.Vinod Kumar Bansal is presented posted as Assistant Commissioner (General) Ludhiana and Sh.Udaydeep Singh is posted as Director Lotteries, Punjab at Chandigarh

Since both the officers who have served as PIOs on different times, have failed to implement the RTI Act, the Commission hereby directs both the PIOs Sh.Vinod Kumar Bansal and Sh.Udaydeep Singh Sidhu to **show cause why penalty be not imposed on them under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 for not supplying the information within the statutorily prescribed period of time.** He/she should file an affidavit in this regard. If there are other persons responsible for the delay in providing the information, the PIO is directed to inform such persons of the show cause and direct them to appear before the Commission along with the written replies.

The Commission also observes that the appellant has had to suffer undue inconvenience to get the information, it is a fit case for awarding compensation to the appellant u/s 19(8)(b) of the RTI Act.

The PIO is directed to pay an amount of **Rs.3000/-** via demand draft drawn through Govt. Treasury as compensation to the appellant for the loss and detriment suffered by him of having to file the appeals and not getting information in time. The PIO is directed to duly inform the Commission of the compliance of the order and submit proof of having compensated the appellant.

To come up for further hearing on **21.09.2020 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Patiala.

Chandigarh
Dated:20.07.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

CC to: 1. Sh.Vinod Kumar Bansal,
Assistant Commissioner(General),
Ludhiana(Earlier PIO-cum-EO, BDA)

2. Sh.Udaydeep Singh Sidhu,
Director, Punjab State Lotteries,
Yojna Bhawan, Sector 33-A,
Chandigarh.(Earlier PIO-cum-EO, BDA)

Dr. Arvinder Pal Kaur.
H No-B-2/1139, Lehal Colony,
Patiala.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Chairman-cum-Managing Director,
PSPCL, Patiala.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Pr. Secretary,
Deptt of Power Govt of Punjab,
Chandigarh.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 2088 of 2019

PRESENT: Dr. Bhupinder Pal Singh on behalf of the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on 22.10.2019. The respondent present from the office of Department of Power, Govt of Punjab pleaded that since the information relates to the office of Chairman-cum-Managing Director, PSPCL Patiala, the RTI application was transferred to them on 04.01.2019. The respondent present from the office of PSPCL Patiala brought the information and handed over to the appellant.

The appellant was not satisfied and stated that the information is incomplete. Having gone through the RTI application and the information provided by the respondent, following was concluded:

Points-8	-	Not required
Point-9	-	To provide
Points-13, 16, 17, 18, 21	-	To provide whatever the information is available on Record
Points-24 & 25	-	PIO to procure and provide

Rest of the information had been provided. The appellant was directed to go through the information and point out the discrepancies, if any at the next date of hearing.

The case was again heard on **08.01.2020**. The appellant pointed out the discrepancies. The respondent provided the information on points- 9, 13 & 25.

Regarding point-16, the PIO-Powercom was directed to provide whatever the document is available which defines the powers of the Administrative Secretary.

Points 17 & 18:	The respondent stated that the information is not available. The PIO was directed to give this in writing on an affidavit.
Point No.24	The PIO to remove the anomaly.

The case was last heard on **28.05.2020**. The respondent present from the office of PSPCL Patiala provided the information on point-24 during the hearing. The representative present for the appellant was not satisfied with the affidavit regarding points 17 & 18. The representative has also approached the Commission about the inadequacy of few more points. The respondent from Powercom was absent. Hearing both the parties, following was directed:

- | | |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------------------------|
| - Point-17 & 18 | - The PIO to provide proper affidavit duly attested. |
| - Point – 16 | - PIO-Powercom to provide |
| - Point-13 | - To provide whatever instruction is available |
| - Point-10 | - PIO to procure from the concerned person and provide |
| - Point-12 | - To provide link |

Hearing dated 20.07.2020:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. The representative present on behalf of the appellant informed that they have received the information on point-12 but the PIO has not supplied the information on points 10 & 13. The appellant further informed that the affidavit regarding information relating to points-17 & 18 provided by the PIO is not in proper form and the copy of information regarding point-16 is not legible.

The respondent is absent. The PIO is directed to provide legible certified copies of information on points 10 & 13. The PIO is also directed to provide affidavit regarding points 17 & 18 in a proper form and legible copy of information regarding point-16.

To come up for further hearing on **21.09.2020 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Patiala.

Chandigarh
Dated 20.07.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

Note: Sh. Kamalpreet Singh, Deputy Manager, PSPCL appeared late. He was informed the status of hearing and directed to provide information as per order.



Sh Sukhchain Singh, s/o Sh Gurcharan Singh,
Patti Mahian, Opp Water Tanki,
VPO Bhawanigarh, Distt Sangrur.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Punjab Pollution Control Board,
Patiala.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Punjab Pollution Control Board,
Patiala.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 4435 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Sukhchain Singh as the Appellant
Sh.Harjit Singh, PIO for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on 12.03.202. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent was absent. The PIO was directed to provide whatever action has been taken on the complaint of the appellant.

Sh.Simarpreet Singh, JE appeared late and brought information. He was directed to send the information to the appellant through registered post. A copy of the information was attached with the order for the appellant.

The case came up for further hearing on **29.05.2020** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Patiala.

The respondent present pleaded that the information has been supplied to the appellant. The representative appeared on behalf of the appellant informed that the copy of NOC issued to the school has not been provided. The respondent informed that NOC was not issued and no such information is available.

Having gone through the record, the Commission observed that there has been enormous delay of more than eight months in providing the information and directed the PIO to **show cause why penalty be not imposed on him under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 for not supplying the information within the statutorily prescribed period of time. The PIO was directed to file reply on an affidavit.**

Hearing dated 20.07.2020:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant and the appellant has received the information.

The respondent further informed that the appellant had filed RTI application in the office of Punjab Pollution Control Board, Patiala on 31.07.2019 which was received by their office on 16.08.2019 from PPCB Patiala and the reply was sent to the appellant on 13.09.2019. The respondent further informed that since no NOC was issued to the school, the copy of NOC was not available in their record, hence the same was not provided. The respondent again pleaded that he has already submitted an affidavit in this regard.

Appeal Case No. 4435 of 2019

Having gone through the affidavit, it is observed that the RTI application was filed on 31.07.2019 which was received by the PIO on 16.08.2019 and the information was sent to the appellant on 13.09.2019 with a delay of 13 days. I feel that the RTI application was attended by the PIO without any malafide intention and delay is not due to any malafide reason or for the reason to hold back the information. The information has rather been provided to the best possible extent as the appellant is pursuing information that is not in existence (NOC). Hence the minor delay of 13 days is condoned and the show cause is dropped.

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

Chandigarh
Dated 20.07.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

Smt Avtar Kaur, D/o Sh. Surinder Singh,
Village Neelpur, Tehsil Rajpura,
Distt Patiala. .

....Appellant

Vs

Public Information Officer,
O/o SSP,
Patiala.

First Appellate Authority
O/o IGP, Patiala Range,
Patiala.

.....Respondent

Appeal Case .No. 4481 of 2019

PRESENT: Smt. Avtar Kaur as the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 20.06.2019 has sought information regarding enquiry report on FIR No.46 dated 27.02.2018 Police Station City Rajpura alongwith statement of witnesses and other information concerning the office of SSP Patiala. The appellant was not satisfied with the reply of the PIO dated 09.07.2019 after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 22.08.2019 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case came up for hearing last on 29.05.2020 through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Patiala. The respondent present pleaded that since the case after completion of enquiry report has been presented in the court, the appellant to get the information from the court. The appellant claimed that they have checked from the Civil Court and as per information, the case for cancellation of FIR has not been presented in the court.

The respondent was directed to relook at the RTI application and if the information is in the custody of the police, the same be provided to the appellant within 10 days

Hearing dated 20.07.2020:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. The appellant informed that the police has not submitted the case for cancellation of FIR in the court. The respondent is absent and vide email has sought adjournment.

The earlier order stands. The PIO is directed to comply with the earlier order of the Commission and provide the information to the appellant under the RTI Act.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **21.09.2020 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Patiala.

Chandigarh
Dated 20.07.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

Sh.Jasbir Singh, S/o Sh Harbans Singh,
Village Jalal Khera, P.O Sular ,
Dist Patiala.

....Appellant

Vs

Public Information Officer,
O/o SSP,
Patiala.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o SSP,
Patiala.

.....Respondent

Appeal Case .No. 4583 of 2019

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 16.09.2019 has sought information regarding FIR No.125 filed against Jasbir Singh and Harbans Singh on 07.08.2014 and other information concerning the office of SSP Patiala. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 21.10.2019 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case came up for hearing on 29.05.2020 through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Patiala. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent present pleaded that since the case after completion of enquiry report has been presented in the court, the appellant to get the information from the court. The copy of FIR had been provided to the appellant.

The PIO-SSP was directed to relook at the RTI application and reply that under the RTI Act), under whose custody this information lies and how can the petitioner obtain it.

Hearing dated 20.07.2020:

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

To come up for further hearing on **21.09.2020 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Patiala.

Chandigarh
Dated 20.07.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

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



Sh.Jasbir Singh, S/o Sh Harbans Singh,
Village Jalal Khera, P.O Sular ,
Dist Patiala.

.....Appellant

Vs

Public Information Officer,
O/o SSP,
Patiala.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o SSP,
Patiala.

.....Respondent

Appeal Case .No. 4584 of 2019

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 16.09.2019 has sought information regarding copy of complaint No.1032 CPRC dated 07.06.2014 filed by Sh.Sohan Singh against Jasbir Singh and Harbans Singh and other information concerning the office of SSP Patiala. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 21.10.2019 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case came up for hearing on 29.05.2020 through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Patiala. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent present pleaded that since the case after completion of enquiry report has been presented in the court, the appellant to get the information from the court. The copy of FIR had been provided to the appellant.

The PIO-SSP was directed to relook at the RTI application and reply that under whose custody this information lies and how can the petitioner obtain it.

Hearing dated 20.07.2020:

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

To come up for further hearing on **21.09.2020 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Patiala.

Chandigarh
Dated 20.07.2020

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. Jasbir Singh,
Village Bholapur Jhabewal,
PO Ramgarh , Distt Ludhiana.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o SSP,
Patiala.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o SSP,
Patiala.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 2963 of 2019

**PRESENT: None for the Appellant
 None for the Respondent**

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 17.05.2019 has sought information regarding status report of FIR No.88 dated 18.03.2014 – Police Station Tripti, Patiala alongwith copy of challan and other information concerning the office of SSP Patiala. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 17.06.2019 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case was first heard on **18.12.2019**. The respondent present pleaded that challan has already been presented in the court and the appellant has been sent reply vide letter dated 20.06.2019, hence the information cannot be provided. The appellant was absent and vide email sought exemption. The appellant was directed to send his observations in writing to the Commission.

The case was again heard on **17.02.2020**. The respondent present pleaded that since the challan alongwith complete record has been presented in the court, the information cannot be provided.

The appellant claimed that the PIO vide letter dated 09.07.2019 had denied the information stating that the information is 3rd party. The PIO was directed to respond to the RTI application appropriately.

The case was last heard on **28.05.2020**. The respondent pleaded that the challan has been presented in the court and the appellant may get the information from the court. The respondent also pleaded that the information asked for pertains to third party and hence cannot be provided.

Hearing dated 20.07.2020:

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

To come up for further hearing on **21.09.2020 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Patiala.

**Chandigarh
Dated 20.07.2020**

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner