



Smt Meena Kumari (98556-68191),  
H No-917, Street No-13, Tripari Town,  
Patiala.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o Dean, Research,  
Punjabi University, Patiala.

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

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 3230 of 2017**

**PRESENT:**

**Sh.S.P.Verma for the Appellant**

**Sh.Angel Sharma, Advocate for the Respondent**

**Order:** This order should be considered in continuation to the earlier order.

The appellant through RTI application dated 18.08.2017 sought information regarding Ph.D. Law Degree Course from the PIO-Punjabi University, Patiala. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 06.09.2017 which took no decision on the appeal. On having received no response of the First Appellate Authority, the appellant filed 2<sup>nd</sup> appeal in the Commission on 14.10.2017.

The case was first heard by Sh.Hem Inder Singh, State Information Commissioner on 17.01.2018. The advocate appeared on behalf of the respondent said that the information has been supplied to the appellant vide letter dated 08.01.2018. The appellant was absent and the case was adjourned.

On the next date of hearing which was held on 14.03.2018, the representative appeared on behalf of the appellant informed that the information was incorrect and incomplete. The counsel for the respondent stated that the information is voluminous and after discussions, the appellant was directed to inspect the record and get the relevant information.

The case was continuously heard by Sh.Hem Inder Singh, SIC on 02.05.2018, 10.05.2018, 31.05.2018, 10.07.2018, 08.08.2018, 17.10.2018, 14.11.2018, 18.12.2018, 29.01.2019 but the appellant was not provided the complete information.

On the date of hearing of 26.02.2019, the advocate appeared on behalf of the respondent stated that the information as available on the record of the public authority has already been supplied to the appellant. However, the representative appeared on behalf of the appellant was not satisfied and requested the Commission to direct the respondents to furnish a duly attested affidavit under the signature of respondent-PIO that the information, as available has been supplied and no further information is available in their record. The representative further requested that the respondent has taken 18 months to supply the information and he may be compensated accordingly.

**Appeal Case No. 3230 of 2017**

The respondent was directed to furnish a duly attested affidavit, under the signature of respondent-PIO, that the available information has been supplied to the appellant and no more information is there on the record of the public authority.

Having gone through the record, the Commission observes that the information was not supplied by the PIO to the appellant even after a lapse of 18 months and in view of the loss and detriment suffered by the appellant in obtaining the information, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 19(8)(b) of the RTI Act, 2005, a compensation of Rs.4000/- was awarded to Ms.Meena Kumar, appellant, to be paid by the Public Authority i.e. Punjabi University, Patiala through Bank Draft, within 30 days and confirmation to this effect would be furnished to the Commission.

On the date of hearing of 23.04.2019, the advocate appeared on behalf of the respondent submitted an affidavit which was handed over to the representative of the appellant. The representative of the appellant however informed that the PIO has not been paid the compensation amount. The advocate for the respondent requested for reconsideration of the order of compensation. The case was discussed and after discussion, the appellant was directed to submit her reply with regard to the affidavit and the case was adjourned.

On the next date of hearing on 06.08.2019, the representative of the appellant informed that neither complete information nor compensation amount of Rs.4000/- was provided to the appellant. He further submitted a written reply in this regard.

The advocate for the respondent requested to review the order dated 26.02.2019 regarding compensation amount of Rs.4000/-.

Without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the case file was sent to Deputy Registrar to place it before the Hon'ble Chief Information Commissioner to constitute a larger bench. Accordingly, a full bench comprising of State Information Commissioners Sh.Nidharak Singh Brar, Sh.Hem Inder Singh and Sh.Sanjiv Garg was constituted and the case was heard by this bench on 07.11.2019.

On the date of hearing on 07.11.2019, both the parties were present. Sh.S.P.Verma was present for the appellant and Sh.Angel Sharma, advocate was present on behalf of the respondents. Sh.S.P.Verma, representing the appellant submitted a letter dated 07.11.2019 before the bench addressed to the Hon'ble Chief Information Commissioner with a copy to this bench. As per this letter, the appellant did not want the case to be heard by this bench and stated that Sh.Hem Inder Singh, State Information Commissioner cannot review its order dated 26.02.2019 and Sh.Nidharak Singh Brar, State Information Commissioner had not considered her submissions in her earlier cases heard by him.

Keeping this in view, it was decided to send back this case to the Hon'ble Chief Information Commissioner for further orders. Accordingly, this bench was constituted vide order dated 03.12.2019 of the Hon'ble Chief Information Commissioner and a fresh notice was issued to both the parties on 09.01.2020.

The case has come up for hearing before this bench today. Both the parties are present. Sh.S.P.Verma appeared on behalf of the appellant pleaded that the decision of the information commission cannot be reviewed and has cited order of the Central Information Commission as well as notification of the Central Information Commission.

Having gone through the record and hearing both the parties, the Bench observed that the RTI application was filed on 18.08.2017 and the first reply was sent to the appellant on 05.09.2017 whereby the PIO denied the information. However, after the appellant came to the Commission, the documents were supplied, which clearly indicates that the information was existing but the same was blanketly denied by the PIO.

Keeping the above in view, the bench see no further course of action and uphold the order of Sh.Hem Inder Singh, State Information Commissioner.

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

**Sd/-  
(Asit Jolly)  
State Information Commissioner**

**Sd/-  
(Sanjiv Garg)  
State Information Commissioner**

**Chandigarh  
Dated: 21.01.2020**

**Sd/-  
(Khushwant Singh)  
State Information Commissioner**