

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. Mohan Mittal,
H No-815, Ahata Badan Singh,
Moga.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Commissioner, MC,
Moga.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Commissioner, MC,
Moga.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 580 of 2019

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
Sh.Gautam Kumar, PIO for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on **24.06.2019**. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the complete information. The respondent was absent. Having gone through the RTI application and the reply of the PIO, the Commission found that the appellant in point no.2 has sought that if any document exists that establishes the status of the encroachment being regularized. The PIO was directed to provide, if any document has been created to assess the encroachment, or any such document that exists which regularizes such encroachment.

The case was again heard on **26.08.2019**. The appellant was absent and vide email informed that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent was absent. In the interest of justice, one more opportunity was granted and the PIO was directed to comply with the earlier order which still stands and be present on the next date of hearing alongwith the explanation for not complying with the order of the Commission.

The case was last heard on **05.12.2019**. Both the parties were absent. The appellant vide email informed that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent was absent on three consecutive hearings nor has complied with the order of the Commission. 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 to the appellant within 10 days.

Hearing dated 21.01.2020:

The respondent present informed that the reply was sent to the appellant through messenger but the appellant refused to accept the reply. The respondent has submitted a copy of the reply to the Commission. The respondent has also submitted reply to the show cause notice which is taken on the file of the Commission. Having gone through the reply, there appears to be no malafide on the part of the PIO and the show cause is dropped.

The appellant is absent. A copy of the information is being attached with the order for the appellant. The appellant is directed to point out the discrepancy if any in writing and be present on the next date of hearing.

To come up for further hearing on **24.03.2020 at 11.00 AM.**

Chandigarh
Dated 21.01.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



registered post

Sh. Jagbir Singh. s/o Sh Harjinder Singh,
VPO Fatehpur Rajputan,
Distt Amritsar.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o SDM,
Amritsar-1.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o SDM,
Amritsar-1.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 628 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Jagbir Singh as the Appeellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard by Sh.S.S.Channay, Chief Information Commissioner on 27.03.2019. The respondent submitted a letter dated 26.03.2019 from APIO-cum-Tehsildar Amritsar-1 stating that the requisite information has been provided. A copy of same was handed over to the appellant and the appellant was directed to send his observations, if any, to the PIO and the respondent was directed to send reply to the appellant.

The case was again heard on 22.08.2019 by this bench. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information as per the RTI application. The respondent present from the office of SDM Amritsar-1 informed that the information is in the custody of the PIO-Tehsildar Amritsar-1 and they have already transferred the RTI application to them vide letter dated 27.07.2018. The PIO-Tehsildar Amritsar-1 was absent. The PIO-SDM was exempted. The PIO-Tehsildar Amritsar was directed to provide the information as per the RTI application within 10 days otherwise the Commission will be constrained to take action as per the RTI Act.

Sh.Arinder Singh O/o Tehsildar Amritsar-1 appeared late and submitted a letter from the PIO dated 26.04.2019 stating that the correction in the Fard can only be done with the order of the Civil Court and the appellant has been informed of the same.

The case was last heard on **25.11.2019**. The respondent present from the office of Tehsildar Amritsar-1 submitted reply of the PIO dated 20.11.2019 vide which the PIO had denied the information stating that the information is in question form. Having gone through the RTI application and hearing both the parties, the Commission found that the appellant had simply asked for the action taken on his application submitted to the Tehsildar on 15.05.2017 for correction in the fard and report of field staff dated 25.05.2017.

The PIO-Tehsildar Amritsar-1 was directed to provide action taken report and report of field staff as well as to provide whatever the document is available on record as per the RTI application.

Hearing dated 21.01.2020:

The appellant claims that the PIO has not provided the information. The PIO-Tehsildar Amritsar-1 is absent nor has complied with the order of the Commission. The Commission has taken a serious view of this and hereby directs the PIO-Tehsildar Amritsar-1 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.** 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 PIO is again directed to provide the information to the appellant within 10 days.

To come up for further hearing on **31.03.2020 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Amritsar. Copies of order be sent to both the parties through registered post.

Chandigarh
Dated 21.01.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh.Rajwinder Singh, S/o ShKarnail Singh,
R/o village Karm Patti, Tehsil Malout,
Distt Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o SSP,
Sri Mukatsar Sahib .

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

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 2090 of 2019

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
Sh.Anil Rattan, constable –Vigilance,Pb Mohali for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 04.12.2018 has sought information on 9 points regarding action taken on complaint dated 16.08.2018 filed against Sarpanch Baljit Kaur & her husband Sh.Jagdeep Singh Panchayat Secretary for misappropriation of funds and other information concerning the office of SSP Sri Mukatsar Sahib. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed a first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 23.01.2019, which took no decision on the appeal.

The case was last heard on 22.10.2019. The respondent present from the office of SSP Sri Mukatsar Sahib pleaded that the information relates to the office of Vigilance Bureau. The Commission also received a letter diary No.19116 on 04.10.2019 from the PIO-cum-SSP Sri Mukatsar Sahib whereby the PIO informed that since the information relates to the office of Vigilance Bureau, the information had to be provided by the Chief Officer, Thana Vigilance Bureau Ferozepur or Police Commissioner, Vigilance Bureau, Ferozepur.

The PIO had not transferred the RTI application to the concerned PIO. The respondent present from the office of Vigilance Bureau, Mohali informed that they have not received RTI application. A copy of the RTI application was handed over to the respondent. The respondent was directed to respond to the RTI application within three weeks and send a compliance report to the Commission.

Hearing dated 21.01.2020:

The respondent present from the office of Vigilance Bureau, Mohali informed that they have already written to the Secretary, Government of Punjab, Intelligence Wing, Chandigarh to grant necessary approval for initiating enquiry against Sh.Daya Singh, Panchayat Secretary but the same has not yet been received and the reply has been sent to the appellant. A copy of the same is submitted to the Commission.

The appellant is absent on 2nd consecutive hearing nor has pointed out any discrepancy in writing. Having gone through the reply of the PIO, the Commission finds that the RTI has been sufficiently answered and no further course of action is required.

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

Chandigarh
Dated 21.01.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh. Hardeep Singh. S/o Sh Tarsem Lal,
R/o Village Nurpur, Block Aur,
Tehsil Banga, Distt SBS Nagar.

... Appellant

Versus

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

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

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 2700 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Hardeep Singh as the Appellant
Sh.Maninderjit Singh, JE-Punjab Pollution Control Board, Hoshiarpur for
the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was last heard on 16.12.2019. The respondent present informed that the challan books are issued to the team constituted by the District Administration and they are collecting the challan books from the team members and on receipt of the challan books, the information will be provided to the appellant. The appellant was absent. The PIO was directed to provide the information to the appellant before the next date of hearing and send a compliance report to the Commission.

Hearing dated 21.01.2020:

The respondent present pleaded that the information is available in the custody of the Agriculture officer, Aur who is the Nodal officer of the teams constituted by the District Administration to check the sites of the stubble burning and to fine the violators accordingly. The Nodal Officer, Department of Agriculture, Punjab, Block Aur is impleaded in the case and directed to look at the RTI application and provide the information to the appellant. A copy of the RTI application is being attached with the order for the PIO-Nodel Officer, Department of Agriculture Block Aur Distt.Nawanshahar.

The Commission however observes that the Pollution Control Board has not handled the RTI application appropriately since it should have been transferred to the concerned department under section 6(3) of the RTI Act which they did not transfer. It is a grave negligence on the part of the Pollution Control Board. The PIO-Pollution Control Board is directed to be present personally on the next date of hearing and explain the reasons for not transferring the RTI application to the concerned department.

To come up for further hearing on **31.03.2020 at 11.00 AM.**

Chandigarh
Dated 21.01.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

CC to: Nodal Officer, Department of Agriculture, Pb
Block Aur, Distt.Nawanshahar.

Sh Rohit Sabharwal,
Kundan Bhawan, 126, Model Gram.
Ludhiana.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Chief Environment Engineer,
Punjab Pollution Control Board,
Ludhiana.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Sr. Environment Engineer,
Punjab Pollution Control Board,
Zonal Office-1, Ludhiana.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1664 of 2019

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
Sh.Shiva Khurmi, Advocate for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was last heard on 14.11.2019. The appellant was absent and vide email through his counsel informed that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent submitted a reply of the PIO which was taken on the file of the Commission.

Having gone through the file, the Commission observed that there are two different replies of the PIO. In one reply which was sent on 25.02.2019, the PIO had mentioned that all large and medium industries which are covered under Hazardous wastes have submitted annual reports to the Board whereas in the 2nd reply which was sent on 25.03.2019, the PIO had mentioned that no separate record is being maintained and they are unable to provide the information. The Commission found the reply to be wishy-washy and directed the PIO to clarify and if such information exists on record, to provide the information.

Hearing dated 21.01.2020:

The appellant is absent and vide letter received in the Commission on 17.01.2020 through his counsel, has sent written submission.

The advocate representing the PIO has submitted a reply of the PIO dated 20.01.2020 which is taken on the file of the Commission. The PIO in the reply has mentioned that the information sought by the appellant is not readily available and has asked for some more time. The plea is accepted and the PIO is directed to provide the information to the appellant within 35 days of the issue of this order.

The case is adjourned for further hearing on **01.04.2020 at 11.00 AM.**

Chandigarh
Dated 21.01.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Smt Suman. W/o Sh Satish Kumar,
H O-1384, Ground Floor, Sector-39-B,
Chandigarh.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Estab Administrative Officer,
PUDA, Mohali.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Chief Administrative,
PUDA, Mohali.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 2412 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Satish Kumar husband of Smt.Suman for the Appellant
Sh.Balwinder Singh, Superintendent, GMADA for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 28.03.2019 has sought information on 10 points regarding Guru Nanak Enclave Lalru comprising name of developer, number of applicants, NOC issued and other information concerning the office of Estate Officer, PUDA Mohali. The appellant was asked vide letter dated 09.04.2019 by the PIO to provide ID proof which the appellant deposited with the PIO. However, the appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed First appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 29.04.2019 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case was last heard on 11.12.2019. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent present pleaded that the information is 3rd party and they have sought consent of 3rd party vide letter dated 05.12.2019 which is still awaited.

The Commission observed that there has been an enormous delay in providing the information and directed the PIO to provide the information to the appellant within 15 days which is available in material form and send a compliance report to the Commission.

Hearing dated 21.01.2020:

The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant on 09.01.2020 and a copy of the same is submitted to the Commission.

The appellant is not satisfied with the reply of the PIO regarding points 4,5,6 & 7. The respondent says that the information on these points is not available. The PIO is directed to give this in writing on an affidavit within a week and send a compliance report to the Commission.

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

Chandigarh
Dated 21.01.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh Narinder Singh,
7113, Sector-125,
New Sunny Enclave,
Greater Mohali.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o The Bharat Scouts and Guides,
Head Quarter, Punjab University,
Pb, Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o State Chief Commissioner,
The Bharat Scouts and Guides,
Head Quarter, Punjab University,
Pb, Chandigarh.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 2513 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Narinder Singh as the Appellant
Sh.Roshan Singh, State Secretary for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was last heard on 11.12.2019. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant on 24.04.2019 and again on 06.12.2019, a copy of which is submitted to the Commission. The appellant was not satisfied with the information relating to points 1,3, 4, 7 & 8. Having gone through the information and hearing both the parties, following was concluded:

- Point-1 - PIO to provide proceedings of meeting dated 20.12.2015 and the information already supplied be certified.
- Point-3 - PIO to provide annual reports for the year 2013-14 & 2014-15. If not Available, to give in writing on an affidavit.
- Point-4 - PIO to provide audit reports for the year 2014-15. If not available to give in writing on an affidavit.
- Point-7 - To give in writing on an affidavit, if not available
- Point-8 - To give list only.

Hearing dated 21.01.2020:

The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant. 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 21.01.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh Narinder Singh,
7113, Sector 125, New Sunny Enclave,
Mohali.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o The Bharat Scouts and Guides Head Quarter,
Punjab University, Pb, Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o State Chief Commissioner,
O/o The Bharat Scouts and Guides Head Quarter,
Punjab University, Pb, Chandigarh.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 2574 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Narinder Singh as the Appellant
Sh.Roshan Singh, State Secretary for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was last heard on 16.12.2019. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 13.12.2019 and a copy of the same is submitted to the Commission. The appellant was not satisfied. Having gone through the RTI application and the information supplied by the PIO and hearing both the parties, the following was concluded:

- Point-1 - PIO has denied the information stating that the record is not available. The PIO is directed to conduct an enquiry into the matter and submit an enquiry report which establishes that the record is missing or stands destroyed.
- Point-2, 3 & 5 - Earlier denied using section 8(e)(j), now provided during the Hearing
- Point-4 - Earlier denied using section 8(e)(j), now provided during the hearing. The appellant is not satisfied. PIO to provide copy of budget

Having gone through the reply of the PIO, it was observed that the PIO is using section 8(e)(j) to stonewall the information with a malafide intention and has now provided the information after the notice of the Commission. To establish whether the information was stonewalled by malafide intention or not, The PIO was issued a **show cause under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 and directed to file reply on and affidavit.**

Hearing dated 21.01.2020:

The respondent pleaded that the complete information has been provided to the appellant and the appellant has received the same.

In the previous hearing, the Commission had observed that the PIO had used section 8(e)(j) without applying his mind, which appeared to be an attempt to stonewall the information with a malafide intention, after which a show cause was issued to the PIO.

The respondent has submitted a reply to the show cause notice on an affidavit which is taken on the file of the Commission. In the reply, the PIO has prayed that a lenient view be taken on the ground that they did not use section 8(e)(j) with a malafide intention but it was an outcome of poor training to the PIOs by the Organization. In the reply, the PIO has stated that they were not adequately trained to handle the RTI applications and this reply was the result of incompetence.

Having gone through the reply – even though it is a reflection of the apathy and the manner in which RTI application is treated in the organization, I accept the PIO's plea for a lenient view, and hereby drop the show cause. However, this cannot be ignored and I hereby direct the Secretary, The Bharat Scouts & Guides, Punjab to immediately arrange a training programme for the PIOs in the organization, and send a compliance of the same to the Commission. .

I am also of the view that the appellant has had to suffer undue harassment while seeking information which was denied to him due to poor application of mind of the PIO.

Keeping in mind the above circumstances, I find it as 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.5000/-** 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 send proof of having compensated the appellant within 15 days.

To come up for compliance on **01.04.2020 at 11.00 AM.**

Chandigarh
Dated 21.01.2020

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. Harinder Kumar, S/o Lt Sh Shripal,
R/o H No-3485, Street NO-14, Near Nav Gyan School,
Goal Nagar, Haibowal Kalan,
Ludhiana.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Deputy Secretary,
PSPCL, Patiala.

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

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 2567 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Harinder Kumar as the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 02.04.2019 has sought information regarding complete file of pension case of Sh.Shri Pal, Sweeper who was working in PSPCL Sarapha Nagar, Ludhiana and expired on 24.07.2001 – details of salary paid to the sweeper from 01.4.2000 to 24.07.2001 and other information concerning the office of Deputy Secretary, PSPCL Patiala. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed a first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 08.05.2019 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case was last heard on 16.12.2019. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 23.05.2019. The appellant was not satisfied with the information regarding points-1 & 4. The respondent provided information on point-4 during the hearing. The respondent informed that the information regarding point-1 relates to the pension department.

The Chief Accounts Officer(Pension), PSPCL-Patiala was impleaded in the case and directed to provide the information on point-1 to the appellant. The information be provided within 15 days and send a compliance report to the Commission.

Hearing dated 21.01.2020:

The appellant claims that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent from the office of Chief Accounts Officer(Pension), PSPCL Patiala is absent. The PIO- Chief Accounts Officer(Pension), PSPCL Patiala is given one last opportunity to comply with the earlier order of the Commission which still stands and provide the information on point-1 to the appellant within 10 days. The PIO is also directed to be present on the next date of hearing with the explanation for not complying with the order of the Commission.

To come up for further hearing on **01.04.2020 at 11.00 AM.**

Chandigarh
Dated 21.01.2020

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 Prateek Soni, S/o Sh Ashwani Soni,
Kothi No- 534, Phase-1, Sector-55,
Mohali.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o EO, GMADA,
Mohali.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o EO, GMADA,
Mohali

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 2527 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Prateek Soni as the Appellant
Sh.Gulshan Kumar PIO for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 26.11.2018 has sought information regarding number of allottees to whom possession has been given by GMADA under the scheme for allotment of 235 plots in IT city Mohali and other information concerning the office of EO-GMADA Mohali. The appellant was not satisfied with the information provided by the PIO on 03.01.2019 after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 17.01.2019 which disposed off the appeal on 27.03.2019 and PIO resent the information to the appellant.

The case was last heard on 11.12.2019. The respondent present pleaded that the information has already been provided to the appellant. The appellant was not satisfied with the information regarding points 4,5 & 6. Hearing both the parties, the PIO was directed to relook at points 4, 5 & 6 and provide the information to the appellant.

Hearing dated 21.01.2020:

The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant says that the PIO has not provided the copy of the policy containing terms & conditions. Hearing both the parties, the PIO is directed to provide a copy of the first policy which was framed before the release of brochure. The information be provided within 10 days.

To come up for compliance on **01.04.2020 at 11.00 AM.**

Chandigarh
Dated 21.01.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

Sh Mohit Bindra,
H No-654, Sector-8,
Panchkula.

... Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o XEN, GMADA, C-1,
Sector-62, Mohali.

First Appellate Authority,
GMADA,
Sector-62, Mohali

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 2649 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Mohit Bindra as the Appellant
Sh.Gulshan Kumar, PIO for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on 03.09.2019. The appellant informed that in response to the PIO's letter dated 01.05.2019, he has already specified the information vide letter dated 02.05.2019, but the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent was absent. The PIO was directed to provide the information as per the RTI application and send a compliance report to the Commission.

The case was last heard on **25.11.2019**. The respondent present informed that the information has already been provided to the appellant. The appellant was absent nor had pointed out any discrepancy.

Hearing dated 21.01.2010:

The respondent present pleaded that the information has been supplied to the appellant. The appellant informed that the PIO has not provided the information but only asked vide letter dated 01.05.2019 to specify the information, which was specified on 02.05.2019.

The PIO is directed to relook at the RTI application and provide the information to the appellant within 10 days.

The case is adjourned. To come up for compliance on **01.04.2020 at 11.00 AM**.

Chandigarh
Dated 21.01.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh Jagtar Singh, Sh Sampooran Singh,
Village Naraina, PO Bhagrana,
Tehsil Bassi Pathana,
Distt Fatehgarh Sahib. (98152-89033).

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o SDO, PSPCL,
Sub Division, Badali Ala Singh.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o XEN, PSPCL, Sirhind,
Distt Fatehgarh Sahib.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 2713 of 2019

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 09.05.2019 has sought information regarding election connections UID No.1036 – Sapinder Singh, UID No.1053 –Kuldeep Kaur, UID No.1279-Harjinder Singh and other information concerning the office of SDO PSPCL Sub Division, Badali Ala Singhi. The appellant was not satisfied with the reply of the PIO dated 30.05.2019 after which the appellant filed a first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 13.06.2019 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case was last heard on 16.12.2019. The respondent present pleaded that since the information is 3rd party information, they have issued letters to all those 3rd parties for seeking their consent and after receipt of consent, the information will be supplied to the appellant.

Having gone through the RTI application and hearing both the parties, the Commission observed that the appellant is basically seeking information to bring into light that when he was denied the connection under Chairman quota, were there other connections that were issued while his application was rejected. The PIO was directed to provide the names of all those persons who were given tubewell connections during the period from 16.02.2016 to 16.04.2016 in the area of Badali Ala Singh circle Khanna. The information be provided within 10 days.

Hearing dated 21.01.2020:

Both the parties are absent. The Commission has received a letter on 01.01.2020 from the PIO stating that the information has been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 20.12.2019 and a copy submitted to the Commission.

The appellant is absent nor has communicated any discrepancies. The appellant is directed to point out the discrepancies, if any and be present on the next date of hearing.

To come up for further hearing on **01.04.2020 at 11.00 AM.**

Chandigarh
Dated 21.01.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner