

**OPUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**RED CORSS BUILDING, SECTOR-16, MADHYA MARG, CHANDIGARH**  
Tele No. 0172-2864112, FAX No. 0172-2864125, Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)  
Email: [psic22@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in)

Shri Jasmit Singh Juneja,  
#208-C, 8<sup>th</sup> Floor, Tower 2, Leaf Stone Apartments,  
Nabha Pabhat Road, Zirakpur,  
District Mohali.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Municipal Council (Building Proposal Department),  
Zirakpur.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o Municipal Council (Building Proposal Department),  
Zirakpur.

Respondents

**Appeal Case No.3121/2018**

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
20.06.2018	Nil	31.07.2018	Nil	13.09.2018

**Present:**      **Sh. Jasmit Singh Juneja, Appellant in person.**  
1.   **Sh. Gurinder Singh, Superintendent, MC Office, Zirakpur,**  
2.   **Sh. Gurpreet Singh, Bldg. Inspector, MC Office, Zirakpur, for Respondents.**

**ORDER**

The following order was made by this forum on 06.12.2018:

*“Briefly speaking, the appellant had sought the information relating to approval of a building complex raised by one M/s M.D. Builders & Developers located in Village Nabha, Highland Marg, Zirakpur in their jurisdiction. The Commission takes serious view of the non-chalance shown by the respondents in stonewalling his application as well as the notice of the Commission. The PIO (by name) is hereby issued a show cause notice as to why he should not be proceeded against under Section 20(1) of the RTI Act for having failed to meet the obligation under Section 7(1) ibid. Meanwhile, he shall ensure that the appellant is informed point-wise before the next date of hearing.”*

*“The case has come up today. Despite express order passed, the respondents have shown scant and brazen apathy to the directions.*

*The Commission is well within its authority to impose a penalty on the PIO. However, another opportunity is afforded to him to explain his conduct after providing the requisite information.”*

The case has again come up today. The respondents have filed a detailed reply. It has been stated that the available information has been provided to him. The appellant is still not

Contd...page...2

**Appeal Case No.3121/2018**

satisfied and contends that the one provided to him is deficient.

Having heard the Parties, the Commission feels that it shall be appropriate to allow the appellant the access to the original record available on the subject with the respondents by way of inspection which shall be clinched on 29.01.2019 at 11.30 AM in the office of the Assistant Town Planner (ATP), Municipal Council, Zirakpur and they shall provide him the certified copies of reasonable number of documents on its identification.

The matter shall be reheard on **26.02.2019 at 11.30 AM.**

**Sd/-**

**22.01.2019**

**(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](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)  
Email: [psic22@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in)

Sh. Nasib Singh,  
S/o Sh. Dia Singh,  
Nabipur, Fatehgarh Sahib.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Block Development and Panchayat Officer,  
Sirhind, Dist. Fatehgarh Sahib.

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

Respondents

**Appeal Case No.3341/2018**

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
08.05.2018	Nil	27.06.2018	Nil	25.09.2018

**Present:**        **Sh. Nasib Singh, Appellant in person.**  
                     **None on behalf of the Respondents.**

**ORDER**

It shall be appropriate to reproduce the interim order passed by this forum on  
06.12.2018:

*"Having failed to procure the information from the PIO and their senior officers, the appellant has been constrained to file second appeal with the Commission. The appellant in fact had sought details of the allottees of about 16 kanal of shamlat land of gram panchayat to the landless inhabitants of the village. The Commission takes serious view of the absence and dismissal of the show cause notice without reply by the respondents.*

*The PIO is desired not only to provide the information before the next date of hearing positively but also explain his conduct in writing as to why a penalty should not be imposed on him for not having responded to the application under RTI Act within the stipulated time."*

The case has come up today. None is present on behalf of the respondents. They

Contd...page...2

**Appeal Case No.3341/2018**

have not parted with the information sought by the appellant also. It is already more than seven months that the original application has been filed. The respondents have rendered themselves liable for penal action.

Sh. Mohinder Jit Singh, BDPO, Sirhind 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 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 **26.02.2019 at 11.30 AM.**

**22.01.2019**

**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](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)  
Email: [psic22@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in)

Shri Hakikat Singh,  
S/o Late Shri Kartar Singh,  
R/o Village Mandir,  
Tehsil Dharamkot, Distt Moga.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Panchayat Secretary,  
Gram Panchayat, Mandir,  
Tehsil Dharamkot, Distt Moga

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

Respondents

**Appeal Case No.3504/2018**

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
14.05.2018	Nil	06.07.2018	Nil	22.10.2018

**Present:**        **Sh. Hakikat Singh, Appellant in person.**  
                     **None on behalf of the Respondents.**

**ORDER**

The following order was passed by the Commission 26.12.2018:

*“Sh. Hakikat Singh, Appellant is present in the Commission’s office at Chandigarh.*

*None is present on behalf of the respondents in the studio of DC, Moga. No communication has been received from them. The Commission takes serious cognizance of the lackadaisical conduct of the PIO.*

*Sh. Prithipal Singh who is the deemed PIO having been duly informed by the District Development and Panchayat Officer, Moga to provide the requisite information 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*

*Contd...page...2*

**Appeal Case No.3504/2018**

*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. The respondents are absent. The Commission has already expressed its serious concern. A final opportunity is afforded to them to comply with the aforesaid order failing which proposed action shall be taken.

To come up on **12.02.2019 at 11.30 AM.**

**Sd/-**

**22.01.2019**

**(Yashvir Mahajan)  
State Information Commissioner**

**Cc: Sh. Prithipal Singh, Panchayat Secretary, Block: Kot Isse Khan, District Moga, 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](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)  
Email: [psic22@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in)

Sh. Jasbir Singh,  
R/o Guru Nanak Nagar, Village-Bholpur , Jhabewal,  
PO-Ramgarh, Distt. Ludhiana.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Sub District Magistrate,  
Fatehgarh Sahib.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o Deputy Commissioner,  
Fatehgarh Sahib.

Respondents

**Appeal Case No.3355/2018**

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
02.07.2018	Nil	13.08.2018	Nil	01.10.2018

**Present:**        **Ms. Inderjeet Kaur, on behalf of the appellant.**  
                     **None on behalf of the Respondents.**

**ORDER**

The respondents are absent. No written reply or statement has been filed also. The Commission takes serious view of the non-challant conduct of the respondents. They are afforded another opportunity to do the needful under intimation to the Commission else penal consequences shall follow.

To come up on **21.02.2019 at 11.30 AM.**

**Sd/-**

**22.01.2019**

**(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](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)  
Email: [psic22@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in)

Sh. Sanjeev Thakur,  
R/o Village-Gudha Khurd ,  
PO Madhopur Cantt. Tehsil-Pathankot,  
Distt. Gurdaspur.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Assistant Excise and Taxation Commissioner,  
Mobile Wing, Amritsar.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o Division Excise Taxation Commissioner,  
Amritsar.

Respondents

**Appeal Case No.3372/2018**

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
12.04.2018	Nil	17.04.2018	Nil	03.10.2018

**Present:** Adv. Sandeep Sharma on behalf of the Appellant.  
Sh. Sushil Kumar, ETO, Mobile Wing, Amritsar – for Respondents.

**ORDER**

The following order was made by this forum on 06.12.2018:

*“The appellant had sought information about the cases of penalty imposed against defaulters under GST Act w.e.f. 01.01.2018 to 12.04.2018.*

*Sh. Sushil Kumar, ETO appearing on behalf of the respondents reiterates the stance taken by them and conveyed to the Commission vide memo dated 03.12.2018. The defence of the respondent is that the sought for information is a ‘personal information’ of the third parties whose number is in legions. To follow the procedure under Section 11 of the RTI Act for such number of people shall divert their resources disproportionately. They further say that information sought has no relation to the public interest and is exempted from revelation under Section 8(1) (j) of the Act.*

*They have also taken the plea that the second appeal is a time-barred having been filed after 90 days of the order passed by the First Appellate Authority. The FAA had disposed of his appeal having afforded him a couple of opportunities by upholding the aforesaid position of the PIO. An opportunity is afforded to the appellant to comment on the position taken by the respondents failing which it shall be presumed that he has nothing to say on the matter and the appeal shall be decided as per record on file.”*

The case has come up today. Adv. Sandeep Sharma appearing on behalf of the



**Appeal Case No.3372/2018**

Appellant refutes the contention of the respondents that the orders passed attract Section 8(1) (j) of the Act as the same are passed in the official performance of their duty against the offenders in the larger public interest. Its revelation according to him does not in any way intrude into the privacy of an individual. The appellant further says that he apprehends some malady in the aforesaid practice and intends to highlight the same so that corrective measures are taken.

The Commission has given a thoughtful consideration and is inclined to partially accept the viewpoint of the appellant. However, to provide the information for the entire period as asked for shall erode the resources of the Public Authority significantly. It deems appropriate to direct the respondents to provide him the copies of the orders passed by them from March 15 to March 31, 2018 enabling the appellant to make an objective study of the issue in his mind. The respondents shall do it within ten days from today positively.

With this observation the appeal is **disposed**.

**Sd/-**

**22.01.2019**

**(Yashvir Mahajan)**  
**State Information Commissioner**

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**RED CORSS BUILDING, SECTOR-16, MADHYA MARG, CHANDIGARH**  
Tele No. 0172-2864112, FAX No. 0172-2864125, Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)  
Email: [psic22@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in)

Sh. Sukhvir Singh,  
S/o Sh. Karnail Singh,  
R/o Village Dhianpur, Tehsil Chamkaur Sahib,  
Distt. Ropar.

Appellant

Versus

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

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

Respondents

**Appeal Case No.2640/2018**

Date of RTI application:	26.12.2017
Date of First Appeal :	19.03.2018
Date of Reply :	23.01.2018
Date of Order of FAA :	Nil
Date of 2 <sup>nd</sup> Appeal/complaint:	03.08.2018

**Present:**      **Sh. Sukhvir Singh, Appellant in person.**  
                  **1. Sh. Parvez Singh, PIO – cum - BDPO, Morinda,**  
                  **2. Sh. Jagmohan Singh, Panchayat Secretary, O/o bDPO, Morinda – for**  
                  **Respondents.**

**Order**

This is in continuation of the order passed on 29.11.2018.

Sh. Parvez Singh, BDPO, Morinda is present in person. He states that as the salary of the delinquent official has to be realized from the grant issued by the department the same shall be realized on receipt of the same. He assures this forum to do the needful scrupulously. It is ordered that the penalty should be realized in five equal installments commencing from the first release of his salary. The Public Authority shall also ensure that the amount of compensation awarded shall be paid to the appellant within a month from today positively under intimation to the Commission.

Contd...page...2

**Appeal Case No.2640/2018**

As the information has been transmitted in the Court itself, no further action seems called for. The Commission hopes that the disciplinary authority shall also inform the Commission about the charge-sheet issued to Sh. Jagmohan Singh, Panchayat Secretary.

**Disposed.**

**Sd/-**

**22.01.2019**

**(Yashvir Mahajan)  
State Information Commissioner**

- CC: The Director of Rural Development and Panchayats, Punjab, Sector – 62, SAS Nagar (Mohali) for n/a.**
- CC: The Block Dev. & Panchayat Officer, Block Morinda, Distt. Ropar for n/a.**
- CC: The District Development & Panchayat Officer, Ropar for n/a.**
- CC: Sh. Jagmohan Singh, Panchayat Secretary, Vill: Dhianpura, O/o Block Dev. & Panchayat Officer, Morinda.**

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**RED CORSS BUILDING, SECTOR-16, MADHYA MARG, CHANDIGARH**  
Tele No. 0172-2864112, FAX No. 0172-2864125, Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)  
Email:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in

Shri Bharpur Singh,  
s/o Shri Sarwan Singh,  
R/o Village Lubhana Teku, Tehsil Nabha,  
District- Patiala.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Block Development & Panchayat Officer,  
Nabha, District Patiala.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o District Development & Panchayat Officer,  
Patiala.

Respondents

**Appeal Case No.3140/2018**

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
20.06.2018	Nil	17.07.2018	Nil	17.09.2018

**Present:       None.**

**ORDER**

None is present on behalf of the Parties. Nothing has been received in writing as well. The matter shall be heard on **26.02.2019 at 11.30 AM.**

**Sd/-**

**22.01.2019**

**(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](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)  
Email: [psic22@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in)

Sh. Gurmail Singh,  
S/o Sh. Chanan Singh,  
R/o House No. 297, VPO-Dhablan,

Appellant

Versus

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

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o District Development and Panchayat Officer,  
Mini Secretariat, Patiala.

Respondents

**Appeal Case No.3294/2018**

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
04.07.2017	Nil	07.06.2018	Nil	25.09.2018

**Present:**        **Sh. Gurmail Singh, Appellant in person.**  
                      **Sh. Buta Singh, Panchayat Secretary, BDPO Office, Patiala – for Respondents.**

**ORDER**

The following order was passed by the Commission on 05.12.2018:

*“The appellant had sought the copies of the record entailed in various activities of the village panchayat from May, 2013 to June, 2017.*

*Sh. Daljeet Singh appearing on behalf of the respondents says that the concerned Panchayat Secretary has been transferred. Nonetheless, he had given in writing that the information had been provided to the appellant. The appellant reports that the same was deficient and incomplete. The respondents are advised to get the record inspected by him and provide him the certified copies of the documents but not beyond one hundred pages, which are pointed out by him and have not been provided to him as yet.”*

The current incumbent, Sh. Buta Singh, Panchayat Secretary of relevant Circle is present. He has brought along the entire record which has been handed over to the appellant. A file

Contd...page...2

**Appeal Case No.3294/2018**

relating to vouchers for the month of June, 2015 is not available with him. According to him the same is in the custody of the concerned J.E. He assures to deliver its copies after procuring it from the concerned J.E. early. The appellant has expressed his satisfaction and is satisfied with the bonafides of the respondents.

The Commission finds that by and large information has been given. The appellant is not inclined to further pursue the matter.

**Disposed.**

**22.01.2019**

**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](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)  
Email: [psic22@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in)

Sh. Rajesh Kumar Bharti,  
R/o #70/2 Gali No. 15-14 B,  
Sawatantar Nagar, Narela, Delhi-40.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Executive Officer,  
Municipal Council,  
Zirakpur, Distt. Mohali.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o Additional Director,  
Local Government,  
Plot No. 3, Dakshin Marg, Sector-35A, Chandigarh.

Respondents

**Appeal Case No.3265/2018**

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
15.04.2018	Nil	24.05.2018	Nil	21.09.2018

**Present:       None.**

**ORDER**

None is present on behalf of the Parties. Nothing has been received in writing as well. The matter shall be heard on **26.02.2019 at 11.30 AM.**

.

**Sd/-**

**22.01.2019**

**(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](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)  
Email: [psic22@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in)

Sh. Pardeep Singh,  
S/o Sh. Darbara Singh,  
R/o Village Gurdaspura (Gurthali),  
Tehsil and Distt. Sangrur.

Appellant

Versus

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

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

Respondents

**Appeal Case No.3327/2018**

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
07.09.2017	Nil	31.10.2017	Nil	03.10.2018

**Present:**        **Sh. Pardeep Singh, Appellant in person.**  
                      **1. Sh. Ajaib Singh, Panchayat Secretary,**  
                      **2. Sh. Karamjeet Singh, Panchayat, O/o BDPO, Sangrur – for Respondents.**

**ORDER**

The following order was made by this forum on 06.12.2018:

*“Sh. Ajaib Singh, Panchayat Secretary appearing on behalf of the respondents says that he has joined this office only on 3<sup>rd</sup> December, 2018. He states that his predecessor was on medical leave. He further submits that the information has already been transmitted through a registered post.*

*The appellant denies its receipt. Probably, it should be in transit. Nonetheless, he has brought along a copy of the same which has been handed over on spot to the appellant. He may like to go through it and point-out the deficiency in writing, if any before the next date of hearing.*

*Meanwhile the predecessor of the incumbent Panchayat Secretary, Sh. Karamjit Singh who has been sitting on the application for more than a year should explain the delay and show cause as to why he should not be penalized as per the provisions of RTI Act.”*

*Contd...page...2*



**Appeal Case No.3327/2018**

The case has come up today. Sh. Karamjit Singh, Panchayat Secretary who was desired to explain his conduct in the aforementioned order has filed a written explanation. It has been stated that he joined the office in the month of June, 2018 replacing one Sh. Lakhvir Singh. At that time an enquiry was being conducted by the Divisional Deputy Director, Rur. Dev. & Panchayats, Patiala and the relevant record was in his custody. It was returned in the month of September, 2018. Unfortunately he met with an accident and was confined to bed with a fractured leg. Having rejoined his duty he promptly delivered the information to the appellant.

The explanation given by Sh. Karamjit Singh cuts some ice. There does not appear any malafide on his part to withhold the information. However, there is an unexplained delay of about six months on the part of his predecessor, Sh. Lakhvir Singh. He is presently posted as Panchayat Secretary in the Sangrur block. He is desired to explain his conduct as to why the penalty should not be imposed on him for the delay in providing the information beyond thirty days of the receipt of application as envisaged under Section 20(1) of the RTI Act.

To come up on **26.02.2019 at 11.30 AM.**

**22.01.2019**

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

**CC: Sh. Lakhvir Singh, Panchayat Secretary, O/o Block Dev. & Panchayat Officer, Sangrur, 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](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)  
Email: [psic22@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in)

Sh. Gurmeet Singh,  
S/o Niranjn Singh,  
R/o V.P.O- Thuhi, Tehsil-Nabha,  
Distt. Patiala.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Block Development and Panchayat Officer, Nabha.  
First Appellate Authority,  
O/o District Development and Panchayat Officer,  
Patiala.

Respondents

**Appeal Case No.3260/2018**

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
13.04.2018	Nil	09.07.2018	Nil	21.09.2018

**Present:** Sh. Gurmeet Singh, Appellant in person.  
None on behalf of the respondents.

**ORDER**

The following order was made by this forum on 06.12.2018:

*"Having failed to procure the information after filing an application on 13.04.2018 and first appeal on 09.07.2018, the appellant has been constrained to file second appeal with the Commission. He is seeking a basic information about the various facets of functions of the Panchayat Samiti, Nabha.*

*Sh. Deepak Jindal appearing on behalf of the respondents feign ignorance about the receipt of original application and first appeal. The stance is tenuous and un-believable. The appellant has duly sent the application enclosing a postal order under registered post. He has shown a copy of the postal receipt and certificate of delivery of documents to the respondents.*

*The respondent assures that they will provide the information before the next date of hearing. Regardless of the prospective compliance as has been maintained by the respondents they have rendered themselves liable for penal action*

*Sh. Swinder Singh, PIO – cum – BDPO, Nabha 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*

*Contd...page...2*

**Appeal Case No.3260/2018**

*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. Strangely, Sh. Swinder Singh, Block Development & Panchayat Officer, Nabha is absent. No reply has been filed as well. The Commission cannot take it lying down. The Block Development and Panchayat Officer is once again desired to ensure that the asked for information is provided to the appellant before the next date of hearing else he should come along the original record in the Commission. The Commission would like to underline that his failure shall compel it to ensure his presence by way of issue of warrants.

To come up on **26.02.2019 at 11.30 AM.**

**Sd/-**

**22.01.2019**

**(Yashvir Mahajan)  
State Information Commissioner**

**PS:** Having dictated the above order Smt. Kamaljit Kaur, Superintendent office of BDPO, Nabha has come present. She regrets the delay in attending due to inclement weather and non-availability of transport. She has produced an affidavit of Sh. Swinder Kinder, BDPO, Nabha. It has been stated in the affidavit that the record under consideration has been with the office of the Additional Deputy Commissioner (Dev.), Patiala who is holding an enquiry into some complaint. On the discharge of the same the zerox copies of the record have been made. She has brought along copies of the same which seemingly are more than one thousand of pages. The appellant shall collect it from the office of the Block Development and Panchayat Officer, Nabha, before the next date of hearing.

**CC:** Sh. Swinder Singh, PIO – cum – Block Dev. & Panchayat Officer, Nabha.

**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](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)  
Email:psic22@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh. Jaspal Singh,  
R/o # 2542, Mari Wala Town,  
Manimajra, Chandigarh.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Deputy Commissioner,  
Roopnagar.

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

Respondents

**Appeal Case No.3348/2018**

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
04.03.2018	Nil	04.05.2018	Nil	27.09.2018

**Present:**

**None on behalf of the Appellant.**

1. Sh. Sadhu Ram, Superintendent, BDPO office, Morinda,
2. Sh. Sanjeev Kumar, Panchayat Secretary, BDPO Office, Morinda, and
3. Sh. Surinder Pal Singh, RTI Clerk, DC Office, Ropar.

**ORDER**

The following order was made by this forum on 06.12.2018:

*"The information sought pertains to various activities of gram panchayat over a period of last ten years. Obviously, it shall entail massive record. The Commission finds that providing of certified copies of the entire record shall not only divert its resources but it shall be an onerous task for the Public Authority too. The Commission directs the respondents to allow him the inspection of the record at a mutually agreed date and time which shall be adhered to scrupulously and provide him certified copies not beyond one hundred pages as identified by him. The limit can be ignored if he convinces the Commission that the public interest shall not be served within the above said number of copies."*

The case has come up today. The appellant is absent. The respondents say that despite various communications to him he has failed to turn up and inspect the record. In the interest of natural justice another opportunity is afforded to the appellant to put forward his point of view if any failing which it shall be presumed that he has nothing to say on the matter and the appeal shall be disposed on merit on the basis of the record available on file.

To come up on **26.02.2019 at 11.30 AM.**

Sd/-

**22.01.2019**

**(Yashvir Mahajan)**  
**State Information Commissioner**