

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com
E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh Kaka Ram, S/o Sh Ajit Singh
Alias Sh Ajit Ram,
Street No-1, H No-4, Near Shiv Mandir,
Ram Nagar, Patiala.

... Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
Chief Engineer, Enforcement,
PSPCL, Shakti Vihar, Patiala.

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 872 of 2018

Present: Sh.Kaka Ram as Complainant
Sh.Gurmeet Singh, Addl. Assistant Engineer O/o PSPCL, Sub Division, Balbera
for the Respondent

Order:

The Complainant through RTI application dated 29.06.2018 had sought information regarding tubewell connection No.0248 at Bathoi Khurd and other information concerning the office of Chief Engineer, Enforcement, PSPCL Patiala.. The complainant was not provided the information after which he filed complaint with the Commission on 13.08.2018.

The case was last heard on **13.11.2018**. Since both the parties were absent, the case was adjourned.

Hearing dated 22.01.2019:

The respondent present has pleaded that the available information has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 28.08.2018 and again on 09.11.2018. The appellant has received the information and does not want to pursue his case further.

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

Chandigarh
Dated: 22.01.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com

E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh Kaka Ram, S/o Sh Ajit Singh
(Alias Sh Ajit Ram),
Street No-1, H No-4, Near Shiv Mandir,
Ram Nagar, Patiala.

... Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
DGP, Vigilance,
PSPCL, Patiala.

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 873 of 2018

Present: **Sh.Kaka Ram as Complainant**
 Sh.Gurmeet Singh, Addl. Assistant Engineer O/o PSPCL, Sub Division,
 Balbera for the Respondent

Order:

The case was last heard on **13.11.2018**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The Complainant through RTI application dated 29.06.2018 has sought information regarding tubewell connection No.0248 at Bathoi Khurd and other information concerning the office of DGP Vigilance PSPCL Patiala.. The complainant was not provided the information after which he filed complaint with the Commission on 13.08.2018.

The respondent present has informed that since the information relates to the office of Executive Engineer, PSPCL Balbera, they have transferred the RTI application to them vide letter dated 12.07.2018 and the complainant has been informed of the same. The respondent further informed that the SDO Balbera has also sent the information to the complainant vide letter dated 01.08.2018. The Commission is of the view that the application has been attended to by the PIO within time and there is no malafide on the part of the PIO.

During hearing, it has come to the notice of the Commission that the complainant has sought the same information but from the different authorities and that information has been provided to him in complaint case No.874. From the scrutiny of the cases No.873 & 874, it is observed that the information provided in case No.874 is equally relevant to the information sought in the cases No.872 & 873.

The complainant is absent to point out the discrepancy if any, and vide email has sought adjournment. The complainant is afforded one more opportunity to point out the discrepancy if any and to plead his cases on the next date of hearing.”

Complaint Case No. 873 of 2018

Hearing dated 22.01.2019:

The respondent present has pleaded that the available information has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 01.08.2018. It was observed that the information sought in this case is the same information which has been provided in complaint case No.874/2018. The appellant is present and informed that he has received the information and does not want to pursue his case further.

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

Chandigarh
Dated: 22.01.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

CC to :The PIO, SDO PSPCL Balbera

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com

E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh Kaka Ram, S/o Sh Ajit Singh Alias Sh Ajit Ram,
Street No-1, H No-4, Near Shiv Mandir, Ram Nagar,
Patiala.

... Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
SDO, Sub Division,
PSPCL, Balbera.

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 874 of 2018

Present: **Sh.Kaka Ram as Complainant**
 Sh.Gurmeet Singh, Addl. Assistant Engineer O/o PSPCL, Sub Division,
 Balbera for the Respondent

Order: The case was last heard on **13.11.2018**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The Complainant through RTI application dated 29.06.2018 has sought information regarding tubewell connection No.0248 at Bathoi Khurd and other information concerning the office of PSPCL Patiala.. The complainant was not provided the information after which he filed complaint with the Commission on 13.08.2018.

The respondent present has pleaded that they received the RTI application on 10.07.2018 and the same was replied vide letter dated 01.08.2018. The complainant was also called to the office telephonically for handing over the information by hand but he refused to take the information by hand. Thereafter, the information was sent to the complainant vide registered letter dated 26.09.2018 and again on 09.11.2018. A copy of the same is submitted to the Commission. The Commission is of the view that the application has been attended to by the PIO within time and there is no malafide on the part of the PIO.

During hearing, it has come to the notice of the Commission that the complainant has sought the same information but from the different authorities and that information has been provided to him in complaint case No.874. From the scrutiny of the cases No.873 & 874, it is observed that the information provided in case No.874 is equally relevant to the information sought in the cases No.872 & 873.

The complainant is absent to point out any discrepancy and vide email has sought adjournment. The complainant is afforded one more opportunity to point out the discrepancy if any and plead his cases on the next date of hearing.”

Hearing dated 22.01.2019:

The respondent present has pleaded that the available information has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 14.11.2018. The respondent has submitted an acknowledgement of the complainant having received the information. The appellant is also present and informed that he has received the information and does not want to pursue his case further.

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

Chandigarh
Dated: 22.01.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com

E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh. Prem Chand, S/o Sh Gurmeet Ram,
R/o VPO Mamu Kheda,
Tehsil & Distt Fazilka.

... Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
DSP, Sub Division,
Jalalabad

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 919 of 2018

Present: **Sh.Surjit S/o Sh.Gurmit Ram representative of Sh.Prem Chand for the**
 Appellant
 None for the Respondent

Order: The case was last heard on **14.11.2018**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The complainant through RTI application dated 14.05.2018 has sought information regarding action taken on the application dated 26.09.2017 and 04.01.2018 alongwith statements of the accused as well as their accomplices and other information concerning the office of DSP Sub Division, Jalalabad. The complainant was not provided the information after which he filed complaint to the Commission on 23.08.2018.

The respondent is absent without intimation to the Commission. The Commission has taken a serious view of this. The PIO is hereby directed to relook at the RTI application and provide the information to the complainant in accordance with the RTI Act. The PIO is also directed to be present personally or through his representative on the next date of hearing and explain the reasons for not attending to the RTI application within the time prescribed under the RTI Act.”

Hearing dated 22.01.2019:

The appellant claims that the information has not been provided. The respondent is absent.

In the last hearing, the respondent appeared late and had brought the information. The respondent was directed to send the information to the appellant through registered post. The PIO is directed to send the information to the appellant within 15 days and appear on the next date of hearing otherwise the Commission will be constrained to take action against the PIO for not attending to the RTI application within the time prescribed under the RTI Act 2005.

The case is adjourned. Both the parties to be present **on 13.03.2019 at 11.00 AM** for further hearing.

Chandigarh
Dated: 22.01.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh
Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com
E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh. Prem Chand, S/o Sh Gurmeet Ram,
R/o VPO Mamu Kheda,
Tehsil & Distt Fazilka.

... Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o SHO, Police Station,
Khui Kheda, Distt Fazilka.

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 920 of 2018

Present: **Sh.Surjit S/o Sh.Gurmit Ram representative of Sh.Prem Chand for the Appellant**
 Sh.Mukhtiar Singh, HC O/o SHO Police Station, Khui Kheda for the Respondent

Order:

The case was last heard on **14.11.2018**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The complainant through RTI application dated 27.06.2018 has sought information regarding complaint lodged by Sh.Vijay Kumar s/o Pannu Ram of village Mamu Khera alongwith statements of Sh.Vijay Kumar and witnesses and other information concerning the office of SHO Police Station, Khul Khera, District Fazilka. The complainant was not provided the information after which he filed complaint to the Commission on 23.08.2018.

The respondent is absent without intimation to the Commission. The Commission has taken a serious view of this. The PIO is hereby directed to relook at the RTI application and provide the information to the complainant in accordance with the RTI Act. The PIO is also directed to be present personally or through his representative on the next date of hearing and explain the reasons for not attending to the RTI application within the time prescribed under the RTI Act.”

Hearing dated 22.01.2019:

The respondent present has pleaded that the available information has been provided and the appellant has received the same. The representative present on behalf of the appellant informed that the they have received the information and do not want to pursue the case further.

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

Chandigarh
Dated: 22.01.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com

E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh. Prem Chand, S/o Sh Gurmeet Ram,
R/o VPO Mamu Kheda,
Tehsil & Distt Fazilka.

... Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o SDM,
Fazilka.

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 923 of 2018

Present: **Sh.Surjit S/o Sh.Gurmit Ram representative of Sh.Prem Chand for the**
 Appellant
 Sh.Parmesh Reader O/o Tehsildar Harniwala Shekh Subhan for the
 Respondent

Order:

The case was last heard on **14.11.2018**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The complainant through RTI application dated 10.03.2018 has sought information regarding action taken on the application dated 04.09.2017 and other information concerning the office of SDM Fazilka. The complainant was not provided the information after which he filed complaint to the Commission on 24.08.2018.

The respondent present has submitted a letter dated 13.11.2018 whereby the respondent has pleaded that the application of the complainant dated 04.09.2017 which relates to the police department, was sent to the DSP Fazilka for further action vide letter dated 15.09.2017.

The PIO-SDM is hereby directed to collect the information from the office of DSP Fazilka and provide the same to the complainant within 15 days. The PIO is also directed to be present on the next date of hearing with explanation for enormous delay in handling the RTI application since the RTI application was of 10.03.2018 whereas the reply was sent on 13.11.2018.”

Hearing dated 22.01.2019:

The respondent present has pleaded that the available information has been provided and the appellant has received the same. The representative present on behalf of the appellant informed that they have received the information and do not want to pursue the case further.

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

Sd/-

Chandigarh
Dated: 22.01.2019

(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh
Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com
E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh. Karan Singh, S/o Sh. Shyam Singh,
79, High Land Society, Baltana, Zirakpur.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
State Transport Commissioner,
Sector-17, Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority,
State Transport Commissioner,
Sector-17,
Chandigarh.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1751 of 2018

Present: None for the Appellant
Sh.Gurpal Singh, APIO and Sh.Davinder Kumar, PIO for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on **29.08.2018**. The appellant petitioned for the information, as well as appropriate action against the PIO in accordance with the RTI Act for the delay in tending to his RTI application.

Sh.Gurpal Singh, APIO was present for the respondent. The respondent claimed that the record pertaining to the information sought is missing and sought more time to trace the record. The plea of the respondent was accepted and the case was adjourned with the instructions that the department makes a diligent effort to trace the file.

The case was last heard on **17.10.2018**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The case has come up for hearing today and should be read in continuation with the last hearing. The respondent in the last hearing had denied the appellant the information on the pretext that the file pertaining to information being sought is untraceable. The Commission at the last hearing had directed the respondent to trace the file diligently.

At today's hearing the APIO, Gurpal Singh has changed the earlier stand of the missing file to deny information, to a different reason. According to the PIO even though the file has been traced, the office of the State Transport Commissioner cannot part with the information.

1)The respondent at this hearing has submitted a memo dated 15.10.2018 from the office of State Transport Commissioner, Punjab which states that the cars and drivers allocated to the Chief Minister, Cabinet Minister, MLA/MPs by the Ministers Car Branch, are as per the norms prescribed by the Motor Vehicle Board.

2)That it is the Chief Minister's Security Wing that deploys vehicles/drivers with the Chief Minister.

3)That due to the above reasons, the RTI Act is not applicable to the Chief Minister's Security and Vehicles. They have attached an order of the Government of Punjab dated 23.02.2006 whereby it had notified exempting certain organizations from the Act.

On close scrutiny of the reply submitted by the PIO, it is observed that the PIO's reply is not in accordance with the RTI sought. The information sought is about usage of official vehicles attached with a former Minister, and hence has nothing to do with the Chief Minister's security. The reasoning provided to seek exemption is bereft of any logic and no section of the RTI Act has been invoked to seek exemption.

It appears to be an attempt to willfully stonewall flow of information on one pretext or the other.

The appellant is present. He has pleaded that his RTI application pertains to the expenditure and names of drivers attached to former Minister's vehicles and has nothing to do with the security cover provided to the minister, Chief Minister or the Minister concerned.

The appellant has sought an adjournment due to ill health as well as to prepare and file his reply to the exemption that the respondent has sought."

Hearing dated 22.01.2019:

The appellant is absent without intimation to the commission. In the last hearing the appellant had sought an adjournment to file a reply to respondent's reasons for denying the information which are recorded in the order of the earlier hearing of 17.10.2018.

The respondent, after the commission's scathing observation of it trying to stone wall the information, has brought the information for point No-2. The respondent is directed to send the information of point No.2 to the appellant by registered post.

For information regarding point number-1 the respondent has pleaded for more time. The reason they have cited is that since the record asked is for ten years, it is voluminous in nature, for which more time is required.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **24.04.2019 at 11.00 A.M.**

Chandigarh
Dated: 22.01.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com
E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh Karan Singh, S/o Sh.Shyam Singh,
79, High Land Society, Baltana, Zirakpur.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
State Transport Commissioner,
Sector-17, Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority,
State Transport Commissioner,
Sector-17, Chandigarh.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1752 of 2018

Present: None for the Appellant
Sh.Gurpal Singh, APIO and Sh.Davinder Kumar, PIO for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was last heard on **29.08.2018**. Sh.Gurpal Singh, APIO was present. The respondent pleaded that the information was sent to the appellant on 17.04.2018. The appellant pleaded that he has not received the information. The respondent again brought the information and handed over to the appellant.

The appellant was asked to go through the information and inform the discrepancy, if any, to the PIO. The PIO was directed to remove the discrepancy.

The case was last heard on **17.10.2018**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The appellant informed that no information has been provided to him since the information that was handed over to him at the last hearing was only a reply to the application.

The respondent at this hearing has changed his stand from providing the information to not providing the information.

1)The respondent at this hearing has submitted a memo dated 15.10.2018 from the office of State Transport Commissioner, Punjab which states that the cars and drivers allocated to the Chief Minister, Cabinet Minister, MLA/MPs by the Ministers Car Branch, are as per the norms prescribed by the Motor Vehicle Board.

2)That it is the Chief Minister's Security Wing that deploys vehicles/drivers with the Chief Minister.

3)That due to the above reasons, the RTI Act is not applicable to the Chief Minister's Security and Vehicles. They have attached an order of the Government of Punjab dated 23.02.2006 whereby it had notified exempting certain organizations from the Act.

On close scrutiny of the reply submitted by the PIO, it is observed that the PIO's reply is not in accordance with the RTI sought. The information sought is about usage of official vehicles attached with a former Minister, and hence has nothing to do with the Chief Minister's security. The reasoning provided to seek exemption is bereft of any logic and no section of the RTI Act has been invoked to seek exemption.

It appears to be an attempt to willfully stonewall flow of information on one pretext or the other.

The appellant is present. He has pleaded that his RTI application pertains to the expenditure and names of drivers attached to former Minister's vehicles and has nothing to do with the security cover provided to the minister, Chief Minister or the Minister concerned.

The appellant has sought an adjournment due to ill health as well as to prepare and file his reply to the exemption that the respondent has sought."

Hearing dated 22.01.2019:

The appellant is absent without intimation to the commission. In the last hearing the appellant had sought an adjournment to file a reply to respondent's reasons for not providing the information which are recorded in the order of the earlier hearing of 17.10.2018.

The respondent present has pleaded for more time citing the reason that since the record asked is for ten years, it is voluminous in nature, for which more time is required.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing **on 24.04.2019 at 11.00AM.**

Chandigarh
Dated: 22.01.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com

E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh Karan Singh, S/o Sh. Shyam Singh,
79, High Land Society, Baltana, Zirakpur.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
State Transport Commissioner,
Sector-17, Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority,
State Transport Commissioner,
Sector-17,
Chandigarh.

... Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1753 of 2018

Present: **None for the Appellant**
 Sh. Gurpal Singh, APIO for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was last heard on **29.08.2018**. The appellant petitioned for the information, as well as appropriate action against the PIO in accordance with the RTI Act for the delay in tending to his RTI application.

The respondent denied the information on points 1, 2, & 3 stating that the information sought is in the question form and cited an order of Chief Information Commissioner on dated 21/4/2006 whereby it is stated that the PIO is not obliged to provide information if it is in question form. The respondent, at the hearing, also cited security reasons for denial of information.

The matter before the commission to adjudicate was:

- 1) That whether the reasons for denial of information hold any ground under the RTI Act, 2005 or are mere pretexts to deny information.
- 2) That if the RTI application appears to be in question form, can it become a ground for denial of information, even though the information may be available with the Public Authority?
- 3) That whether the appellant has applied for information in a coherent form?

The Commission passed the following interim order

Interim Order-

1) The commission finds that the reason that divulging information about security men and drivers of a former minister can become a security hazard is rather far-fetched. A mere assumption cannot become a basis to deny information unless backed by material evidence. The PIO is hereby directed to cite the appropriate RTI Act rule, which exempts such information to be shared.

2) The PIO is also directed to mention the sections of the RTI Act under which the information has been denied in the letter (No-3631 dated 24/8/18) since denial of information has to be based on exemptions granted under the RTI Act and not arbitrarily.

3) The appellant is also hereby directed to be more specific with the identities of the persons about whom the information is being sought. Just writing two names and asking which minister they were attached to as drivers, and assuming that the public authority should know exactly that whom the appellant is referring to, is an unseemly way of seeking information. For example, if the appellant is seeking information about driver Kamal Kishor he should be more elaborate to identify the Kamal Kishor he is asking about. If not, then he should identify the Minister with whom he was attached to seek information about him. Obviously, there can be more than one Kamal Kishore and there can be many who are not attached with a minister. The appellant is hereby ordered to be more specific with the information that he seeks and bring the clarification at the next date of hearing.

The case was last heard on **17.10.2018**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The case has come up for hearing today. The respondent at this hearing has changed the reasons to not provide information.

In the last hearing, it was observed that the PIO had denied the information on the ground that points 1,2, & 3 of the RTI application did not come under the preview of the RTI Act since they were in the question form. However, at this hearing, the PIO has claimed that the office of the State Transport Commissioner cannot part with the information.

1)The respondent at this hearing has submitted a memo dated 15.10.2018 from the office of State Transport Commissioner, Punjab which states that the cars and drivers allocated to the Chief Minister, Cabinet Minister, MLA/MPs by the Ministers Car Branch, are as per the norms prescribed by the Motor Vehicle Board.

2)That it is the Chief Minister’s Security Wing that deploys vehicles/drivers with the Chief Minister.

3)That due to the above reasons, the RTI Act is not applicable to the Chief Minister’s Security and Vehicles. They have attached an order of the Government of Punjab dated 23.02.2006 whereby it had notified exempting certain organizations from the Act.

On close scrutiny of the reply submitted by the PIO, it is observed that the PIO’s reply is not in accordance with the RTI sought. The information sought is about Mr. Davinder Singh (Belt number 833), Mr. Bawa Singh (Driver) and one Kamal Kishor (Driver) that with which minister/ official and government vehicle was he attached as a driver and hence has nothing to do with the Chief Minister’s security. The reasoning provided to seek exemption is bereft of any logic and no section of the RTI Act has been invoked to seek exemption.

It appears to be an attempt to willfully stonewall flow of information on one pretext or the other.

The appellant is present. He has pleaded that his RTI application pertains to the expenditure and names of drivers attached to former Minister’s vehicles and has nothing to do with the security cover provided to the minister, Chief Minister or the Minister concerned.

The appellant has sought an adjournment due to ill health as well as to prepare and file his reply to the exemption that the respondent has sought.”

Hearing dated 22.01.2019:

The appellant is absent without intimation to the commission. In the last hearing the appellant had sought an adjournment to file a reply to respondent's reasons for not providing the information which are recorded in the order of the earlier hearing of 17.10.2018.

The respondent after the commission's scathing observation of it trying to stone wall the information, has brought the information.

The appellant is absent. A copy of the information brought by the respondent is being enclosed with the order.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **24.04.2019 at 11.00 A.M.**

Chandigarh
Dated: 22.01.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com

E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh Karan Singh, S/o . Singh,
79, High Land Society, Baltana, Zirakpur.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
State Transport Commissioner,
Sector-17, Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority,
State Transport Commissioner,
Sector-17, Chandigarh.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1754 of 2018

Present: Sh.Karan Singh as Appellant
Sh.Gurpal Singh, APIO for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was last heard on **29.08.2018**. Sh.Gurpal Singh APIO was present. The respondent pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant was not satisfied. The respondent further pleaded that since the information is voluminous, the appellant be asked to inspect the record and get the requisite information. The appellant was directed to inspect the record on the date fixed i.e. 07.09.2018 and get the specific information, he wants. The PIO was directed to provide the information as per RTI.

The case was last heard on **17.10.2018**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The case has come up for hearing today. The appellant informed that he visited the office of the PIO on 07.09.2018 but he was not allowed to inspect the record.

In the last hearing, it was observed that the PIO had denied the information on the ground that the information is voluminous and appellant may come to their office and inspect the record on any working day. However, at this hearing, the PIO has claimed that the office of the State Transport Commissioner cannot part with the information.

1)The respondent at this hearing has submitted a memo dated 15.10.2018 from the office of State Transport Commissioner, Punjab which states that the cars and drivers allocated to the Chief Minister, Cabinet Minister, MLA/MPs by the Ministers Car Branch, are as per the norms prescribed by the Motor Vehicle Board.

2)That it is the Chief Minister’s Security Wing that deploys vehicles/drivers with the Chief Minister.

3)That due to the above reasons, the RTI Act is not applicable to the Chief Minister’s Security and Vehicles. They have attached an order of the Government of Punjab dated 23.02.2006 whereby it had notified exempting certain organizations from the Act.

On close scrutiny of the reply submitted by the PIO, it is observed that the PIO’s reply is not in accordance with the RTI sought. The information sought is about distance covered, name of the drivers and name of Ministers with whom the vehicles were attached and hence has nothing to do with the Chief Minister’s security. The reasoning provided to seek exemption is bereft of any logic and no section of the RTI Act has been invoked to seek exemption.

It appears to be an attempt to willfully stonewall flow of information on one pretext or the other.

The appellant is present. He has pleaded that his RTI application pertains to the expenditure and names of drivers attached to former Minister's vehicles and has nothing to do with the security cover provided to the minister, Chief Minister or the Minister concerned.

The appellant has sought an adjournment due to ill health as well as to prepare and file his reply to the exemption that the respondent has sought."

Hearing dated 22.01.2019:

The appellant is absent without intimation to the commission. In the last hearing the appellant had sought an adjournment to file a reply to respondent's reasons for not providing the information which are recorded in the order of the earlier hearing of 17.10.2018.

Contrary to the earlier facts whereby the appellant had pleaded that his RTI application pertains to the expenditure and names of drivers attached to former Minister's vehicles and has nothing to do with the security cover provided to the minister, Chief Minister or the Minister concerned, a new fact has emerged at this hearing. The respondent has stated that the information pertains to the vehicles attached with the CM Security wing, and does not come under the purview of the RTI Act. The respondent has submitted a copy of the notification dated 23.02.2006 issued by the Government of Punjab which states that the RTI Act does not apply to the information pertaining to the security wing.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further adjudication **on 05.03.2019 at 11.00AM.**

Chandigarh
Dated: 22.01.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864114 Visit us @ www.infocommpunjab.com
E-mail-Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in

Sh Jasvir Singh, S/o Sh Harbans Singh,
Village Jala Khera, P.O Sular,
Distt Patiala.

Appellant.

Versus

Public Information Officer
O/o Chief Engineer,
Enforcement, PSPCL, Patiala.

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

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 2994 of 2018

Present: Sh Jasvir Singh as Appellant
Sh.Gurmeet Singh, Addl. Assistant Engineer O/o PSPCL, Sub Division, Balbera
for the Respondent

Order:

The Complainant through RTI application dated 28.06.2018 has sought information regarding tubewell connection No.0248 at Bathoi Khurd and other information concerning the office of Chief Engineer, Enforcement, PSPCL Patiala.. The complainant was not provided the information after which he filed complaint with the Commission on 21.07.2018.

Both the parties are absent without intimation to the Commission. In the interest of justice, one more opportunity is granted and the case is adjourned.

Hearing dated 22.01.2019:

The respondent present has pleaded that the available information has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 01.08.2018 & again on 28.08.2018. 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: 22.01.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner