



Sh Tejinder Singh,
Civil Court, Tehsil Complex,
Backside Sanjh Kender,
Phillaur.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Food Safety Officer,
Amritsar.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o District Health (Designated Officer Food Safety),
Amritsar

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 403 of 2021

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through an RTI application dated 24.04.2020 has sought information regarding notices issued to food business operators from Nov.2019 to March 2020 along with speaking order if any passed – action taken on sellers operating in open places – inspection conducted on food business operators –samples collected and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of Food Safety Officer, Amritsar. The appellant was not satisfied with the information provided by the PIO vide letter dated 12.06.2020 after which the appellant filed a first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 03.10.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 14.07.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Ludhiana/Amritsar. The respondent informed that the information has been provided to the appellant.

The appellant claimed that despite the deposit of requisite fee of Rs.300/-on 21.06.2020 as raised by the PIO vide their letter dated 12.06.2020 relating to information regarding point-4 and pointing out the discrepancies, the PIO has not provided the complete information.

The PIO was given one more opportunity to sort out the discrepancies and provide complete information to the appellant. The PIO was also directed to explain the reasons for the delay in attending the RTI application.

On the date of the last hearing on **18.11.2021**, the respondent present pleaded that the discrepancies as pointed out by the appellant have been sorted out and the reply has been sent to the appellant on 10.11.2021 with a copy to the Commission.

The appellant was absent and vide email informed that despite deposit of requisite fee as well as the order of the Commission, the PIO has not supplied the requisite information.

Having gone through the reply, the commission observed that the respondent had sent the following reply:

- Point-1 - No improvement notice issued /speaking order passed from Nov.2019 to March 18, 2003.
- Point-2 - The information relates to 3rd party
- Point-4 - Since the postal order received from the appellant on account of the fee raised has not been yet got encashed by the concerned Clerk, the information will be provided after encashment of postal order. Further, since the information is available with Sh.Simranjit Singh, Food Safety Officer, now at Mohali and Smt.Gagandeep Kaur-Food Safety Officer now at Patiala, the designated officer o/o Civil Surgeon, Amritsar has been requested vide letter dated 27.07.2021 to call the information from them.

Having gone through the RTI application and the reply, the commission observed that point-1 of the RTI application has been suitably replied to. However, regarding point-3, the PIO is directed to apply section 10 of the RTI Act and provide information after severing the information that is personal, in this instance the home address.

Regarding point-4, Sh.Simranjit Singh, Food Safety Officer, Mohali and Smt.Gagandeep Kaur-Food Safety Officer Patiala were impleaded in the case and directed to send information to the Food Safety Amritsar immediately and the Food Safety Officer, Amritsar was directed to supply complete information to the appellant with a copy to the Commission.

Hearing dated 22.03.2022:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Ludhiana/Amritsar. Both the parties are absent.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **10.08.2022 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Ludhiana. The PIO to appear through VC at DAC Amritsar.

Chandigarh
Dated: 22.03.2022

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commission

CC to :1. Sh.Simranjit Singh,
Food Safety Officer,
O/o Civil Surgeon,Mohali

2. .Sh.Gagandeep Singh,
Food Safety Officer,
O/o Civil Surgeon, Patiala.



Sh. Lajpat Rai, S/o sh Harbans Lal,
H No-B-3/287, Romana Street,
Jaito, Distt Faridkot.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o EO, MC,
Jaito, Distt Faridkot.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Deputy Director,
Local Govt, Ferozepur.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 777 of 2021

PRESENT: Sh.Lajpat Rai as the Appellant
Sh.Naib Singh, Inspector for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 25.11.2020 has sought information on 8 points regarding record/videography relating to MC Clerk Davinder Kumar who gave mercy petition on 08.05.2019 for reinstatement in election code of Lok sabha and DDLG Ferozepur sent order No.10408 dt.12.06.2019 as against this for not writing cash book. – the record of property tax collection – the retirement dues given to Manjit Singh and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of EO-MC Jaito, Distt.Faridkot. The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed a first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 21.12.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 14.07.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information.

The respondent was absent. The notice issued by the Commission was returned with the remarks 'refused due to strike'.

A fresh notice was sent to the PIO along with the order. The PIO was directed to look at the RTI application and provide whatever information is available on the record to the appellant.

On the date of the last hearing on **18.11.2021**, due to a technical problem in the VC at DAC Faridkot, the hearing could not take place. The case was adjourned.

Hearing dated 22.03.2022:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The appellant claims that the PIO has not supplied the information.

The respondent present pleaded that they have not received the RTI application/notice of the Commission. The appellant has been directed to hand over a copy of the RTI application to the Respondent. The PIO is directed to provide information to the appellant.

Appeal Case No. 777 of 2021

Having gone through the record, the Commission observes that the notice issued by the Commission on 02.06.2020 was received back on 17.06.2021 with the remarks of the postal authority "Refused". The notice was again sent to the PIO on 22.06.2021 which was also returned back by the postal authority with the same remarks on 01.07.2021. Now again, the order of the Commission dated 18.11.2021 has been returned with the remarks of postal authority "Refused".

Since the notice of the Commission has been refused by the PIO, under the powers vested under section 18(2) of the RTI Act, **the case is marked to the Deputy Commissioner, Faridkot to enquire into the matter that why disciplinary action 20(2) of the RTI Act 2005 be not taken against the PIO. Section 20(2) reads as under-**

"Where the Central Information Commission or the State Information Commission, as the case may be, at the time of deciding any complaint or appeal is of the opinion that the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, has, without any reasonable cause and persistently, failed to receive an application for information or has not furnished information within the time specified under sub-section (1) of section 7 or malafidely denied the request for information or knowingly given incorrect, incomplete or misleading information or destroyed information which was the subject of the request or obstructed in any manner in furnishing the information, it shall recommend for disciplinary action against the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, under the service rules applicable to him."

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **10.08.2022 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Faridkot.

Chandigarh
Dated : 22.03.2022

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commission

Copy to: The Deputy Commissioner,
Faridkot.



Sh Naval Jain, S/o Sh Nand Lal Jain,
Romana Street, Jaito, Distt Faridkot.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o EO, MC,
Jaito, Distt Faridkot.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Deputy Director,
Local Govt, Ferozepur.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 779 of 2021

PRESENT: Sh.Naval Jain as the Appellant
Sh.Naib Singh, Inspector for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 21.03.2020 has sought information on 8 points regarding a copy of the action taken report of the visit of Dy Director Ferozepur to Jaito on Sept.2018 – action taken against employees who misplaced a record – enquiry report of FIR No.29/18 by Vigilance Bureau -detail of property No.B3/281 and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of EO-MC Jaito, Distt.Faridkot. The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed a first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 29.09.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 14.07.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information.

The respondent was absent. The notice issued by the Commission had been returned with the remarks 'refused due to strike'.

A fresh notice was sent to the PIO along with the order. The PIO was directed to look at the RTI application and provide whatever information is available on the record to the appellant.

On the date of the last hearing on **18.11.2021**, due to a technical problem in the VC at DAC Faridkot, the hearing could not take place.

Hearing dated 22.03.2022:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The appellant claims that the PIO has not supplied the information.

The respondent present pleaded that they have not received the RTI application/notice of the Commission. The appellant has been directed to hand over a copy of the RTI application to the Respondent. The PIO is directed to provide information to the appellant.

Having gone through the record, the Commission observes that the notice issued by the Commission on 02.06.2020 was received back on 16.06.2021 with the remarks of the postal authority "Refused". The notice was again sent to the PIO on 22.06.2021 which was also returned back by the postal authority with the same remarks on 01.07.2021. Now again the order of the Commission dated 18.11.2021 has been returned with the remarks of postal authority "Refused".

Appeal Case No. 779 of 2021

Since the notice of the Commission has been refused by the PIO, under the powers vested under section 18(2) of the RTI Act, **the case is marked to the Deputy Commissioner, Faridkot to enquire into the matter that why disciplinary action 20(2) of the RTI Act 2005 be not taken against the PIO. Section 20(2) reads as under-**

“Where the Central Information Commission or the State Information Commission, as the case may be, at the time of deciding any complaint or appeal is of the opinion that the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, has, without any reasonable cause and persistently, failed to receive an application for information or has not furnished information within the time specified under sub-section (1) of section 7 or malafidely denied the request for information or knowingly given incorrect, incomplete or misleading information or destroyed information which was the subject of the request or obstructed in any manner in furnishing the information, it shall recommend for disciplinary action against the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, under the service rules applicable to him.”

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **10.08.2022 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Faridkot.

Chandigarh
Dated: 22.03.2022

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commission

Copy to: The Deputy Commissioner,
Faridkot.



Sh. Lajpat Rai, S/o sh Harbans Lal,
H No-B-3/287, Romana Street,
Jaito, Distt Faridkot.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/EO, MC,
Jaito, Distt Faridkot.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Deputy Director,
Local Govt, Ferozepur.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 775 of 2021

PRESENT: Sh.Lajpat Rai as the Appellant
Sh.Naib Singh Inspector for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 25.11.2020 has sought information on 8 points regarding resolution No.296, 297, 298 dt 07.04.2017 Ramesh Kumar, Prem Chand, Komal Sharma application for promotion along with suspension orders during service – enquiry report against Davinder Kumar clerk on filing letter dated 15.11.2016 & 13.12.2017 and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of EO-MC Jaito, Distt.Faridkot. The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed a first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 21.12.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 14.07.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. As per the appellant, the PIO had not provided the information.

The respondent was absent. The notice issued by the Commission had been returned with the remarks 'refused due to strike'.

A fresh notice was sent to the PIO along with the order. The PIO was directed to look at the RTI application and provide whatever information is available on the record to the appellant.

On the date of the last hearing on **18.11.2021**, due to a technical problem in the VC at DAC Faridkot, the hearing could not take place.

Hearing dated 22.03.2022:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The appellant claims that the PIO has not supplied the information.

The respondent present pleaded that they have not received the RTI application/notice of the Commission. The appellant has been directed to hand over a copy of the RTI application to the Respondent. The PIO is directed to provide information to the appellant.

Having gone through the record, the Commission observes that the notice issued by the Commission on 02.06.2020 was returned on 15.06.2021 with the remarks of the postal authority "Refused". Now again, the order of the Commission dated 18.11.2021 has been returned with the remarks of postal authority "Refused".

Since the notice of the Commission has been refused by the PIO, under the powers vested under section 18(2) of the RTI Act, **the case is marked to the Deputy Commissioner, Faridkot to enquire into the matter that why disciplinary action 20(2) of the RTI Act 2005 be not taken against the PIO. Section 20(2) reads as under:-**

“Where the Central Information Commission or the State Information Commission, as the case may be, at the time of deciding any complaint or appeal is of the opinion that the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, has, without any reasonable cause and persistently, failed to receive an application for information or has not furnished information within the time specified under sub-section (1) of section 7 or malafidely denied the request for information or knowingly given incorrect, incomplete or misleading information or destroyed information which was the subject of the request or obstructed in any manner in furnishing the information, it shall recommend for disciplinary action against the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, under the service rules applicable to him.”

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **10.08.2022 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Faridkot.

Chandigarh
Dated : 22.03.2022

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commission

Copy to: The Deputy Commissioner,
Faridkot.



Sh Baljinder Singh, S/o Sh Gian Singh,
Village Surghuri, Tehsil Jaito,
Distt Faridkot.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o EO, MC,
Jaito, Distt Faridkot.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Deputy Director,
Local Govt, Ferozepur.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1201 of 2021

PRESENT: Sh.Lajpat Rai for the Appellant
Sh.Naib Singh Inspector for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 28.07.2020 has sought information on 6 points regarding details of employees recruited in the years 2009, 2013 & 2010 along with publication notices in the newspaper, appointment letters & salary released from 01.01.2019 to 28.07.2020 – the record of plot in the name of Mukhtiar Singh allotted in 2009 and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of EO MC Jaito. The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed a first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 12.11.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 19.07.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. As per the appellant, the PIO had not provided the information.

The respondent was absent. The notice issued by the Commission was returned with the remarks 'refused due to strike'.

A fresh notice was sent to the PIO along with the order. The PIO was directed to look at the RTI application and provide whatever information is available on the record to the appellant.

Hearing dated 22.03.2022:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The appellant claims that the PIO has not supplied the information.

The respondent present pleaded that they have not received the RTI application/notice of the Commission. The appellant has been directed to hand over a copy of the RTI application to the Respondent. The PIO is directed to provide information to the appellant.

Having gone through the record, the Commission observes that the notice issued by the Commission on 03.06.2020 was returned on 16.06.2021 with the remarks of the postal authority "Refused". The notice was again sent to the PIO on 22.06.2021 which was also returned back by the postal authority with the same remarks on 01.07.2021. Now again the order of the Commission dated 18.11.2021 has been returned with the remarks of postal authority "Refused".

Appeal Case No. 1201 of 2021

Since the notice of the Commission has been refused by the PIO, under the powers vested under section 18(2) of the RTI Act, **the case is marked to the Deputy Commissioner, Faridkot to enquire into the matter that why disciplinary action 20(2) of the RTI Act 2005 be not taken against the PIO. Section 20(2) reads as under:-**

“Where the Central Information Commission or the State Information Commission, as the case may be, at the time of deciding any complaint or appeal is of the opinion that the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, has, without any reasonable cause and persistently, failed to receive an application for information or has not furnished information within the time specified under sub-section (1) of section 7 or malafidely denied the request for information or knowingly given incorrect, incomplete or misleading information or destroyed information which was the subject of the request or obstructed in any manner in furnishing the information, it shall recommend for disciplinary action against the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, under the service rules applicable to him.”

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **10.08.2022 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Faridkot.

Chandigarh
Dated : 22.03.2022

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commission

Copy to: The Deputy Commissioner,
Faridkot.



Sh Baljinder Singh, S/o Sh Gian Singh,
Village Surghuri, Tehsil Jaito,
Distt Faridkot.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o EO, MC,
Jaito, Distt Faridkot.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Deputy Director,
Local Govt, Ferozepur.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1200 of 2021

PRESENT: Sh.Lajpat Rai for the Appellant
Sh.Naib Singh Inspector for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through an RTI application dated 28.07.2020 has sought a copy of the attendance register of Ramesh Kumar and Suresh Kumar from March 2011 to 31.07.2020 along with the action taken against them after the decision of the court dated 26.08.2019 as per Fir No.21 dated 21.03.2011 – a copy of recruitment of Ruchi Bala on the compassionate ground - Promotion of Munshi Ram sweeper and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of EO-MC Jaito. The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed a first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 12.11.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 19.07.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. As per the appellant, the PIO had not provided the information.

The respondent was absent. The notice issued by the Commission was returned with the remarks 'refused due to strike'.

A fresh notice was sent to the PIO along with the order.

Hearing dated 22.03.2022:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The appellant claims that the PIO has not supplied the information.

The respondent present pleaded that they have not received the RTI application/notice of the Commission. The appellant has been directed to hand over a copy of the RTI application to the Respondent. The PIO is directed to provide information to the appellant.

Having gone through the record, the Commission observes that the notice issued by the Commission on 03.06.2020 was returned back on 16.06.2021 with the remarks of the postal authority "Refused". The notice was again sent to the PIO on 22.06.2021 which was also returned back by the postal authority with the same remarks on 01.07.2021. Now again, the order of the Commission dated 18.11.2021 has been returned with the remarks of postal authority "Refused".

Appeal Case No. 1200 of 2021

Since the notice of the Commission has been refused by the PIO, under the powers vested under section 18(2) of the RTI Act, **the case is marked to the Deputy Commissioner, Faridkot to enquire into the matter that why disciplinary action 20(2) of the RTI Act 2005 be not taken against the PIO. Section 20(2) reads as under:-**

“Where the Central Information Commission or the State Information Commission, as the case may be, at the time of deciding any complaint or appeal is of the opinion that the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, has, without any reasonable cause and persistently, failed to receive an application for information or has not furnished information within the time specified under sub-section (1) of section 7 or malafidely denied the request for information or knowingly given incorrect, incomplete or misleading information or destroyed information which was the subject of the request or obstructed in any manner in furnishing the information, it shall recommend for disciplinary action against the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, under the service rules applicable to him.”

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **10.08.2022 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Faridkot.

Chandigarh
Dated : 22.03.2022

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commission

Copy to: The Deputy Commissioner,
Faridkot.

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. Lajpat Rai, S/o sh Harbans Lal,
H No-B-3/287, Romana Street,
Jaito, Distt Faridkot.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o EO, MC,
Kotakpura.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Deputy Director,
Urban Local Bodies,
Ferozepur Cantt.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1191 of 2021

PRESENT: Sh.Lajpat Rai as the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 21.03.2020 has sought information on 7 points regarding proceeding book from 01.09.2019 including forwarding letter sent to director local govt., file of JCB Machine, Biredeshon machine, Hazard waste machine, stock register – an estimate of sanitation branch for purchase of Rehries of Rs.9.00 lacs including the name of in charge of sanitation with joining report - and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of EO-MC Kapurthala. The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed a first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 24.12.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 19.07.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information.

The respondent present pleaded that since the information sought by the appellant is voluminous, the appellant be asked to inspect the record and get the relevant information. The respondent further informed that the RTI application is also not legible.

Hearing both the parties, the appellant was directed to send a legible application that is typed to the PIO, with a copy to the Commission. The PIO was directed to go through the RTI application and provide all information that is easily accessible and which is permissible under the RTI Act. The PIO was directed to reply to each point of the RTI application separately.

On the date of last hearing on **18.11.2021**, due to a technical problem in the VC at DAC Faridkot, the hearing could not take place.

Hearing dated 22.03.2022:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The appellant claims that the PIO has not supplied the information.

The respondent is absent. The earlier order stands.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **10.08.2022 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Faridkot.

Chandigarh
Dated : 22.03.2022

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commission

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. Lajpat Rai, S/o sh Harbans Lal,
H No-B-3/287, Romana Street,
Jaito, Distt Faridkot.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o EO, MC,
Jaitu, Distt Faridkot.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Deputy Director,
Urban Local Bodies,
Ferozepur Cantt.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1190 of 2021

PRESENT: Sh.Lajpat Rai as the Appellant
Sh.Naib Singh Inspector for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 27.06.2020 has sought information on 11 points regarding Tax Bill TS-1 register No.36(2012) 1 to 40, 90 to 100 (book No.19-2019) 1 to 30, 85 to 100 and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of EO-MC Jaitu. The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed a first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 11.01.2021 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case last came up for hearing on 18.11.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. As per the appellant, the PIO had not provided the information.

The respondent was absent. The notice issued by the Commission was returned with the remarks 'refused due to strike'.

A fresh notice was sent to the PIO along with the order. The PIO was directed to look at the RTI application and provide whatever information is available on the record to the appellant.

On the date of the last hearing on **18.11.2021**, due to a technical problem in the VC at DAC Faridkot, the hearing could not take place.

Hearing dated 22.03.2022:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The appellant claims that the PIO has not supplied the information.

The respondent present pleaded that they have not received the RTI application/notice of the Commission. The appellant has been directed to hand over a copy of the RTI application to the Respondent. The PIO is directed to provide information to the appellant.

Having gone through the record, the Commission observes that the notice issued by the Commission on 03.06.2020 was returned on 15.06.2021 with the remarks of the postal authority "Refused". Now again the order of the Commission dated 18.11.2021 has been returned with the remarks of the postal authority "Refused".

Appeal Case No. 1190 of 2021

Since the notice of the Commission has been refused by the PIO, under the powers vested under section 18(2) of the RTI Act, **the case is marked to the Deputy Commissioner, Faridkot to enquire into the matter that why disciplinary action 20(2) of the RTI Act 2005 be not taken against the PIO. Section 20(2) reads as under:-**

“Where the Central Information Commission or the State Information Commission, as the case may be, at the time of deciding any complaint or appeal is of the opinion that the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, has, without any reasonable cause and persistently, failed to receive an application for information or has not furnished information within the time specified under sub-section (1) of section 7 or malafidely denied the request for information or knowingly given incorrect, incomplete or misleading information or destroyed information which was the subject of the request or obstructed in any manner in furnishing the information, it shall recommend for disciplinary action against the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, under the service rules applicable to him.”

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **10.08.2022 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Faridkot.

Chandigarh
Dated : 22.03.2022

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commission

Copy to: The Deputy Commissioner,
Faridkot.



Sh. Lajpat Rai, S/o sh Harbans Lal,
H No-B-3/287, Romana Street,
Jaito, Distt Faridkot.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o EO, MC,
Jaitu, Distt Faridkot.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Deputy Director,
Urban Local Bodies,
Ferozepur Cantt.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1189 of 2021

PRESENT: Sh.Lajpat Rai as the Appellant
Sh.Naib Singh Inspector for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through the RTI application dated 27.06.2020 has sought information on 08 points regarding letters No.9966, 17.5.2018, 20519/25.11.2019 received from DDLG Feerozepur relating to meeting and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of EO-MC Jaitu. The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed a first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 11.01.2021 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case last came up for hearing on 18.11.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. As per the appellant, the PIO had not provided the information.

The respondent was absent. The notice issued by the Commission was returned with the remarks 'refused due to strike'.

A fresh notice was sent to the PIO along with the order. The PIO was directed to look at the RTI application and provide whatever information is available on the record to the appellant.

On the date of the last hearing on **18.11.2021**, due to a technical problem in the VC at DAC Faridkot, the hearing could not take place.

Hearing dated 22.03.2022:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The appellant claims that the PIO has not supplied the information.

The respondent present pleaded that they have not received the RTI application/notice of the Commission. The appellant has been directed to hand over a copy of the RTI application to the Respondent. The PIO is directed to provide information to the appellant.

Having gone through the record, the Commission observes that the notice issued by the Commission on 03.06.2020 was received back on 15.06.2021 with the remarks of the postal authority "Refused". Now again the order of the Commission dated 18.11.2021 has been returned with the remarks of the postal authority "Refused".

Appeal Case No. 1189 of 2021

Since the notice of the Commission has been refused by the PIO, under the powers vested under section 18(2) of the RTI Act, **the case is marked to the Deputy Commissioner, Faridkot to enquire into the matter that why disciplinary action 20(2) of the RTI Act 2005 be not taken against the PIO. Section 20(2) reads as under-**

“Where the Central Information Commission or the State Information Commission, as the case may be, at the time of deciding any complaint or appeal is of the opinion that the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, has, without any reasonable cause and persistently, failed to receive an application for information or has not furnished information within the time specified under sub-section (1) of section 7 or malafidely denied the request for information or knowingly given incorrect, incomplete or misleading information or destroyed information which was the subject of the request or obstructed in any manner in furnishing the information, it shall recommend for disciplinary action against the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, under the service rules applicable to him.”

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **10.08.2022 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Faridkot.

Chandigarh
Dated : 22.03.2022

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commission

Copy to: The Deputy Commissioner,
Faridkot.