

Sh. Meetinder Singh Mann
S/o Late Sh. Gurmit Singh
H. No. 3095, Sector 28-D,
Chandigarh (9878312900)

.....Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o The Addl. Director General of Police, Pb.,
(NRI Wing), (RTI Branch)
Phase 7, Distt. S.A.S. Nagar (Mohali) (Punjab)

First Appellate Authority ,
O/o The Addl. Director General of Police, Pb.,
(NRI Wing), (RTI Branch)
Phase 7, Distt. S.A.S. Nagar (Mohali) (Punjab)

....Respondent

Appeal Case No. 2172 of 2022

Present : None on behalf of the appellant.
None on behalf of the respondent.

ORDER

The RTI request is dated 19.10.2021. First appeal is dated 29.11.2021. Second appeal has been received in the Commission on 04.05.2022.

2. Neither the appellant, Sh. Meetinder Singh Mann nor the respondent is present in today's hearing.

3. After examining the documents placed on record, it is found that the Incharge (RTI Branch) Sh. Sukhdeep Singh through a letter has intimated the Commission that he is unable to attend today's hearing and a reply has already been given to the appellant. It is taken on record.

4. After examining the documents placed on record, it is also found that the respondent PIO through another reply vide letter no. 17597 dated 01.07.2022 (received in the Commission vide Diary No. 14392 dated 01.07.2022), has intimated the Commission that a reply has already been given to the appellant intimating him that the information sought for by him exempted from disclosure under Section 8 (1) (h) of the RTI Act. It is taken on record.

5. The appellant, Sh. Meetinder Singh Mann, was absent on the last date of hearing, held on 29.06.2022. He is again absent from today's hearing without any intimation to the Commission. He has also not approached the Commission with any contrary claim .

6. In view of the above, it is assumed that the appellant has received the above-said reply dated 01.07.2022 and is satisfied with the same.

7. As no cause of action is left in this case, hence, the instant appeal-case is announced as **disposed and closed**.

Copies of the orders be sent to the parties.

Date : 22nd July, 2022

(Amrit Partap Singh Sekhon)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

Ms. Kiran Sharma
W/o Late Sh. Jagdish Sharma,
Street No. 42, Preet Nagar,
Shimlapuri, Ludhiana (Punjab)
(793081420)

....Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o The Director General of Police, Punjab
Police Head Quarter,
Sector 9, Chandigarh

First Appellate Authority,
O/o The Director General of Police, Punjab
Police Head Quarter,
Sector 9, Chandigarh

...Respondents

Appeal Case No. 4740 of 2021

Present : Sh. Sushil Kumar (9814500575) on behalf of the appellant.
i) Sh. Ramesh Kumar, A. S. I. (78378-03000) O/o Commissioner of Police,
Ludhiana ;
ii) Sh. Ravi Kumar, Constable (98884-30990) O/o Commissioner of Police,
Ludhiana ;
iii) Ms. Narinder Kaur, APIO/Incharge, (87250-00755), for the respondent.

ORDER

The RTI request is dated 24.07.2021. First appeal is dated 23.08.2021. Second appeal has been received in the Commission on 14.10.2021.

Sh. Sushil Kumar, appeared on behalf of the appellant, Ms. Kiran Sharma in today's hearing.

Sh. Ramesh Kumar, A. S. I. ; Sh. Ravi Kumar, Constable and Ms. Narinder Kaur, APIO/Incharge, who appeared on behalf of the respondent PIO in today's hearing, state that the required information has already been given to the appellant time and again and also handed over the same to the appellant during the hearing in the Commission today.

After going over the information supplied, Sh. Sushil Kumar (representative of appellant) has given an acknowledgement receipt (on behalf of the appellant) of having received the requisite information, during the hearing. It is taken on record.

Since complete information has been supplied by the respondent PIO and the representative of appellant has also acknowledged that the required information has been received and has also given his consent to close the case, hence, the instant appeal-case is announced as **disposed of and closed.**

Copies of the orders be sent to the parties.

Date : 22nd July, 2022

(Amrit Partap Singh Sekhon)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

Sushil Kumar
H. No. 1410, Phase – I,
Urban Estate, Dugri Road
Ludhiana – 141013 (Punjab)
(9814500575)

....Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o The Addl. Director General of Police, Pb.,
(I V C),
Police Head Quarter,
Sector - 9, Chandigarh

First Appellate Authority,
O/o The Director General of Police, Pb.,
Police Head Quarter,
Sector - 9, Chandigarh

...Respondents

Appeal Case No. 4220 of 2021

Present : Sh. Sushil Kumar , the appellant in person.
i) Sh. Ramesh Kumar, A. S. I.(78378-03000) O/o Commissioner of Police,
Ludhiana ;
ii) Sh. Ravi Kumar, Constable(98884-30990) O/o Commissioner of Police,
Ludhiana ;
iii) Ms. Narinder Kaur, APIO/Incharge, (87250-00755),
iv) Sh. Baljinder singh, Sr Inspector (90418-17179) ;
v) Sh. Purshotam Kumar, A. S. I. (94171-31510) for the respondent.

ORDER

The RTI request is dated 18.10.2020. First appeal is dated 28.07.2021. Second appeal has been received in the Commission on 16.09.2021.

2. Sh. Sushil Kumar, appeared in person in today's hearing.

3. Sh. Ramesh Kumar, A. S. I. ; Sh. Ravi Kumar, Constable ; Ms. Narinder Kaur, APIO/Incharge ; Sh. Baljinder singh, Sr Inspector and and Sh. Purshotam Kumar, A. S. I., who appeared on behalf of the respondent PIO in today's hearing, state that the required information has already been given to the appellant time and again and also handed over the same to the appellant during the hearing in the Commission today.

4. After going over the information supplied, the appellant has given an acknowledgement receipt of having received the requisite information, during the hearing. It is taken on record.

5. Since complete information has been supplied by the respondent PIO and the appellant has also acknowledged that he has received the required information and has also given his consent to close the case, hence, the instant appeal-case is announced as **disposed of and closed.**

Copies of the orders be sent to the parties.

Date : 22nd July, 2022

(Amrit Partap Singh Sekhon)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

Gurmej Lal
1331-5, Street No. 05,
Vishwakarma Bhawan,
Down Canal Road,
Simlapuri, Distt. - Ludhiana - 141003 (Punjab)
(97816-72776)

....Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o The Executive Officer,
Nagar Council,
Sirhind, Distt. – Fatehgarh Sahib (Punjab)

First Appellate Authority,
O/o The Executive Officer,
Nagar Council,
Sirhind, Distt. – Fatehgarh Sahib (Punjab)

...Respondents

Appeal Case No. 1114 of 2022

Present : None on behalf of the appellant.
Sh. Robin, Clerk, (98885-31917), on behalf of the respondent.

ORDER

The RTI request is dated 13.11.2021. First appeal is dated 20.12.2021. Second appeal has been received in the Commission on 04.03.2022.

2. The appellant, Sh. Gurmej Lal, is not present in today's hearing but through an e-mail, he has intimated the Commission that the information demanded through RTI request is specified and an opportunity be given for inspection of the relevant official-record. It is taken on record.

3. Sh. Robin, Clerk, Junior Engineer, who appeared on behalf of the respondent PIO in today's hearing, states that part information has already been supplied to the appellant and some of the information demanded through RTI request is 'voluminous' in nature.

4. Nevertheless, an opportunity is given to the appellant to visit the office of the respondent PIO during working hours to specify the required information.

5. The respondent PIO concerned is directed to supply the information, after receiving the specific queries, which would be intimated by the appellant (within the queries raised through RTI request) , to him by registered post under intimation to the Commission.

6. With the above-announced directions, the instant appeal-case is announced as **disposed and closed.**

Copies of the orders be sent to the parties.

Date : 22nd July, 2022

(Amrit Partap Singh Sekhon)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

Gurmej Lal
1331-5, Street No. 05,
Vishwakarma Bhawan,
Down Canal Road,
Simlapuri, Distt. - Ludhiana - 141003 (Punjab)
(97816-72776)

....Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o The Executive Officer,
Nagar Council,
Gobindgarh,
Distt. – Fatehgarh Sahib (Punjab)

First Appellate Authority,
O/o The Executive Officer,
Nagar Council,
Gobindgarh,
Distt. – Fatehgarh Sahib (Punjab)

...Respondents

Appeal Case No. 1115 of 2022

Present : None on behalf of the appellant.
Sh. Bodh Raj Singh, Junior Engineer (78141-45739), for the respondent.

ORDER

The RTI request is dated 13.11.2021. First appeal is dated 20.12.2021. Second appeal has been received in the Commission on 04.03.2022.

2. Sh. Bodh Raj Singh, Junior Engineer, who appeared on behalf of the respondent PIO in today's hearing, states that a reply has already been given to the appellant intimating him that information demanded through RTI request is 'voluminous' in nature and if the appellant would be more specific for what he demands, information would be provided and a reply vide letter no. 557 dated 22.07.2022 has also been set to the Commission. It is taken on record.

3. The appellant, Sh. Gurmej Lal, is not present in today's hearing but through an e-mail, he has intimated the Commission that the information demanded through RTI request is specified and an opportunity be given for inspection of the relevant official-record. It is taken on record.

4. Nevertheless, an opportunity is given to the appellant to visit the office of the respondent PIO during working hours to specify the required information.

5. The respondent PIO concerned is directed to supply the information, after receiving the specific queries, which would be intimated by the appellant (within the queries raised through RTI request), to him by registered post under intimation to the Commission.

6. With the above-announced directions, the instant appeal-case is announced as **disposed and closed**.

Copies of the orders be sent to the parties.

Date : 22nd July, 2022

(Amrit Partap Singh Sekhon)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

Sh. Sushil Kumar, # 1410, Phase -1, Urban Estate
Durgri, Ludhiana – 141013 (9814500575)

.....Appellant

..Vs

Public Information Officer,
O/o Director General of Punjab
Punjab Police Headquarter, Sector 9
Chandigarh

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Director General of Punjab
Punjab Police Headquarter, Sector 9
Chandigarh

2.Public Information Officer,
O/o Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana

.....Respondent

AC No. 687 of 2022

PRESENT : (i) Sh. Sushil Kumar (9814500545) on behalf of the appellant
(ii) For the Respondent: Sh. Ramesh Kumar, ASI (7837803000), o/o Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana, Sh. Ravi Kumar, Constable (9888430990), o/o Commissioner of Police Ludhiana.

ORDER:

This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 04.07.2022 vide which PIO, O/o C.P.Ludhiana was impleaded as respondent no.2.

2. The brief facts of the case is that the appellant has sought certain information under the Right to Information Act of 2005(hereinafter referred to as the Act) dated 09.11.2021.

3. Since, the information being sought for by the Appellant in the RTI Application was not furnished to him, therefore he filed the first appeal before the office of Director General of Punjab. Being aggrieved by the non-receipt of the information the Appellant sought to file the present Second Appeal before this Commission, which was taken up for hearing on 30.05.2022. On the first hearing dated 30.05.2022, neither the appellant nor the respondent was present. On the next date of hearing i.e. 04.07.2022, again the appellant was not present and the respondent appeared on behalf of PIO, o/o DGP Punjab stated that the information is lying with PIO, o/o Commissioner of Police (C.P.) Ludhiana. Hence, PIO, o/o C.P. Ludhiana was impleaded as respondent no. 2.

4. Today, Sh. Ramesh Kumar, ASI and Sh. Ravi Kumar , Constable both office of Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana and Sh. Purshotam Kumar , ASI office of DGP Punjab , appeared and states that the requisite information has already been supplied to the appellant. They states that they have also brought complete original record today in the Commission. The appellant can inspect the record. They have also handed over the information running into 53 pages to the appellant today in the Commission.

5. The appellant Sh. Sushil Kumar, who appeared in person in today's hearing, has gone through the same and states that incomplete information has been given to him so far. He states that he is not satisfied with the information provided by the respondents.

6. After hearing both the parties and examining the case file, it is observed that the respondents has brought original record today in the Commission. They have also handed over the information pertaining to 53 pages, duly attested, to the appellant today in the Commission. But the appellant is not satisfied.

7. A close scrutiny of the questions asked and the answers given shows that the information, as demanded, has been supplied in its entirety by the Respondent. The appellant, however, is unnecessarily dragging the matter with some ulterior motive. It appears that he is trying to pressurize the department into doing his bidding through the misuse of RTI Act. I cannot allow such practices.

8. Further , it is also found that appellant before this Commission has filed numerous Second Appeals under the RTI Act seeking vague and voluminous information which is verbatim similar to each other under the RTI Act , which are pending for adjudication before the coordinate Benches of this Commission. Out of all such cases filed by the Appellant before this Commission, eleven have been listed before this Bench today. In the name of Sh. Sushil Kumar, Smt. Neena Gupta, Smt.Kiran Sharma, which are being represented by Sh. Sushil Kumar himself with authority letter.

9. It is observed that the appellant herein has been indulging in the practice of filing repeated RTI applications on the same subject matter, seeking the same information, more than once, and has been taking the said matters to first and second appeal, respectively merely in order to harass and humiliate the respective Public Authorities.

10. It is also found that the RTI applications filed by the appellant are absolutely frivolous and non serious applications. The appellant has been very often in the habit of making such frivolous applications.

11. The aforesaid conduct of the Appellant , not only amounts to abuse of process of law but also lines up in stark violation of the Statement of objects and Reasons with which the RTI was enacted by the Parliament.

12. In the light of the above, it is abundantly clear that the respondent PIO o/o C.P.Ludhiana has done his lawful duty to segregate his part of the information relevant to his department and to furnish to the appellant even though the same was jumbled by the information seeker in the most vague way.

13. Upon perusal of the facts on record as well as on the basis of the proceedings during the hearing, the Commission observes that the appellant in his hand written RTI application has adopted a convoluted method to express the facts of the instant case. The Commission, therefore opines that the appellant instead of seeking information in a reasonable and comprehensible way, has resorted to adopt a tortuous method containing quite a lot of issues/queries in a disorganized /indecipherable manner, resulting in unfathomable hurdles on the part of the Respondent. The appellant being a responsible citizen who poses to be concerned about the functionality of the Respondent public authority must impliedly know his limitations while filing an RTI query before any Respondent public authority. The Commission, strictly cautions him that in future, he shall holistically adhere to the relevant provisions of the RTI Rules, while filing any RTI applications before any public authority.

14. In view of the foregoing, the Commission is of the considered opinion that the Respondent has provided appropriate and permissible information to the Appellant. In addition the respondent has also given an opportunity to inspect the record to the appellant which the appellant has not remitted.

15. The Commission advises the appellant, who is presumed to know the law, to be sane enough to see reason in not abusing the RTI and behave like a responsible citizen.

16. Since, the information has been provided to the appellant by the respondent, no cause of action is left, hence the appeal case filed by the appellant is **disposed of and closed**. The public authorities have spent considerable time and resources in responding to the RTI application. The appellant is further advised to not cause a mockery of the spirit of the RTI Act by unnecessarily flooding the public authority with RTI applications on the same matter. It is made clear that many number of RTI applications on the same issue will not alter the information that was held and parted with by the Respondents. Copy of the decisions be provided to the parties.

Date : 22nd July, 2022

**(Amrit Partap Singh Sekhon)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab**

Shri Sushil Kumar, (98145 00575)

House No. 1410, Phase-I,
Urban Estate, Dugri Road,
Ludhiana – 141013

....Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Director General of Punjab
Punjab Police Headquarter,
Sector – 9, Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority
O/o Commissioner of Police,
Ludhiana.

....Respondents

AC No. 5173 of 2021

PRESENT : (i) Sh. Sushil Kumar (9814500545) on behalf of the appellant
(ii) For the Respondent: Sh. Ramesh Kumar, ASI (7837803000), o/o Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana, Sh. Ravi Kumar, Constable (9888430990), o/o Commissioner of Police Ludhiana.

ORDER:

This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 17.06.2022

2. The brief facts of the case is that the appellant has sought certain information under the Right to Information Act of 2005(hereinafter referred to as the Act) dated 22.05.2021.

3. Since, the information being sought for by the Appellant in the aforesaid Application was not furnished to him, therefore he filed the first appeal before the office of Director General of Punjab. Being aggrieved by the non-receipt of the information the Appellant sought to file the present Second Appeal before this Commission, which was taken up for hearing on 16.05.2022.

4. On the first hearing dated 16.05.2022, the appellant was absent and the respondent filed his reply that the complaint of the appellant has already been seen and filed. The same reply has also been scanned in the Commission orders dated 16.05.2022. On the next date of hearing i.e. 17.06.2022, the appellant was not satisfied hence the respondent was again directed to file his reply.

5. Today, Sh. Ramesh Kumar, ASI and Sh. Ravi Kumar , Constable both office of Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana and Sh. Purshotam Kumar , ASI office of DGP Punjab , appeared and states that the requisite information has already been supplied to the appellant. They states that they have also brought original record today in the Commission. The appellant can inspect the record.

6. The appellant Sh. Sushil Kumar, who appeared in person in today's hearing, has gone through the same and states that he is not satisfied with the same.

7. After hearing both the parties and examining the case file, it is observed that the respondents has brought original record today in the Commission. The appellant has gone through the same and states that he is not satisfied.

8. A close scrutiny of the questions asked and the answers given shows that the reply has been supplied in its entirety by the Respondent. The appellant, however, is unnecessarily dragging the matter with some ulterior motive. It appears that he is trying to pressurize the department into doing his bidding through the misuse of RTI Act. I cannot allow such practices.

9. In the light of the above, it is abundantly clear that the respondent PIO o/o C.P.Ludhiana has done his lawful duty to segregate his part of the information relevant to his department and to furnish to the appellant even though the same was jumbled by the information seeker in the most vague way.

10. Upon perusal of the facts on record as well as on the basis of the proceedings during the hearing, the Commission observes that the appellant in his hand written RTI application has adopted a convoluted method to express the facts of the instant case. The Commission, therefore opines that the appellant instead of seeking information in a reasonable and comprehensible way, has resorted to adopt a tortuous method containing quite a lot of issues/queries in a disorganized /indecipherable manner, resulting in unfathomable hurdles on the part of the Respondent.

11. Further , it is also found that appellant before this Commission has filed numerous Second Appeals under the RTI Act seeking vague and voluminous information which is verbatim similar to each other under the RTI Act , which are pending for adjudication before the coordinate Benches of this Commission. Out of all such cases filed by the Appellant before this Commission, eleven have been listed before this Bench today. In the name of Sh. Sushil Kumar, Smt. Neena Gupta, Smt.Kiran Sharma, which are being represented by Sh. Sushil Kumar himself with authority letter.

12. The appellant being a responsible citizen who poses to be concerned about the functionality of the Respondent public authority must impliedly know his limitations while filing an RTI query before any Respondent public authority. The Commission, strictly cautions him that in future, he shall holistically adhere to the relevant provisions of the RTI Rules, while filing any RTI applications before any public authority.

13. In view of the foregoing, the Commission is of the considered opinion that the Respondent has provided appropriate and permissible information to the Appellant. In addition the respondent has also given an opportunity to inspect the record to the appellant which the appellant has not remitted.

14. The Commission advises the appellant, who is presumed to know the law, to be sane enough to see reason in not abusing the RTI and behave like a responsible citizen.

15. Since, the information has been provided to the appellant by the respondent, no cause of action is left, hence the appeal case filed by the appellant is **disposed of and closed**. The public authorities have spent considerable time and resources in responding to the RTI application. The appellant is further advised to not cause a mockery of the spirit of the RTI Act by unnecessarily flooding the public authority with RTI applications on the same matter. It is made clear that many number of RTI applications on the same issue will not alter the information that was held and parted with by the Respondents. Copy of the decisions be provided to the parties.

Date : 22nd July, 2022

**(Amrit Partap Singh Sekhon)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab**

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION)
RED CROSS BUILDING, MADHYA MARG, SECTOR 16, CHANDIGARH
Helpline No. 0172-2864100 Phone No-0172-2864115
Email: psic25@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us - www.infocommpunjab.com
Bench: Sh. Amrit Partap Singh Sekhon, State Information Commissioner, Punjab
Smt. Kiran Sharma, W/o Late Sh. Jagdish Sharma
Street No. 42, Preet Nagar, Shimlapuri
Ludhiana (793081420)



.....Appellant

..Vs

Public Information Officer,
O/o Director General of Punjab,
Punjab Police Headquarter, Sector 9,
Chandigarh

First Appellate Authority
O/o Commissioner of Police, LudhianaRespondent

AC No. 5172 of 2021

PRESENT : (i) Sh. Sushil Kumar (9814500545) on behalf of the appellant
(ii) For the Respondent: Sh. Ramesh Kumar, ASI (7837803000), o/o Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana, Sh. Ravi Kumar, Constable (9888430990), o/o Commissioner of Police Ludhiana.

ORDER:

This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 24.06.2022

2. The brief facts of the case is that the appellant has sought certain information under the Right to Information Act of 2005(hereinafter referred to as the Act) dated 22.05.2021.
3. Since, the information being sought for by the Appellant in the aforesaid Application was not furnished to him, therefore he filed the First Appeal before the office of Director General of Punjab. Being aggrieved by the non-receipt of the information the Appellant sought to file the present Second Appeal before this Commission, which was taken up for hearing on 21.03.2022.
4. On 21.03.2022, the appellant was not present and the respondent filed point-wise reply which was scanned in the orders. On the next date of hearing i.e. 24.06.2022, again the appellant was not present and the respondent was directed to file his point-wise reply.
5. Today, Sh. Ramesh Kumar, ASI and Sh. Ravi Kumar , Constable both office of Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana and Sh. Purshotam Kumar , ASI office of DGP Punjab , states that the requisite information has already been supplied to the appellant.
6. Sh. Sushil Kumar, representative for the appellant, who appeared in today's hearing, has gone through the same and states he is not satisfied with the information provided by the respondents.

7. A close scrutiny of the questions asked and the answers given shows that the reply to the RTI of the appellant has been supplied by the Respondent. The appellant, however, is unnecessarily dragging the matter with some ulterior motive.

8. It is found that appellant before this Commission has filed numerous Second Appeals under the RTI Act seeking vague and voluminous information which is verbatim similar to each other under the RTI Act, which is pending for adjudication before the coordinate Benches of this Commission. Out of all such cases filed by the Appellant before this Commission, eleven have been listed before this Bench today. In the name of Sh. Sushil Kumar, Smt. Neena Gupta, Smt. Kiran Sharma, which are being represented by Sh. Sushil Kumar himself with authority letter.

9. It is ascertained that the appellant herein has been indulging in the practice of filing repeated RTI applications on the same subject matter, seeking the same information, more than once, and has been taking the said matters to first and second appeal, respectively merely in order to harass and humiliate the respective Public Authorities.

10. The aforesaid conduct of the Appellant, not only amounts to abuse of process of law but also lines up in stark violation of the Statement of objects and Reasons with which the RTI was enacted by the Parliament.

11. Upon perusal of the facts on record as well as on the basis of the proceedings during the hearing, the Commission observes that the appellant in his hand written RTI application has adopted a convoluted method to express the facts of the instant case. The Commission, therefore, opines that the appellant instead of seeking information in a reasonable and comprehensible way, has resorted to adopt a tortuous method containing quite a lot of issues/queries in a disorganized /indecipherable manner, resulting in unfathomable hurdles on the part of the Respondent. The appellant being a responsible citizen who poses to be concerned about the functionality of the Respondent public authority must impliedly know his limitations while filing an RTI query before any Respondent public authority. The Commission, strictly cautions him that in future, he shall holistically adhere to the relevant provisions of the RTI Rules, while filing any RTI applications before any public authority.

12. When confronted with the aforesaid position the representative for the appellant herein, could not provide a reasonable justification and reasons for filing such RTI applications and seeking such wide range of information.

13. Though this Commission is conscious of the fact that there is no provision in RTI Act, 2005 to penalize the applicant for abusing the provisions of the Right to Information Act and unnecessarily burdening the respective Public Authorities with the such repetitive RTI Applications.

14. Therefore the Commission is of the view that the present appeal is **devoid of merit and hence the instant appeal-case is hereby disposed of and closed.** The public authorities have spent considerable time and resources in responding to the RTI application. Sh. Sushil Kumar is further advised to not cause a mockery of the spirit of the RTI Act by unnecessarily flooding the public authority with RTI applications on the same matter. It is made clear that many number of RTI applications on the same issue will not alter the information that was held and parted with by the Respondents. Copy of the decisions be provided to the parties.

Date : 22nd July, 2022

**(Amrit Partap Singh Sekhon)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab**

Sh. Vinay
S/o Sh. Jai Parkash Goyal,
House No. 004, Greet Tower - 6,
Omexe Greens, Ambala Chandigarh Highway,
Jharmari, Derabassi,
Distt. SAS Nagar (Punjab)
(8295000951)

....Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o The Deputy Commissioner,
S. A. S. Nagar(Punjab)

First Appellate Authority,
O/o The Deputy Commissioner,
S. A. S. Nagar(Punjab)

...Respondents

Appeal Case No. 2162 of 2022

Present : Sh. Vinay , the appellant in person.
Sh. Mahipal Sharma, Junior Assistant-cum- APIO(98142-77677), on behalf of the respondent.

ORDER

The RTI request is dated 07.02.2022. First appeal is dated 18.03.2022. Second appeal has been received in the Commission on 04.05.2022.

2. Sh. Mahipal Sharma, Junior Assistant-cum- APIO, who appeared on behalf of the respondent PIO in today's hearing, states that a reply has already been given to the appellant and a reply has also been sent to the Commission vide letter no. 71-72 dated 22.07.2022. It is taken on record.

3. The appellant, Sh. Vinay, who appeared in person with Sh. K. C. Katoch in today's hearing, states that no such reply has been received by him.

3. After going over the queries raised by the appellant through his RTI request and the response submitted by the respondent during the hearing and finding it satisfactory, no cause of action is left in this case.

4. As the above-said reply has not been received by the appellant, hence, the respondent PIO concerned is directed to send the above-said reply to the appellant under intimation to the Commission

5. With the above-announced directions, the instant appeal-case is announced as **disposed and closed.**

Copies of the orders be sent to the parties.

Date : 22nd July, 2022

(Amrit Partap Singh Sekhon)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

Dr. Neelam Sharma,
Assistant Prof. (Education)
Mehsampur Road,
V.P.O. - Rurka Kalan,
Tehsil – Phillaur,
Distt. Jalandhar -144031 (Punjab)
(M.-9878205000)

.....Appellant

Vs

Public Information Officer,
O/o The Director,
Public Instructions (Colleges) Pb.,
Vidhya Bhawan, P.S.E.B. Complex,
Sector 68, S.A.S. Nagar (Mohali) (Punjab)

First Appellate Authority,
O/o The Director,
Public Instructions (Colleges) Pb.,
Vidhya Bhawan, P.S.E.B. Complex,
Sector 68, S.A.S. Nagar (Mohali) (Punjab)

...Respondents

Appeal Case No. 5717 of 2021

Present : Dr. Neelam Sharma, the appellant in person.
i) Ms. Shalini, Superintendent-cum-APIO O/o D.P.I.(Colleges)(Pb.)
S.A.S.Nagar (94175-00818) ;
ii) Ms. Ruchi Joshi, Senior Assistant /o D.P.I.(Colleges)(Pb.) S.A.S.Nagar
(89687-96315) ;
iii) Sh. Navjeet Singh, Legal Assistant O/o D.P.I.(Colleges)(Pb.)
S.A.S.Nagar (76969-11611) ;
iv) Ms. Surinder Jit Kaur, Principal-cum-PIO of Ramgarhia College of
Education, Phagwara, for the respondent.

ORDER

The RTI request is dated 23.11.2020. First appeal is dated 17.09.2021. Second appeal has been received in the Commission on 14.12.2021.

2. The appellant, Dr. Neelam Sharma, appeared in person in today's hearing
3. Ms. Surinder Jit Kaur, Principal-cum-PIO of Ramgarhia College of Education, Phagwara, who appeared in today's hearing, states that for the information, whichever relates with Ramgarhia College of Education, Phagwara, a reply dated 28.06.2022 in an affidavit has already been submitted, which is placed in the case-file.
4. Ms. Shalini, Superintendent-cum-APIO ;Ms. Ruchi Joshi, Senior Assistant and Sh. Navjeet Singh, Legal Assistant of office of D.P.I.(Colleges)(Pb.) S. A. S. Nagar, who appeared in today's hearing, state that the information relates to office of D. P. I.(C), has already been supplied to the appellant .

5. They further state that in compliance to the order dated 23.05.2022, the Deputy Director office of D.P.I.(Colleges)(Pb.) S. A. S. Nagar has sent a reply dated 22.07.2022 in an affidavit alongwith annexure, in response to the show-cause issued vide orders dated 23.05.2022. It is taken on record.

6. After going through the written-submission dated 22.07.2022, sent by the concerned PIO and finding the explanation genuine, no cause of action is required to be taken in this case, hence, the show cause issued vide orders dated 23.05.2022 is dropped and the instant appeal-case is announced as **disposed and closed**.

Copies of the orders be sent to the parties.

Date : 22nd July, 2022

**(Amrit Partap Singh Sekhon)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab**

Dr. Neelam Sharma,
Assistant Prof. (Education)
Mehsampur Road,
V.P.O. - Rurka Kalan,
Tehsil – Phillaur,
Distt. Jalandhar -144031 (Punjab)
(M.-9878205000)

.....Appellant

Vs

Public Information Officer,
O/o The Principal,
Ramgarhia College of Education,
Phagwara (Kapurthala) (Punjab)

First Appellate Authority,
O/o The Director,
Public Instructions (Colleges) Pb.,
Vidhya Bhawan, P.S.E.B. Complex,
Sector 68, S.A.S. Nagar (Mohali) (Punjab)

...Respondents

Appeal Case No. 2144 of 2022

Present : Dr. Neelam Sharma, the appellant in person.
i) Ms. Shalini, Superintendent-cum-APIO O/o D.P.I.(Colleges)(Pb.)
S.A.S.Nagar (94175-00818) ;
ii) Ms. Ruchi Joshi, Senior Assistant /o D.P.I.(Colleges)(Pb.) S.A.S.Nagar
(89687-96315) ;
iii) Sh. Navjeet Singh, Legal Assistant O/o D.P.I.(Colleges)(Pb.)
S.A.S.Nagar (76969-11611) ;
iv) Ms. Surinder Jit Kaur, Principal-cum-PIO of Ramgarhia College of
Education, Phagwara, for the respondent.

ORDER

The RTI request is dated 22.01.2021. First appeal is dated 02.02.2022. Second appeal has been received in the Commission on 29.04.2022.

2. The appellant, Dr. Neelam Sharma, who appeared in person in today's hearing, states that he has received the information except point no. 03 of the RTI request.

3. Ms. Shalini, Superintendent-cum-APIO ;Ms. Ruchi Joshi, Senior Assistant and Sh. Navjeet Singh, Legal Assistant of office of D.P.I.(Colleges)(Pb.) S. A. S. Nagar, who appeared in today's hearing, state that the information relates to office of D. P. I.(C), has already been supplied to the appellant and information at point no. 03 relates with Ramgarhia College of Education, Phagwara.

4. Ms. Surinder Jit Kaur, Principal-cum-PIO of Ramgarhia College of Education, Phagwara, who appeared in today's hearing, states that for the information, whichever relates with Ramgarhia College of Education, Phagwara, a reply dated 28.06.2022 in an affidavit has already been submitted, which is placed in the case-file.

5. A copy of the same (reply dated 28.06.2022 in an affidavit) is also handed over to the appellant during the hearing in the Commission today.

6. Since complete information has been supplied by the respondent PIO and no cause of action is left in this case, hence, the instant appeal-case is announced as **disposed and closed**.

Copies of the orders be sent to the parties.

Date : 22nd July, 2022

**(Amrit Partap Singh Sekhon)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab**



Sh. Hardeep Singh
S/o Sh. Tarsem Lal,
Village Nurpur, Tehsil Banga,
Distt. Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar (Punjab)
(9814847273)

....Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o The District Development
and Panchayat Officer,
Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar (Punjab)

First Appellate Authority,
O/o The Additional Deputy Commissioner
(Urban Development),
Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar (Punjab)

...Respondents

Appeal Case No. 3878 of 2021

Present : None on behalf of the appellant.
Sh. Jagtar Singh, Reader (88377-57294), on behalf of the respondent.

ORDER

The RTI request is dated 24.12.2020. First appeal is dated 01.07.2021. Second appeal has been received in the Commission on 27.08.2021.

2. Sh. Jagtar Singh, Reader, who appeared on behalf of the respondent PIO in today's hearing, states that complete information has already been supplied to the appellant.

3. The appellant, Sh. Hardeep Singh, appellant through a letter dated 21.07.2022, has intimated the Commission that he has received complete information and the case be closed. It is taken on record.

4. Sh. Jagtar Singh, Reader further states that in compliance to the order dated 29.06.2022, the District Development and Panchayat Officer, Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar has sent a reply vide letter no. 155 dated 21.07.2022, in response to the show-cause issued vide orders dated 23.05.2022. It is taken on record.

5. After going through the written-submission dated 21.07.2022, sent by the concerned PIO and finding the explanation genuine, no cause of action is required to be taken in this case, hence, the show cause issued vide orders dated 23.05.2022 is **dropped** and the instant appeal-case is announced as **disposed and closed**.

Copies of the orders be sent to the parties.

Date : 22nd July, 2022

(Amrit Partap Singh Sekhon)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab