



Smt Shiv Mehra. W/o Sh Lt Sh Surinder Chand,
R/o Kothi No-N7/15, Albert Road,
Ratna Giri Avenue, Near Kumar International Hotel,
Amritsar.

... Complainant

Versus

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

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 159 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Shubham Mehta, Advocate for the Appellant
None for the Respodent

ORDER: The complainant through RTI application dated 29.10.2018 has sought information regarding land of khasra No.973, khewat No.213, Khatauni No.248 Page No.166, Jamabandi for the year 2015-16 and other information concerning the office of Tehsildar Amritsar-1. The complainant was not provided the information after which the complainant filed complaint in the Commission on 11.02.2019.

The case was first heard by Sh.S.S.Channay, Chief Information Commissioner on 27.03.2019. The respondent was absent. The case was adjourned. The PIO was directed to supply the information to the complainant before the next date of hearing.

The case has come up for hearing today. The counsel present on behalf of the appellant claims that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent is absent. The Commission has received an email from the PIO-Tehsildar, Armtisar-1 stating that they have already sent reply to the complainant vide letter dated 22.07.2019 whereby the PIO sent a copy of jamabandi and informed that there is no record available in their office pertaining to lease of the property. The complainant was also asked to provide the vasika number of the lease and get the copy of lease deed by visiting the office of PIO on any working day.

The counsel present pleaded that vasika number is not available with the appellant. The Commission observes that there has been an enormous delay in providing the information and hereby directs the PIO to show cause **why penalty be not imposed on him under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 for not supplying the information within the statutorily prescribed period of time.** He/she should file an affidavit in this regard. If there are other persons responsible for the delay in providing the information, the PIO is directed to inform such persons of the show cause and direct them to appear before the Commission along with the written replies.

The PIO is again directed to appear before the Commission on the next date of hearing alongwith entire record of the case.

To come up for further hearing on **27.11.2019 at 11.00 AM.**

Chandigarh
Dated: 22.08.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

Note: Sh.Arinder Singh O/o Tehsildar, Amritsar-1 appeared late and informed that the information cannot be provided since the record stands destroyed in fire in 2015. The respondent is directed to submit detailed reply on an affidavit that the entire record stands destroyed, and that there is no other provision to ascertain the availability of the sought documents.



Sh.Avtar Singh, S/oSh Ajit Singh,
VPO Malakpur, Ludhiana.

... Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Assistant Commissioner of Police,
Sahnewal, Distt Ludhiana.

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 169 of 2019

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER:

The complainant through RTI application dated 19.11.2018 has sought information regarding action taken on complaint UID No.1361170 dated 05.06.2018 against Smt.Neelamjit and other information concerning the office of Assistant Commissioner of Police, Sahnewal. The complainant was not provided the information after which the complainant filed complaint in the Commission vide application dated 12.02.2019.

The case was first heard by Sh.S.S.Channay, Chief Information Commissioner on 27.03.2019. Sh.Charanjit Singh, ASI appeared on behalf of the respondent who brought a copy of enquiry report for handing over to the complainant. Since the complainant was not present, the respondent was directed to send a copy of enquiry report to the complainant through registered post and the complainant was directed to send his observations, if any, to the PIO with a copy to the Commission.

The case has come up for hearing today. Both the parties are absent. The Commission observes that the complainant is absent on 2nd time nor has communicated any discrepancies in the information. It is presumed that the complainant 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: 22.08.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh.Rakesh Kumar s/o Sh Gurditta,
H NO-C-119, Street No-4, Navi Abadi, Islamabad,
Fazilka.

... Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Assistant Inspector General of Police,(Pers-II),
Police Headquarter, Punjab, Chandigarh.

Public Information Officer,
O/o SSP,
Bathinda

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 181 of 2019

PRESENT: None for the Complainant
Sh.Parshotam Kumar, HC O/o AIGP, Pb and Sh.Jagmeet Singh, Constable
O/o SSP Bhatinda for the Respondent

ORDER:

The complainant through RTI application dated 19.11.2018 has sought information regarding physical test conducted for the post of Warden – Roll No.61409110043 Regn No.60044788 by Selection Committee other information concerning the office of AIGP (Pers-II), Punjab Chandigarh. The complainant was not provided the information after which the complainant filed complaint in the Commission vide application dated 12.02.2019.

The case was first heard by Sh.S.S.Channay, Chief Information Commissioner on 09.04.2019. Sh.Purshotam Kumar, HC appeared on behalf of the respondent who submitted a memo dated 20.03.2019 from AIGP(Pers-I) Punjab-cum-PIO(Admn Wing) stating that the RTI application has been transferred to PIO-cum-SSP Bathinda. The PIO-SSP Bathinda was impleaded in the case and directed to send reply to the complainant with a copy to the Commission.

The case has come up for hearing today. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been sent to the complainant vide letter dated 04.02.2019 and again on 06.06.2019. The Commission has received a letter from the complainant on 01.07.2019 stating that he has received the information but it is not certified.

Since the complainant has pointed out discrepancy, the PIO-AIGP is directed to send a certified copy of information to the appellant within 10 days.

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

Chandigarh
Dated: 22.08.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh.Balvir Singh, S/o Sh.Joginder Singh,
R/o Village Saide Ki (Khoo.Mohar Singh Wala),
P/O DulchiKe, Tehsil &Distt.Ferozepur.

... Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o DDPO,
Ferozepur.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o DDPO,
Ferozepur.

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 552 of 2018

Present: None for the Complainant
None for the Respondent

ORDER: The case was first heard on **20.08.2018**. The respondent was absent. The complainant pleaded that despite his first appeal and again a letter sent to the DC Ferozepur on 17.04.2018 as well as his personal visits to the office of BDPO twice, he has not been provided the information. The PIO was directed to provide the information to the complainant within 15 days and be present on the next date of hearing with valid explanation for not providing the information within the prescribed time under the RTI Act.

The case was again heard on **17.09.2018**. The appellant informed that he has not received the information. The PIO was absent. The PIO neither provided the information nor sent any explanation for delay in responding the RTI application. Due to non compliance of the orders of the Commission, the PIO was issued **show cause notice and the PIO** was directed to be present personally before the Commission alongwith written reply on an affidavit. The order is reproduced hereunder:

The case came up for hearing again on **05.11.2018**. The PIO was absent. The respondent present brought the information. The appellant was absent to point out the discrepancies, if any. The respondent was directed to send the information to the complainant through registered post and send compliance to the Commission.

The PIO did not file reply to the show cause notice issued on 17.09.2018. The PIO-BDPO was afforded one last opportunity to appear personally on the next date of hearing and reply to the show cause notice on an affidavit.

The case was again heard on **11.12.2018**. The complainant informed that he has received the information on 09.11.2018 but the information is incomplete. The PIO was again absent and had not filed any reply to the show cause or any paper in his defense.

Keeping all facts in mind, the PIO, BDPO, Ferozepur was held guilty for not providing the information on time as prescribed under section 7, which is within 30 days of the receipt of the request, and for repeated and willful defiance of the Punjab State Information Commission's orders. A penalty of Rs.10,000/- was imposed upon the PIO, BDPO, Ferozepur under section 20 of the RTI Act, 2005 which was to be deposited in the Govt. Treasury.

Further, the PIO-,BDPO, Ferozepur was directed to duly inform the Commission of the compliance of the orders by producing a copy of the challan justifying the deposition of the penalty in the Govt Treasury. The PIO was also directed to contact the complainant and sort out the discrepancies in providing the information as sought under the RTI Act.

Complaint Case No. 552 of 2018

The case was further heard on **13.02.2019**. Sh.Paramjit Singh, PIO-BDPO, Ferozpur alongwith Sh.Kulwant Singh, Panchayat Secretary O/o BDPO appeared late and informed that the information has been provided to the complainant. The PIO further pleaded they will contact the complainant and sort out the discrepancies with the complainant if any. The respondent was directed to comply with the earlier order of the Commission which still stands and send a compliance report to the Commission.

The case was again heard on **03.04.2019**. The respondent present has pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant also acknowledged the receipt of the information and shown his satisfaction. Since the PIO was again absent nor had complied with the order of the Commission, the Commission was constrained to issue warrants against the erring PIO-BDPO Ferozpur under section 18(3) of the RTI Act.

The respondent present further informed that Sh.Paramjit Singh, PIO-cum-BDPO Ferozpur has been transferred to the Head Quarter, at Vikas Bhawan, Sector 62, Mohali.

To secure an erring PIOs presence before the Commission, a bailable Warrant of Sh.Paramjit Singh, PIO-cum-BDPO, Ferozpur was issued through Senior Superintendent of Police, SAS Nagar, Mohali for his presence before the Commission on 22.05.2019.

The case was again heard on **22.05.2019**. The PIO was present and informed that after his transfer from Ferozpur to Head office, his salary has not yet been released and he is unable to deposit the amount of penalty immediately. The PIO however, ensured to deposit the same immediately after release of his salary. The PIO was given one more opportunity to comply with the earlier order of the Commission and submit proof of having deposited the amount of penalty in the Govt Treasury, at the next date of hearing.

The case was last heard on **25.07.2019**. Sh.Paramjit Singh, earlier PIO-cum-BDPO, Ferozpur was present. The PIO informed due to non-functioning of website of the treasury branch of the bank, the amount could not be deposited. The PIO assured to deposit the same within 2-3 days and submit proof in the Commission. The PIO was given one last opportunity to comply with the earlier order of the Commission which still stands and submit proof of having deposited the amount of penalty in the Govt Treasury, at the next date of hearing.

Hearing dated 22.08.2019:

Both the parties are absent. The Commission has received a copy of challan from the PIO as a proof of having deposited the amount of penalty in the Govt Treasury which is taken on the file of the Commission.

Since the information has been provided and the PIO has deposited the amount of penalty in the Govt. Treasury as per order of the Commission, no further course of action is required. The case is **disposed off and closed**.

Chandigarh
Dated: 22.08.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

CC to :1. The BDPO Ferozpur.

2. Director, Rural Development & Panchayat,
Vikas Bhawan, Sector 62, SAS Nagar, Mohali



Sh.Raj Kumar Ghai, S/o Sh Banarsi Dass,
5912, Street No-14, New Shimlapuri,
Daba Road, Ludhiana.

... Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o DC,
Ludhiana.

... Respondent

Complaint Case No. 1088 of 2019

PRESENT: None for the Complainant
Sh.Surinder Singh, District E-governance Coordinator for the Respondent

ORDER: The complainant through RTI application dated 17.07.2018 has sought information regarding functioning of Sewa Kendra, Mini Secretariat, Ludhiana and other information concerning the office of DC Ludhiana. The complainant was not provided the information after which the complainant filed complaint in the Commission on 08.10.2018.

The case was first heard by Sh.S.S.Channay, Chief Information Commissioner on 28.11.2018. Both the parties were absent. However, a letter dated 12.11.2018 was received from DRO-cum-PIO Ludhiana vide which they directed District Technical Coordinator-cum-APIO Sewa Kendra Ludhiana to supply the requisite information. District Technical Coordinator-cum-APIO-Seva Kendra Ludhiana was impleaded in the case and directed to supply the information to the complainant.

On the next date of hearing which was held on 15.01.2019, Sh.Rahul, District Coordinator appeared who informed that complete information has been sent to the complainant vide letter dated 26.11.2018. The complainant was absent. The respondent was directed to send one more copy of the information to the complainant through registered post and the complainant was directed to send his observations, if any, to the PIO.

On the hearing of 12.02.2019, the complainant was absent but vide email informed that the PIO has not provided complete information. The complainant was directed to send specific deficiencies/observations in the information and the PIO was directed to remove the same. On the next date of hearing which was held on 26.03.2019, the complainant was again absent. The respondent informed that the complete information has been sent to the complainant after removing the deficiencies. The complainant was given one last opportunity to send his observations failing which the case will be decided on merit on the basis of documents placed on record.

The case has come up for hearing today. The respondent informed that the complete information has been provided to the complaint but no observation has been received from him.

The complainant is absent on 4th hearing nor has communicated any discrepancy despite giving enough opportunities. It is presumed that the complainant has received the information and is satisfied.

No further course of action is required. The case is **disposed off and closed**.

Chandigarh
Dated: 22.08.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh.Ram Kumar, S/o Sh Chanan Ram,
R/o Near Andarla Dera, Tappa,
Distt Barnala.

... Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Hon'ble Chief Minister,
Punjab, Chandigarh.

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 1231 of 2019

PRESENT: None for the Complainant
Ms.Sunita, Sr.Assistant O/o Chief Minister, Pb for the Respondent

ORDER:

The complainant through RTI application dated 26.07.2018 has sought information regarding action taken on his complaint filed to the office of CM Punjab for evacuation of plot No 2204 which was encroached upon by one Sh.Sham Lal God and FIR was registered on 18.11.2007 and other information concerning the office of CM Punjab. The complainant was not provided the information after which the complainant filed complaint in the Commission on 30.11.2018.

The case was first heard by Sh.S.S.Channay, Chief Information Commissioner on 12.02.2019. The respondent present informed that the reply has already been sent to the complainant. Having gone through the record, it was observed that the complainant had filed complaints to the office of CM Punjab for pressurizing the police to take action on FIR registered on 18.11.2007. His applications were sent to the Additional Chief Secretary to Govt of Punjab, Department of Home Affairs, Justice and Jails who further transferred them to Director General of Police Punjab, Chandigarh and then to SSP Barnala/SHO Tapa u/s 6(3) of the RTI Act. Hence the PIO/Chief Minister of Punjab, Chandigarh was exempted for appearance. The SSP Barnala and SHO Tapa were impleaded in the case with the direction to bring original record for the perusal of the Commission. RTI application was absent. The case was adjourned.

On the next date of hearing on 26.03.2019, the respondents informed that the matter has been investigated thrice and cancellation report has been filed. They further informed that now legal advice has been sought as to whether inquiry can again be conducted or not. The respondent was directed to take necessary action and submit status report on the next date of hearing.

The case has come up for hearing today. The respondent present from the office of CM Punjab pleaded that they have already transferred the RTI application to the Department of Home Affairs and the reply was sent to the appellant vide letter 12.09.2018 asking him to get the information directly from the concerned PIO. The appellant is absent.

In the last hearing, the other respondents present informed that the matter has been investigated thrice and cancellation report has been filed and that they are seeking legal advice as to whether inquiry can again be conducted or not.

Since the RTI application has been sufficiently responded to on the matter of information that has been sought, no further course of action is required. The case is **disposed off and closed**.

Chandigarh
Dated: 22.08.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



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

... Appellant

Versus

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

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

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 628 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Jagbir Singh as the Appeellant
Sh.Phoolraj for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 13.07.2018 has sought information regarding action taken on his applications dated 26.03.2018 and 07.05.2018 for making correction in Fard from the office of SDM Amritsar-1. The appellant was not provided the information after which he filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 23.08.2018 which took no decision on the appeal.

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

The case has come up for hearing today. The appellant claims that the PIO has not provided the information as per the RTI application. The respondent present from the office of SDM Amritsar-1 informed that the information is in the custody of the PIO-Tehsildar Amritsar-1 and they have already transferred the RTI application to them vide letter dated 27.07.2018. The PIO-Tehsildar Amritsar-1 is absent. The PIO-SDM is exempted. The PIO-Tehsildar Amritsar is directed to provide the information as per the RTI application within 10 days otherwise the Commission will be constrained to take action as per the RTI Act.

To come up for further hearing on **27.11.2019 at 11.00 AM.**

Chandigarh
Dated: 22.08.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

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



Sh.Jagmohan Singh,
334, G.T Road, Salem Tabri,
Ludhiana.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Sub Registrar (East),
Transport Nagar, Ludhiana.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o SDM,
Ludhiana (East).

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 660 of 2019

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 29.09.2018 has sought information regarding sale deeds registered during 01.06.2018 to 27.09.2018 and other information concerning the office of Sub-Registrar (East), Ludhiana. The appellant was not provided the information after which he filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 10.11.2018 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case was first heard by Sh.S.S.Channay, Chief Information Commissioner on 27.03.2019. Both the parties were absent. The appellant vide letter dated 27.03.2019 informed that the PIO has not provided the information and the Sub-Registrar is pressurizing him to withdraw the RTI application. The PIO was directed to supply the information to the appellant before the next date of hearing otherwise the Commission will take action under the provisions of the RTI Act.

The case has come up for hearing today. Both the parties are absent. The case is adjourned. The PIO is directed to comply with the earlier order which still stands and be present on the next date of hearing alongwith the explanation for not attending to the RTI application.

To come up for further hearing on **28.11.2019 at 11.00AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Ludhiana. The order be sent to both the parties **through registered post.**

Chandigarh
Dated: 22.08.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh. Jagmohan Singh,
334, G.T Road, Salem Tabri,
Ludhiana.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Distt Technical Coordinator,
Sewa Kendar, Mini Secretariat,
Ludhiana

Deputy Director-cum-PIO,
Department of e-Governance Reforms.
D-241, Near Quark City, Industrial Area, Phase-8-B,
Sector-74, Mohali.

Director-cum- First Appellate Authority,
Department of e-Governance Reforms.
D-241, Near Quark City, Industrial Area, Phase-8-B,
Sector-74, Mohali

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 661 of 2019

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
Sh.Surinder Singh, District E-Governance Coordinator and Sh.Ravinder Kumar, Sr.Assistant –APIO O/o DGR Pb for the Respondent

ORDER: The appellant through RTI application dated 20.10.2018 has sought information regarding marriages registered at Sewa Kendra during the period from 01.01.2012 to 20.10. and other information concerning the office of Sewa Kendra Ludhiana. The appellant was not provided the information after which he filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 04.12.2018 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case was first heard by Sh.S.S.Channay, Chief Information Commissioner on 27.03.2019. The appellant was absent. The respondent was also absent. The notices sent to the PIO and the First Appellate Authority were received back undelivered due to insufficient address. Notices were again sent to the APIO, PIO and First Appellate Authority after ascertain the correct addresses with the direction to supply the requisite information to the appellant.

The case has come up for hearing today. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 01.05.2019 and a copy of the same is submitted to the Commission. The appellant is absent.

I have gone through the RTI application and the reply of the PIO and observe that the PIO has provided partial information i.e. total number of marriage palaces and denied partial information (copies of affidavits) under section 8(1)(j) of RTI Act,2005. I see no larger public interest in disclosure of this information nor the appellant has been able to establish that the disclosure of affidavit has a larger public interest. I uphold the view of the PIO and close the case since the information has been provided to the best possible extent.

No further course of action is required. The case is **disposed off and closed**.

Chandigarh
Dated: 22.08.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden, Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in
Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Sh.Gurpreet Singh, S/o Sh.Surinder Singh,
Village Hussainpura, P/O Badhochi.Kalan
Tehsil &DisttShriFatehgarh Sahib.

Appellant.

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o DC,
Distt.Shri.Fatehgarh Sahib.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Addl, DC,
Distt.Shri.Fatehgarh Sahib.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1795 of 2018

Present: None for the Appellant
Sh. Rajinder Singh, Panchayat Secretary for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on 20.08.2018. The respondent was absent. The Commission received a letter diary No.16039 dated 06.8.2018 from the PIO, DDPO Fatehgarh Sahib vide which the PIO-DDPO has transferred the RTI to BDPO, Sirhind, instructing them to provide the information directly to the appellant. The PIO was directed to provide the information within 15 days and be present on the next date of hearing alongwith the reasons for delay

The case was again heard on **26.09.2018**. The appellant informed that he has not received the information. Sh.Rajinder Singh, Panchayat Secretary appeared and informed that he has just joined the seat as the earlier dealing person Sh.Tajinder Singh has been transferred. The respondent further assured to send the information within 10 days. The PIO was directed to provide the information explain the reasons for delay in providing the information on an affidavit.

The case again came up for hearing on **19.11.2018**. Sh.Iqbal Singh, Panchayat Secretary o/o BDPO Sirhind appeared and pleaded he has received the RTI application recently and assured to provide the information within 10 days. The PIO, BDPO Sirhind was given one more opportunity to provide the information to the appellant within 10 days and be present personally on the next date of hearing alongwith explanation for delay in providing the information on an affidavit.

The case was again heard on **15.01.2019**. The appellant informed that no information has been provided to him. The PIO was absent on 4th consecutive hearing. The PIO-BDPO Sirhind was issued **show cause notice under section 20 of the RTI Act** and directed to file an affidavit in this regard. The commission also directed the PIO to provide the information to the appellant within 10 days and send a compliance report to the Commission.

The case was again heard on **11.03.2019**. The appellant informed that the information has not been provided so far. The respondent Sh.Rajinder Singh appeared late and pleaded that since the earlier BDPO has been transferred and new BDPO has recently joined, the case be adjourned for the next date. The respondent further assured to provide the information within 15 days. The PIO was directed to appear personally on the next date of hearing and submit reply to the show cause notice on an affidavit. The PIO was also directed to provide the information within 15 days and send a compliance report to the Commission.

Appeal Case No. 1795 of 2018

The case was further heard on **06.05.2019**. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant informed that he has received the information but still there is some discrepancy.

During this hearing, it came to the notice that the BDPO Sirhind had transferred the RTI application to Sh. Rajinder Singh, Panchayat Secretary-cum-PIO Gram Panchayat, Hussainpura, Block Sirhind under section 6(3) of the RTI Act vide letter dated 08.02.2018 with a direction to provide the information to the appellant. Since the application was transferred to the Panchayat Secretary-cum-PIO Gram Panchayat, the PIO-Gram Panchayat submitted a reply to the show cause which, however did not justify the enormous delay in providing the information. The PIO-Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat, Hussainpurawas held guilty for not providing the information on, and a penalty of **Rs.10,000/-** was imposed upon him and directed to duly inform the Commission of the compliance of the orders by producing a copy of the challan justifying the deposition of the penalty in the Govt Treasury.

Further, the PIO was also directed to pay an amount of **Rs.5000/-** via demand draft drawn through Govt. Treasury as compensation to the appellant for the loss and detriment suffered by him of having to file the appeals and not getting information in time. The PIO was directed to duly inform the Commission of the compliance of the order and submit proof of having compensated the appellant. The PIO was again directed to provide rest of the information and send a compliance report to the Commission.

The case was last heard on **02.07.2019**. The respondent brought a demand draft of Rs.5000/- and handed over to the appellant. The appellant had received the same. The appellant however, pleaded that some information is still pending. The PIO was directed to complete the information.

Regarding the deposit of penalty, the respondent informed that the BDPO has directed the concerned accountant to deduct the amount from the salary of the respondent for the month of June and to deposit the same in the Govt. Treasury. The PIO was directed to produce a copy of challan justifying the deposit of the penalty in the Govt Treasury.

Hearing dated 22.08.2019:

The respondent present pleaded that the amount of penalty has been deducted from his salary but the same is yet to be deposited in Govt Treasury and assured to deposit the same within a week. In the last hearing, the appellant informed that some information is pending. The appellant is absent nor has communicated any discrepancy. The PIO is directed to produce a copy of challan justifying the deposit of penalty in the Govt Treasury.

To come up for compliance on **23.10.2019 at 11.00 AM.**

Chandigarh
Dated: 22.08.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

CC to 1. The PIO, DDPO Sri Fatehgarh Sahib

2. The PIO- BDPO Sirhind

3. PIO-Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat, Hussainpura



Sh.Naresh Devgan Sharma,
Advocate, Chamber NO-702/2,
District Courts, Ludhiana.

... Appellant

Versus

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

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

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3877 of 2019

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 15.11.2018 has sought information regarding FIR No.83 dated 28.03.2017 and other information concerning the office of Commissioner of Police Ludhiana. The appellant was not provided the information after which he filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 18.10.2018 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case was first heard by Sh.S.S.Channay, Chief Information Commissioner on 28.11.2018. The respondent present from the office of Police Station Division No.5 Ludhiana appeared and sought some more time to collect the information from police station Division No.5 Ludhiana and from the office of Commissioner of Police Ludhiana which was granted and the case was adjourned. On the next date of hearing on 15.01.2019, the appellant informed that the information provided is incomplete. The respondent was directed to allow the appellant to inspect the record and identify the specific documents required by him and supply the same to the appellant. On the hearing of 12.02.2019, the appellant informed that after inspecting the record, he received information pertaining to his 5 complaints out of 8 complaints sent to the Commissioner of Police Ludhiana. The respondents were directed to provide the information on remaining three complaints.

On the last hearing on 26.03.2019, the appellant was absent. The respondent submitted a letter dated 13.03.2019 from incharge, Police Post Kochar Market, Police Station Division No.5 Ludhiana stating that the remaining information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant was given last opportunity to send his observations, if any, to the PIO with a copy to the Commission.

The case has come up for hearing today. The appellant is absent and vide email informed that the PIO has not provided the complete information. Having gone through the RTI application I find that the appellant in his RTI application has not mentioned that what does he need specifically, and that the application is vague. The appellant is asked to specify the information so that the information can be provided to the best possible extent.

To come up for further hearing on **28.11.2019 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Ludhiana. Copy of order be sent to both the parties.

Chandigarh
Dated: 22.08.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh. Naresh Devgan Sharma,
Advocate, Chamber NO-702/2,
Distt Courts, Ludhiana.

... Appellant

Versus

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

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

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3878 of 2019

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 15.11.2018 has sought information regarding FIR No.194/2014, P.S.Div.No.5, FIR No.25/2017, P.S.Focal Point and FIR No.236/2014 P.S.Division No.5 and other information concerning the office of Commissioner of Police Ludhiana. The appellant was not provided the information after which he filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 18.10.2018 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case was first heard by Sh.S.S.Channay, Chief Information Commissioner on 28.11.2018. The respondent present from the office of Police Station Division No.5 Ludhiana appeared and sought some more time to collect the information from concerned police stations which was granted and the case was adjourned. On the next date of hearing on 15.01.2019, the appellant informed that the information provided is incomplete. The respondent was directed to allow the appellant to inspect the record and identify the specific documents required by him and supply the same to the appellant. On the hearing of 12.02.2019, the appellant informed that after inspecting the record, he received information pertaining to his 3 complaints out of 12 complaints sent to the Commissioner of Police Ludhiana. The respondents were directed to provide the information on remaining nine complaints.

On the last hearing on 26.03.2019, the appellant was absent. The respondent submitted a letter dated 13.03.2019 from incharge, Police Post Kochar Market, Police Station Division No.5 Ludhiana stating that the remaining information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant was given last opportunity to send his observations, if any, to the PIO with a copy to the Commission.

The case has come up for hearing today. The appellant is absent and vide email informed that the PIO has not provided the complete information. Having gone through the RTI application I find that the appellant in his RTI application has not mentioned that what does he need specifically, and that the application is vague. The appellant is asked to specify the information so that the information can be provided to the best possible extent.

To come up for further hearing on **28.11.2019 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Ludhiana. Copy of order be sent to both the parties.

Chandigarh
Dated: 22.08.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner