

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.Sushil Kumar, S/o Sh.Nand Lal,
Plot No-13, Bus Stand Road,
Malerkotla.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Chief Vigilance Officer,
Local Deptt, Pb, Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Chief Vigilance Officer,
Local Deptt, Pb, Chandigarh.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 874 of 2020

PRESENT: Sh.Sushil Kumar as the Appellant
Sh.Rajiv Sagar, PIO for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on 03.09.2020. Both the parties were absent.

On the date of the next hearing on **25.02.2021**, the appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information.

Sh.Rajiv Sagar, PIO appeared late and informed that the enquiry on the complaints is pending with Regional Deputy Director, Patiala since 13.08.2019 and the reply has been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 17.01.2020 that after receipt of enquiry report, the information will be provided to the appellant.

The respondent further informed that after receipt of the complete enquiry report, the same will be sent to the Chief Vigilance Officer for final decision and thereafter the information can be provided to the appellant.

The Commission recommended that the Regional Deputy Director, Local Bodies, Patiala to complete the enquiry report within 30 days and send it to the Chief Vigilance Officer for final decision. The Chief Vigilance Officer was directed to send a status report of the enquiry to the appellant.

On the date of the last hearing on **12.05.2021**, the respondent present pleaded that the enquiry report from Regional Director Local Bodies, Patiala has been received but the Chief Vigilance Officer has not yet taken a final decision on the enquiry report.

The appellant vide letter received in the Commission on 26.03.2021 informed that the PIO had not sent any reply vide letter dated 17.01.2020 and the statement given by the PIO during the last hearing and order of the Commission dated 25.02.2021 is beyond the facts of the information that has been sought in the RTI application.

The appellant informed that he has sought information regarding case No.6/106/17-4 in which an FIR has already been lodged and the case is pending in Hon'ble Court.

The reply of the PIO did not relate to the RTI application.

Appeal Case No. 874 of 2020

During the hearing, the PIO after having gone through the facts of the case, informed that the information is in the custody of Regional Deputy Director, Patiala.

The Commission made the respondent as deemed PIO in this case and directed him to relook at the RTI application and provide complete information to the appellant. If not available, procure it from wherever it is available and suitably respond the RTI application.

Hearing dated 23.08.2021:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Sangrur. The respondent present pleaded that the information after collecting from the Regional Deputy Director, Patiala, has been supplied to the appellant vide letter dated 27.07.2021 with a copy to the commission. Further, since the information regarding point-3 relates to NC Malerkotla, the PIO-NC Malerkotla has also provided the information on point-3 vide letter dated 19.08.2021 with a copy to the Commission.

The appellant is not satisfied with the information regarding point-2 and wants the documentary evidence on the basis of the which enquiry was conducted by CVO and statements recorded.

The respondent informed that no separate FIR was filed and as per the report of NC Malerkotla, the FIR was filed by the appellant himself and on the basis of the report of NC Malerkotla, the enquiry was conducted and further action was taken.

Having gone through the RTI application, reply of the PIO and hearing both the parties, the commission finds that the RTI has been sufficiently replied to and the information has been provided to the best possible extent.

However, the PIO is directed to give in writing to the appellant that no separate FIR has been filed and action has been taken on the basis of FIR already registered by the appellant.

To come up for further hearing on **06.10.2021 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Sangrur. The PIO to appear through VC at DAC Mohali..

Chandigarh
Dated :23.08.2021

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. Harbans Singh, S/o Sh. Gurcharan Singh,
Patti Chahalan, VPO Bhawanigarh,
Distt Sangrur.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o DEO (Primary),
Magzine Mohalla, Sangrur.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o DEO (EE),
Magzine Mohalla Sangrur.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3310 of 2020

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
Sh.Rajinder Singh, Legal Assistant for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 22.07.2020 has sought information regarding the audited balance sheet for 31.03.2016 to 31.03.2020 of Heritage Public School, Rampura and Baba Sahib Das Public School Phaguwala – fee structure for the years 2016-17, 2-17-18, 2018-19, 2019-20, 2020-21 – a copy of affiliation of Kinder Garden classes – a copy of building safety certificate and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of DEO(Primary) Sangrur. The appellant was not satisfied with the reply of PIO dated 28.07.2020 after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 05.08.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 28.07.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. The respondent present pleaded that the information has already been supplied to the appellant vide letter dated 28.07.2020.

The appellant was not satisfied with the reply of the PIO on all points.

Having gone through the RTI application and the reply of the PIO, the Commission directed the PIO to apprise the commission whether copies of audited balance sheets of private schools are in the custody of the department or not?

Further, the PIO did not reply appropriately regarding the building safety certificate sought in the RTI application. It might be noted that the Commission in its order (472 of 2020) has already directed the Education Department, Punjab to issue necessary instructions to all Govt and Private Schools to suo motto upload/paste building safety certificates on their website/notice board, and the PIOs reply that the information is not with the education department but with the PWD department is a blasphemous lie. Even in the event of the information not being in the DEO's custody, it should have been transferred to the concerned department u/s 6(3) of the RTI Act.

Appeal Case No. 3310 of 2020

The Commission having taken a serious view of this, issued a **show-cause notice to the PIO under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 and for not supplying the information within the statutorily prescribed period of time as well as for inappropriate reply and willful blocking the information. The PIO was directed to file reply on an affidavit.** The DEO(E) Sangrur to appear personally on the next date of hearing.

Hearing dated 23.08.2021:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Sangrur. As per the respondent, the complete information has been supplied to the appellant vide letter dated 05.08.2021.

The appellant is absent and vide email has informed that he has received the information and his appeal case may be closed.

The PIO has, however, not filed a reply to the show-cause notice. The PIO is given one last opportunity to file a reply to the show cause notice and appear personally before the Commission on the next date of hearing.

To come up for further hearing on **06.10.2021 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Sangrur.

Chandigarh
Dated:23.08.2021

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh Rajinder Kumar, S/o Sh. Mehar Chand,
Ward No-2, Supreme Enclave,
Near Vishwakarma Bhawan,
Link Road, Mansa.

...Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Director, Local Govt,
Sector-35, Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Director, Local Govt, Pb
Sector-35, Chandigarh.

.....Respondent

Appeal Case No. 2128 of 2020

PRESENT: Sh.Rajinder Kumar as the Appellant
Sh.Jung Bahadur, Sr. Assistant for the Respondent

ORDER: Facts of the case:-

That the appellant through RTI application dated 13.05.2020 has sought information regarding the decision taken vide resolution No.365 to 382 of general meeting dated 17.01.2020 of NC Mansa along with noting – resolution no.364 dated 29.11.2019 and other information concerning the office of Director, Local Govt. Punjab, Chandigarh. The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 15.06.2020 which took no decision on the appeal. After filing the first appeal, the PIO sent a reply to the appellant vide letter dated 25.06.2020 stating that the matter is under consideration. On being not satisfied with the reply, the appellant filed 2nd appeal in the Commission on 10.08.2020.

That case was first heard on 02.12.2020. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information.

The respondent was absent. Having gone through the file, the Commission observed that the copy of the RTI application with the commission was not legible. The appellant was directed to send a legible copy of the RTI application to the Commission.

The PIO was directed to relook at the RTI application and provide the information to the appellant as per the RTI application.

That Sh.Jang Bahadur Singh, Sr. Assistant O/o Local Govt.(General Branch) appeared late and brought the information. A copy of the information was sent to the appellant with the order and the appellant was directed to point out the discrepancies, if any, in writing to the PIO and the PIO was directed to remove the same.

That on the date of the hearing on **01.02.2021**, the appellant pointed out the discrepancies. The respondent present informed that the information has already been sent to the appellant as per the RTI application and no further information is available in their record.

Hearing both the parties, the PIO was directed to send a covering letter to the appellant mentioning point-wise details of the information that has been provided as discussed during the hearing.

Secondly, If no other information available on the matter, the PIO must give in writing an affidavit that the information that has been provided is true, complete and no other information is available in the record.

That on the date of last hearing on **12.05.2021**, the appellant claimed that despite orders of the Commission, the PIO has neither supplied complete information nor has given any affidavit.

The respondent was absent without any communication. Since there has been an enormous delay of more than one year in providing the information and there is no compliance of the order, the PIO was issued a **show-cause notice under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 and directed to file reply on an affidavit.**

That the case has come up for hearing **today through video conferencing at DAC Mansa**. As per the appellant, the PIO has neither provided the complete information nor any affidavit as per the direction of the Commission.

That the Commission has received a reply of the PIO on 19.08.2021 which has been taken on the file of the Commission. However, the PIO has not complied with the order of the Commission to provide complete information or to provide an affidavit that the information that has been provided is true, complete and no other information is available in the record.

Since the responsibility to ensure the timely transmission of the information to the appellant lies on the PIO, the PIO-Director Local Govt. Pb, Chandigarh, the Commission is of the view that the appellant has had to suffer undue inconvenience to get the information, and hence it is a fit case for awarding compensation to the appellant u/s 19(8)(b) of the RTI Act.

The PIO- Director Local Govt. Pb, Chandigarh is directed to pay an amount of **Rs.2500/-** via demand draft 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 is directed to duly inform the commission of the compliance of the order and submit proof of having compensated the appellant.

The PIO is again directed to provide an affidavit to the appellant that the information that has been provided is true, complete and no other information is available in the record.

The decision on the show cause notice will be taken on the next date of hearing.

To come up for further hearing on **15.12.2021 at 11.00 AM** through a video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Mansa. The PIO to appear through VC at DAC Mohali.

Chandigarh
Dated :23.08.2021

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh Rajinder Kumar, S/o Sh. Mehar Chand,
Ward No-2, Supreme Enclave,
Near Vishwakarma Bhawan,
Link Road, Mansa.

...Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Director, Local Govt, Pb
Sector-35, Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Director, Local Govt, Pb
Sector-35,
Chandigarh.

Respondent

Appeal Case No. 2219 of 2020

PRESENT: Sh.Rajinder Kumar as the Appellant
Sh.Jung Bahadur, Sr. Assistant for the Respondent

ORDER: Facts of the case:-

That the appellant through RTI application dated 11.05.2020 has sought information on 12 points regarding a letter of the Director Local Govt No.17896 dated 28.04.2020 regarding meeting dated 17.01.2020 – letter No.149-50 dated 20.01.2020 - report of EO vide letter dated 24.01.2020 and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of Director, Local Govt. Punjab, Chandigarh. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 15.06.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

That case was first heard on 02.12.2020. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent was absent. Having gone through the file, the Commission observed that the copy of the RTI application that is with the commission was not legible. The appellant was directed to send a legible copy of RTI application to the Commission.

The PIO was directed to relook at the RTI application and provide the information to the appellant as per the RTI application.

That Sh.Jang Bahadur Singh, Sr. Assistant O/o Local Govt.(General Branch) appeared late and brought the information. A copy of the information was sent to the appellant with the order and the appellant was directed to point out the discrepancies, if any, in writing to the PIO and the PIO was directed to remove the same.

That on the date of the hearing on **01.02.2021**, the appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the complete information on points-9,10,11 & 12. The respondent present informed that the information has already been sent to the appellant as per the RTI application and no further information is available in their record.

The PIO was directed to give in writing an affidavit that the information that has been provided is true, complete and no other information is available in the record.

Appeal Case No. 2219 of 2020

That on the date of last hearing on **12.05.2021**, the appellant claimed that despite orders of the Commission, the PIO has neither supplied complete information nor had given any affidavit.

The respondent was absent without any communication. Since there has been an enormous delay of more than one year in providing the information and there is no compliance of the order, the PIO was issued a **show-cause notice under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 and directed to file a reply on an affidavit.**

That the case has come up for hearing **today through video conferencing at DAC Mansa**. As per the appellant, the PIO has neither provided the complete information nor any affidavit as per the direction of the Commission.

That the Commission has received a reply of the PIO on 19.08.2021 which has been taken on the file of the Commission. However, the PIO has not complied with the order of the Commission to provide complete information or to provide an affidavit that the information that has been provided is true, complete and no other information is available in the record.

Since the responsibility to ensure the timely transmission of the information to the appellant lies on the PIO, the PIO-Director Local Govt. Pb, Chandigarh, the Commission is of the view that the appellant has had to suffer undue inconvenience to get the information, and hence it is a fit case for awarding compensation to the appellant u/s 19(8)(b) of the RTI Act.

The PIO- Director Local Govt. Pb, Chandigarh is directed to pay an amount of **Rs.2500/-** via demand draft 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 is directed to duly inform the commission of the compliance of the order and submit proof of having compensated the appellant.

The PIO is again directed to provide an affidavit to the appellant that the information that has been provided is true, complete and no other information is available in the record.

The decision on the show cause notice will be taken on the next date of hearing.

To come up for further hearing on **15.12.2021 at 11.00 AM** through a video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Mansa. The PIO to appear through VC at DAC Mohali.

Chandigarh
Dated :23.08.2021

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh Rajinder Kumar, S/o Sh. Mehar
Chand, Ward No-2, Supreme Enclave,
Near Vishwakarma Bhawan,
Link Road, Mansa.

...Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Director, Local Govt, Pb
Sector-35, Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Director, Local Govt, Pb,
Sector-35, Chandigarh.

Respondent

Appeal Case No. 2220 of 2020

PRESENT: Sh. Rajinder Kumar as the Appellant
Sh. Harpreet Singh, Sr. Assistant (LG-3) for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on 02.12.2020. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information. The appellant further informed that his First Appeal dated 13.07.2020 had been returned back to him with the remarks of the postal authority "Refused by Under Secretary".

The Commission observed that the Under Secretary, Local Govt. Punjab had refused to accept the first appeal in the present case and the trend has been observed in the previous cases. Taking a strict view on the gross violation of an act of parliament, the Commission directed the Secretary, Local Govt. Department, Punjab to enquire into the matter that why RTI applications/appeals are being refused by the Under Secretary. To submit an enquiry report to the Commission on the matter before the next date of hearing.

A copy of the RTI application was sent to the authority with the direction to reply as per the RTI application as the appellant has shown dissatisfaction over the reply that has been sent. The matter be taken seriously and enquiry report be sent why appeals are being refused from receipt.

In the meantime, the appellant was directed to send a legible copy of the RTI application to the Commission.

On the date of the hearing on **01.02.2021**, the appellant submitted a legible copy of the RTI application.

Having relooked the RTI application and a copy of the same provided to the respondent. The PIO was directed to provide the information to the appellant within 15 days as per the RTI application and send a compliance report to the Commission.

Regarding the refusal of RTI application and First appeal by the Under Secretary, Local Govt., the PIO had submitted a clarification which was taken on the file of the Commission.

Appeal Case No. 2220 of 2020

On the date of the last hearing on **12.05.2021**, the Commission also received a copy of the letter dated 19.03.2021 from the PIO on 25.03.2021 vide which the PIO had sent information to the appellant.

As per the appellant, the information was incomplete since the PIO had not provided the information on points 1(a) and point-2.

The respondent was absent and vide email has sought exemption due to positive cases of COVID-19 in the department.

The PIO was given one last opportunity to comply with the earlier order of the Commission and provide complete information to the appellant within 10 days of the receipt of the order, otherwise, the Commission will be constrained to initiate proceedings against the PIO as per provisions of section 20 of the RTI Act.

Hearing dated 23.08.2021:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Mansa. As per the respondent, the information has been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 12.05.2021.

As per the appellant, the information on point-2 has not been provided. As per the respondent, the enquiry report from DDR has been received but the action is yet to be taken on the enquiry report by the competent authority.

Hearing both the parties, the PIO is directed to provide whatever action has been taken on the complaint of the appellant and send a compliance report to the commission.

To come up for further hearing on **15.12.2021 at 11.00 AM** through a video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Mansa. The PIO to appear through VC at DAC Mohali.

Chandigarh
Dated :23.08.2021

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

CC to :Secretary, Local Govt.Pb, Chandigarh



Sh.Rakesh Parkash s/o Sh.Jagan Nath,
R/o New Road, Kesar Vakilwali Gali,
Mansa.

....Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o District Treasury Officer,
Mansa.

...Respondent

Complaint case No.473 of 2020

**PRESENT: None for the Complainant
 None for the Respondent**

ORDER:

The case was first heard on 02.12.2020. The respondent present informed that since the case is pending with Commissioner Cyber Crime Branch for enquiry, the information cannot be provided and the reply has already been sent to the complainant on 09.06.2020.

The complainant claimed that when the RTI application was filed, the record was available with the District Treasury office.

Having gone through the RTI application, reply of the PIO and hearing both the parties, it was settled that the PIO to provide whatever information is in his custody.

On the date of the hearing on **01.02.2021**, the respondent pleaded that the bills that are being sought through the RTI application, after processing, are sent to the office of AG Punjab for payment, and the asked information is available with the office of AG Punjab.

Given the above, The PIO- AG Punjab was impleaded in the case and directed to look at the RTI application and file a suitable reply. A copy of the RTI application was sent along with the order to the PIO-AG Punjab.

On the date of the last hearing on **12.05.2021**, the respondent PIO-District Treasury Officer reiterated his earlier plea that the asked information is in the custody of the office of AG Punjab.

Smt.Bhanumati, DAG o/o AG Punjab was present and pleaded that it was not possible to provide information without voucher numbers of the bills. According to the respondent, the bills received from different departments of Punjab are kept in record with the marking of voucher numbers.

The PIO O/o AG Punjab was directed to file a written reply.

Complaint case No.473 of 2020

Hearing dated 23.08.2021:

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

Earlier order stands. The case is adjourned.

To come up for further hearing on **15.12.2021 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Mansa. PIO-AG Punjab to appear through VC at DAC Mohali..

Chandigarh
Dated :23.08.2021

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

CC to: PIO-O/o AG, Punjab,
Sector 17, Chandigarh.



Sh. Rajinder Singh,
H. No.463/3-A, Sector-53,
Mohali.

.....Appellant

Vs

Public Information Officer,
O/o GMADA,
Mohali.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o GMADA,
Mohali.

.....Respondent

Appeal case No.50 of 2020

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on 16.09.2020. The respondent present pleaded that information has been supplied to the appellant vide letter dated 23.03.2020 with a copy submitted to the Commission. The Commission had received a copy of the reply on 27.05.2020.

The appellant was absent nor had communicated any discrepancies. The appellant was directed to point out the discrepancies if any to the PIO with a copy to the Commission and the PIO was directed to relook at the RTI application and remove the discrepancies.

On the date of the next hearing on 24.11.2020, the respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant informed that he has received the information but with a delay of more than one year.

The respondent claimed that the RTI application was not received in their branch and once they received the notice of the Commission dated 20.02.2020 along with the RTI application, the information was supplied to the appellant vide letter dated 23.03.2020. The respondent was directed to provide an affidavit stating the above said statement i.e that their office did not receive this particular RTI application, reason for which it could not be tended to.

The PIO was also directed to investigate if the RTI application was received by the office, and how it failed to land on the desk of the concerned PIO. To file a detailed reply.

On the date of the hearing on **01.02.2021**, the respondent was absent and vide email has sought exemption stating that the maximum staff of GMADA is on election duty. The PIO had also sent a list of persons on election duty which has been taken on the file of the Commission. The case was adjourned.

On the date of the hearing on **12.05.2021**, both the parties were absent.

The information had been provided. However, the PIO did not file a detailed reply on the matter of investigation of the RTI application. The PIO was given one last opportunity and directed to investigate if the RTI application was received by the office, and how it failed to land on the desk of the concerned PIO

Hearing dated 23.08.2021:

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

The case is adjourned.

To come up for further hearing on **14.12.2021 at 11.00 AM through video conference** facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Mohali.

**Chandigarh
Dated :23.08.2021**

**Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner**



Sh.Harpal Singh, S/o Late Sh.Bawa Singh
AliasBaru S/o Sh.Jetha,
R/o Village Kumbra,
Tehsil & Dist. Mohali

..... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o EO, GMADA,
Mohali.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o EO. GMADA,
Mohali.

Respondent

Appeal case No.410 of 2020

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on 16.09.2020. The respondent present pleaded that information has been supplied to the appellant vide letter dated 18.10.2019 with a copy submitted to the Commission.

The appellant stated that the information was not clear. The respondent informed that the information relates to the Estate Officer, GMADA. The appellant was directed to point out the discrepancies in writing to the PIO with a copy to the Commission and the respondent was directed to remove the same. If the information is not in the custody of EO-GMADA, the respondent was directed to procure it from the concerned PIO and provide to the appellant.

On the date of hearing on 24.1.2020, the appellant was absent and the vide letter received in the Commission on 23.11.2020 informed that the PIO has not provided the information.

As per the respondent, the appellant had pointed out the discrepancies on 20.11.2020. The respondent assured to remove the discrepancies within 15 days. The PIO was directed to remove the discrepancies within 15 days and send a compliance report to the Commission.

On the date of hearing on 01.02.2021, the respondent pleaded that as per the facts of the case a reply has been sent to the appellant.

The appellant was absent. The case was adjourned.

On the date of the last hearing on **12.05.2021**, the appellant claimed that the PIO has not supplied the complete information/removed the discrepancies as pointed out on 20.11.2020.

The respondent was absent nor had complied with the order of the Commission. Since there was delay of more than one year and eight months in providing the information and the PIO is not complying the order of the Commission, the PIO was issued a **show-cause notice under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 and directed to file reply on an affidavit**. The PIO was again directed to remove the discrepancies and provide complete information to the appellant within 10 days of the receipt of this order.

Hearing dated 23.08.2021:

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

Earlier order stands. The PIO is given one last opportunity to file reply to the show cause notice otherwise it will be presumed that the PIO has nothing to say in the matter and the decision will be taken ex-party.

To come up for further hearing on **14.12.2021 at 11.00 AM** through a video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Mohali.

Chandigarh
Dated :23.08.2021

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.Rajeshwar Sharma.
Kothi No-584, Phase-4,
Mohali.

...Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o GMADA,
Mohali.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o GMADA,
Mohali.

..... Respondent

Appeal case No.3040 of 2019

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER:

That the appellant through the RTI application dated 15.05.2019 has sought information regarding action taken on his request No.9880 dated 18.03.2019 and other information concerning the office of GMADA Mohali. The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed a first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 20.06.2019 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case has already been heard on 08.12.2019, 24.02.2020, 16.09.2020, 24.11.2020, 01.02.2021 & 12.05.2021.

On the date of hearing on 24.11.2020, hearing both the parties, the PIO was directed to provide all notings/documents that have been created to arrive at the decision that has been supplied to the appellant. The appellant was directed to visit the office of the PIO by fixing a mutually convenient time and resolve the matter.

On the date of hearing on 12.05.2021, the appellant informed that he visited the office of PIO on 16.01.2021 and requested the concerned branch to provide notings/documents created to support the decision provided to the appellant but nothing was provided.

The PIO was given one last opportunity to provide the said document, and if no such document exists, to give an affidavit.

That the case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Mohali. Both the parties are absent.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **14.12.2021 at 11.00 AM** through video conferencing in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Mohali.

Chandigarh
Dated :23.08.2021

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner