

## **PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh**

**Ph No- 0172-2864117 Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)**

**[E-mail-psic27@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:E-mail-psic27@punjabmail.gov.in)**

Sh. Sarabjeet Singh Gill, House No. 60-35-P-376-1,  
Street No.8, Maha Singh Nagar, PO Dhandari Kalan,  
Ludhiana - 141014

**Vs**

.....Appellant

**Public Information Officer,**  
o/o Commissioner, MC, Ludhiana  
**First Appellate Authority**  
o/o Commissioner, MC, Ludhiana

.....Respondent

**AC No. 4102 of 2018**

Present : (i) None is present on behalf of the appellant  
(ii) For the respondent : Sh.Kulwinder Singh, APIO

### **ORDER**

1. The RTI application is dated 02.07.2018 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter FAA) and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 28.11.2018 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act).

2. Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for 24.01.2019 in the Commission.

3. The appellant is absent today.

4. Respondent states that the information demanded by the appellant is very voluminous and not specific.

5. After hearing the respondent, it is observed that the information demanded by the appellant is very voluminous and not specific. The attention of the appellant is drawn to the decision of Supreme Court of India in Civil Appeal No. 6454 of 2011 Central Board of Secondary Education **Vs** Aditya Bandopadhyay and ors., judgment dated 09.08.2011, wherein it has held that -

*(37 Indiscriminate and impractical demands or directions under RTI Act for disclosure of all and sundry information (unrelated to transparency and accountability in the functioning of public authorities and eradication of corruption) would be counter-productive as it will adversely affect the*

*efficiency of the administration and result in the executive getting bogged down with the non-productive work of collecting and furnishing information. The Act should not be allowed to be misused or abused, to become a tool to obstruct the national development and integration, or to destroy the peace, tranquility and harmony among its citizens. Nor should it be converted into a tool of oppression or intimidation of honest officials striving to do their duty. The nation does not want a scenario where 75% of the staff of public authorities spends 75% of their time in collecting and furnishing information to applicants instead of discharging their regular duties. The threat of penalties under the RTI Act and the pressure of the authorities under the RTI Act should not lead to employees of a public authorities prioritising 'information furnishing', at the cost of their normal and regular duties.)*

6. Therefore, the appellant is advised to visit the office of the respondent and inspect the record on any working day and obtain the information.
7. This is the first date of hearing , and the appellant is absent, therefore, one more opportunity is given to him to appear before the Commission and state his case. It is made clear that in case the appellant does not appear on the next date of hearing , appropriate order in his absence shall be passed.
8. To come up on **11.02.2019 at 11.00 AM**. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

**Sd/-**

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 24.01.2019**

**(Preety Chawla)**  
**State Information Commissioner**

## PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864117 Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)

[E-mail-psic27@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:E-mail-psic27@punjabmail.gov.in)

Sh. Sarabjeet Singh Gill, House No. 60-35-P-376-1,  
Street No.8, Maha Singh Nagar, PO Dhandari Kalan,  
Ludhiana - 141014

.....Appellant

**Vs**

**Public Information Officer,**  
o/o Commissioner, MC, Ludhiana  
**First Appellate Authority**  
o/o Commissioner, MC, Ludhiana

.....Respondent

**AC No.4103 of 2018**

Present : (i) None is present on behalf of the appellant  
(ii) For the respondent : Sh.Gurdev Singh, (supdt.) Rent

### **ORDER**

The RTI application is dated 02.07.2018 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter FAA) and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 28.11.2018 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act).

2. Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for 24.01.2019 in the Commission.
3. The appellant is absent today.
4. Respondent states that the information demanded by the appellant is very voluminous and not specific.
5. After hearing the respondent, it is observed that the information demanded by the appellant is very voluminous and not specific. The attention of the appellant is drawn to the decision of Supreme Court of India in Civil Appeal No. 6454 of 2011 Central Board of Secondary Education **Vs** Aditya Bandopadhyay and ors., judgment dated 09.08.2011, wherein it has held that -

*(37 Indiscriminate and impractical demands or directions under RTI Act for disclosure of all and sundry information (unrelated to transparency and accountability in the functioning of public authorities and eradication of corruption) would be counter-productive as it will adversely affect the*

*efficiency of the administration and result in the executive getting bogged down with the non-productive work of collecting and furnishing information. The Act should not be allowed to be misused or abused, to become a tool to obstruct the national development and integration, or to destroy the peace, tranquility and harmony among its citizens. Nor should it be converted into a tool of oppression or intimidation of honest officials striving to do their duty. The nation does not want a scenario where 75% of the staff of public authorities spends 75% of their time in collecting and furnishing information to applicants instead of discharging their regular duties. The threat of penalties under the RTI Act and the pressure of the authorities under the RTI Act should not lead to employees of a public authorities prioritising 'information furnishing', at the cost of their normal and regular duties.)*

6. Therefore, the appellant is advised to visit the office of the respondent and inspect the record on any working day and obtain the information.

7. This is the first date of hearing , and the appellant is absent, therefore, one more opportunity is given to him to appear before the Commission and state his case. It is made clear that in case the appellant does not appear on the next date of hearing , appropriate order in his absence shall be passed.

8. To come up on **12.02.2019 at 11.00 AM**. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

**Sd/-**

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 24.01.2019**

**(Preety Chawla)**  
**State Information Commissioner**

## **PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh**

**Ph No- 0172-2864117 Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)**

**[E-mail-psic27@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:E-mail-psic27@punjabmail.gov.in)**

Sh. Sarabjeet Singh Gill, House No. 60-35-P-376-1,  
Street No.8, Maha Singh Nagar, PO Dhandari Kalan,  
Ludhiana - 141014

**Vs**

.....Appellant

**Public Information Officer,**  
o/o Commissioner, MC, Ludhiana  
**First Appellate Authority**  
o/o Commissioner, MC, Ludhiana

.....Respondent

**AC No.4104 of 2018**

Present : (i) None is present on behalf of the appellant  
(ii) for the respondent : Sh. Arvind Kumar, SDO, Sh. Chirag Bansal, JE,  
Sh. Baljinder Singh, JE, Sh. Kulwinder Singh, SDO and Sh. Pawanpreet  
Singh, JDM

### **ORDER**

The RTI application is dated 27.06.2018 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter FAA) and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 28.11.2018 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act).

2. Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for 24.01.2019 in the Commission.
3. The appellant is absent today.
4. Respondent states that the information demanded by the appellant is very voluminous and not specific. He has given in writing that the information demanded by the appellant is from year 1990 to 2013. And in the year 2000, Corporation was divided into four Zones.
5. After hearing the respondent, it is observed that the information demanded by the appellant is very voluminous and not specific. The attention of the appellant is drawn to the decision of Supreme Court of India in Civil Appeal No. 6454 of 2011 Central Board of Secondary Education **Vs** Aditya Bandopadhyay and ors., judgment dated 09.08.2011, wherein it has held that -

*(37 Indiscriminate and impractical demands or directions under RTI Act for disclosure of all and sundry information (unrelated to transparency and accountability in the functioning of public authorities and eradication of corruption) would be counter-productive as it will adversely affect the efficiency of the administration and result in the executive getting bogged down with the non-productive work of collecting and furnishing information. The Act should not be allowed to be misused or abused, to become a tool to obstruct the national development and integration, or to destroy the peace, tranquility and harmony among its citizens. Nor should it be converted into a tool of oppression or intimidation of honest officials striving to do their duty. The nation does not want a scenario where 75% of the staff of public authorities spends 75% of their time in collecting and furnishing information to applicants instead of discharging their regular duties. The threat of penalties under the RTI Act and the pressure of the authorities under the RTI Act should not lead to employees of a public authorities prioritising 'information furnishing', at the cost of their normal and regular duties.)*

6. Therefore, the appellant is advised to visit the office of the respondent and inspect the record on any working day and obtain the information.
7. This is the first date of hearing , and the appellant is absent, therefore, one more opportunity is given to him to appear before the Commission and state his case. It is made clear that in case the appellant does not appear on the next date of hearing , appropriate order in his absence shall be passed.
8. To come up on **11.02.2019 at 11.00 AM**. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 24.01.2019**

**Sd/-**  
**(Preety Chawla)**  
**State Information Commissioner**

## **PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh**

**Ph No- 0172-2864117 Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)**

**[E-mail-psic27@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:E-mail-psic27@punjabmail.gov.in)**

Sh. Sarabjeet Singh Gill, House No. 60-35-P-376-1,  
Street No.8, Maha Singh Nagar, PO Dhandari Kalan,  
Ludhiana - 141014

**Vs**

.....Appellant

**Public Information Officer,**  
o/o Commissioner, MC, Ludhiana  
**First Appellate Authority**  
o/o Commissioner, MC, Ludhiana

.....Respondent

**AC No.4105 of 2018**

Present : (i) None is present on behalf of the appellant  
(ii) for the respondent : Sh.Sukhpal Singh, Clerk

### **ORDER**

The RTI application is dated 19.07.2018 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter FAA) and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 28.11.2018 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act).

2. Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for 24.01.2019 in the Commission.
3. The appellant is absent today.
4. Respondent states that the information demanded by the appellant is very voluminous and not specific.
5. After hearing the respondent, it is observed that the information demanded by the appellant is very voluminous and not specific. The attention of the appellant is drawn to the decision of Supreme Court of India in Civil Appeal No. 6454 of 2011 Central Board of Secondary Education **Vs** Aditya Bandopadhyay and ors., judgment dated 09.08.2011, wherein it has held that -

*(37 Indiscriminate and impractical demands or directions under RTI Act for disclosure of all and sundry information (unrelated to transparency and accountability in the functioning of public authorities and eradication of corruption) would be counter-productive as it will adversely affect the*

*efficiency of the administration and result in the executive getting bogged down with the non-productive work of collecting and furnishing information. The Act should not be allowed to be misused or abused, to become a tool to obstruct the national development and integration, or to destroy the peace, tranquility and harmony among its citizens. Nor should it be converted into a tool of oppression or intimidation of honest officials striving to do their duty. The nation does not want a scenario where 75% of the staff of public authorities spends 75% of their time in collecting and furnishing information to applicants instead of discharging their regular duties. The threat of penalties under the RTI Act and the pressure of the authorities under the RTI Act should not lead to employees of a public authorities prioritising 'information furnishing', at the cost of their normal and regular duties.)*

6. Therefore, the appellant is advised to visit the office of the respondent and inspect the record on any working day and obtain the information.

7. This is the first date of hearing , and the appellant is absent, therefore, one more opportunity is given to him to appear before the Commission and state his case. It is made clear that in case the appellant does not appear on the next date of hearing , appropriate order in his absence shall be passed.

8. To come up on **18.02.2019 at 11.00 AM**. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

**Sd/-**

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 24.01.2019**

**(Preety Chawla)**  
**State Information Commissioner**



## PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864117 Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)

[E-mail-psic27@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:E-mail-psic27@punjabmail.gov.in)

Ms. Shruti (Advocate)

# 82, Labour Colony , Back side

Scooter Market, Gill Road, Ludhiana

.....Appellant

**Vs**

**Public Information Officer,**

o/o Commissioner, MC, Ludhiana

**First Appellate Authority**

o/o Commissioner, MC, Ludhiana

.....Respondent

**AC No.4106 of 2018**

Present : (i) None is present on behalf of the appellant  
(ii) for the respondent : Sh. Ajay Kumar, Building Inspector

### **ORDER**

The RTI application is dated 14.07.2018 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter FAA) and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 28.11.2018 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act).

2. Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for 24.01.2019 in the Commission.
3. The appellant is absent today.
4. Respondent states that the information demanded by the appellant is very voluminous and not specific.
5. After hearing the respondent, it is observed that the information demanded by the appellant is very voluminous and not specific. The attention of the appellant is drawn to the decision of Supreme Court of India in Civil Appeal No. 6454 of 2011 Central Board of Secondary Education **Vs** Aditya Bandopadhyay and ors., judgment dated 09.08.2011, wherein it has held that -

*(37 Indiscriminate and impractical demands or directions under RTI Act for disclosure of all and sundry information (unrelated to transparency and accountability in the functioning of public authorities and eradication of corruption) would be counter-productive as it will adversely affect the*

*efficiency of the administration and result in the executive getting bogged down with the non-productive work of collecting and furnishing information. The Act should not be allowed to be misused or abused, to become a tool to obstruct the national development and integration, or to destroy the peace, tranquility and harmony among its citizens. Nor should it be converted into a tool of oppression or intimidation of honest officials striving to do their duty. The nation does not want a scenario where 75% of the staff of public authorities spends 75% of their time in collecting and furnishing information to applicants instead of discharging their regular duties. The threat of penalties under the RTI Act and the pressure of the authorities under the RTI Act should not lead to employees of a public authorities prioritising 'information furnishing', at the cost of their normal and regular duties.)*

6. Therefore, the appellant is advised to visit the office of the respondent and inspect the record on any working day and obtain the information.

7. This is the first date of hearing , and the appellant is absent, therefore, one more opportunity is given to him to appear before the Commission and state his case. It is made clear that in case the appellant does not appear on the next date of hearing , appropriate order in his absence shall be passed.

8. To come up on **20.02.2019 at 11.00 AM**. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Sd/-

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 24.01.2019**

**(Preety Chawla)**  
**State Information Commissioner**

## PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864117 Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)

[E-mail-psic27@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:E-mail-psic27@punjabmail.gov.in)

Sh.Surjit Singh, House No. 2990/76  
Street No.4, Guru Gobind Singh Nagar  
Near Mair Di Chowki, PO Daba, Ludhiana

.....Appellant

**Vs**

**Public Information Officer,**  
o/o Commissioner, MC, Ludhiana  
**First Appellate Authority**  
o/o Commissioner, MC, Ludhiana

.....Respondent

**AC No.4107 of 2018**

Present : (i) None is present on behalf of the appellant  
(ii) For the respondent :Sh. Harjeet Singh, Draftsman-cum-APIO

### **ORDER**

The RTI application is dated 28.08.2018 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter FAA) and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 28.11.2018 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act).

2. Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for 24.01.2019 in the Commission.
3. The appellant is absent today.
4. Respondent states that the information demanded by the appellant is very voluminous and not specific.
5. After hearing the respondent, it is observed that the information demanded by the appellant is very voluminous and not specific. The attention of the appellant is drawn to the decision of Supreme Court of India in Civil Appeal No. 6454 of 2011 Central Board of Secondary Education **Vs** Aditya Bandopadhyay and ors., judgment dated 09.08.2011, wherein it has held that -

*(37 Indiscriminate and impractical demands or directions under RTI Act for disclosure of all and sundry information (unrelated to transparency and accountability in the functioning of public authorities and eradication of corruption) would be counter-productive as it will adversely affect the*

*efficiency of the administration and result in the executive getting bogged down with the non-productive work of collecting and furnishing information. The Act should not be allowed to be misused or abused, to become a tool to obstruct the national development and integration, or to destroy the peace, tranquility and harmony among its citizens. Nor should it be converted into a tool of oppression or intimidation of honest officials striving to do their duty. The nation does not want a scenario where 75% of the staff of public authorities spends 75% of their time in collecting and furnishing information to applicants instead of discharging their regular duties. The threat of penalties under the RTI Act and the pressure of the authorities under the RTI Act should not lead to employees of a public authorities prioritising 'information furnishing', at the cost of their normal and regular duties.)*

6. Therefore, the appellant is advised to visit the office of the respondent and inspect the record on any working day and obtain the information.
7. This is the first date of hearing , and the appellant is absent, therefore, one more opportunity is given to him to appear before the Commission and state his case. It is made clear that in case the appellant does not appear on the next date of hearing , appropriate order in his absence shall be passed.
8. To come up on **18.02.2019 at 11.00 AM**. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

**Sd/-**

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 24.01.2019**

**(Preety Chawla)**  
**State Information Commissioner**

## PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh

Ph No- 0172-2864117 Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)

[E-mail-psic27@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:E-mail-psic27@punjabmail.gov.in)

Sh.Surjit Singh, House No. 2990/76  
Street No.4, Guru Gobind Singh Nagar  
Near Mair Di Chowki, PO Daba, Ludhiana

.....Appellant

Vs

**Public Information Officer,**  
o/o Commissioner, MC, Ludhiana  
**First Appellate Authority**  
o/o Commissioner, MC, Ludhiana

.....Respondent

**AC No.4108 of 2018**

Present : (i) None is present on behalf of the appellant  
(ii) for the respondent : Sh.Arvind Kumar, SDO-cum-APIO, Sh.Chirag  
Bansal, JE

### **ORDER**

The RTI application is dated 19.07.2018 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter FAA) and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 28.11.2018 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act).

2. Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for 24.01.2019 in the Commission.
3. The appellant is absent today.
4. Respondent states that the information demanded by the appellant is very voluminous and not specific.
5. After hearing the respondent, it is observed that the information demanded by the appellant is very voluminous and not specific. The attention of the appellant is drawn to the decision of Supreme Court of India in Civil Appeal No. 6454 of 2011 Central Board of Secondary Education **Vs** Aditya Bandopadhyay and ors., judgment dated 09.08.2011, wherein it has held that -

*(37 Indiscriminate and impractical demands or directions under RTI Act for disclosure of all and sundry information (unrelated to transparency and accountability in the functioning of public authorities and eradication of corruption) would be counter-productive as it will adversely affect the*

*efficiency of the administration and result in the executive getting bogged down with the non-productive work of collecting and furnishing information. The Act should not be allowed to be misused or abused, to become a tool to obstruct the national development and integration, or to destroy the peace, tranquility and harmony among its citizens. Nor should it be converted into a tool of oppression or intimidation of honest officials striving to do their duty. The nation does not want a scenario where 75% of the staff of public authorities spends 75% of their time in collecting and furnishing information to applicants instead of discharging their regular duties. The threat of penalties under the RTI Act and the pressure of the authorities under the RTI Act should not lead to employees of a public authorities prioritising 'information furnishing', at the cost of their normal and regular duties.)*

6. Therefore, the appellant is advised to visit the office of the respondent and inspect the record on any working day and obtain the information.

7. This is the first date of hearing , and the appellant is absent, therefore, one more opportunity is given to him to appear before the Commission and state his case. It is made clear that in case the appellant does not appear on the next date of hearing , appropriate order in his absence shall be passed.

8. To come up on **11.02.2019 at 11.00 AM**. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

**Sd/-**

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 24.01.2019**

**(Preety Chawla)**  
**State Information Commissioner**

## **PUNJAB, STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**Sector-16, Madhya Marg, Near Rose Garden, Chandigarh**

**Ph No- 0172-2864117 Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)**

**[E-mail-psic27@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:E-mail-psic27@punjabmail.gov.in)**

Sh.Surjit Singh, House No. 2990/76  
Street No.4, Guru Gobind Singh Nagar  
Near Mair Di Chowki, PO Daba, Ludhiana

.....Appellant

**Vs**

**Public Information Officer,**  
o/o Commissioner, MC, Ludhiana  
**First Appellate Authority**  
o/o Commissioner, MC, Ludhiana

.....Respondent

**AC No.4109 of 2018**

Present : (i) None is present on behalf of the appellant  
(ii) For the respondent : Sh. Ranbir Singh, APIO

### **ORDER**

The RTI application is dated 02.07.2018 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter FAA) and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 28.11.2018 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act).

2. Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for 24.01.2019 in the Commission.

3. The appellant is absent today.

4. Respondent states that the information demanded by the appellant is very voluminous and not specific. He further states that the First Appellate Authority has also disposed of the case.

5. After hearing the respondent, it is observed that the information demanded by the appellant is very voluminous and not specific. The attention of the appellant is drawn to the decision of Supreme Court of India in Civil Appeal No. 6454 of 2011 Central Board of Secondary Education **Vs** Aditya Bandopadhyay and ors., judgment dated 09.08.2011, wherein it has held that -

*(37 Indiscriminate and impractical demands or directions under RTI Act for disclosure of all and sundry information (unrelated to transparency and accountability in the functioning of public authorities and eradication of corruption) would be counter-productive as it will adversely affect the*

*efficiency of the administration and result in the executive getting bogged down with the non-productive work of collecting and furnishing information. The Act should not be allowed to be misused or abused, to become a tool to obstruct the national development and integration, or to destroy the peace, tranquility and harmony among its citizens. Nor should it be converted into a tool of oppression or intimidation of honest officials striving to do their duty. The nation does not want a scenario where 75% of the staff of public authorities spends 75% of their time in collecting and furnishing information to applicants instead of discharging their regular duties. The threat of penalties under the RTI Act and the pressure of the authorities under the RTI Act should not lead to employees of a public authorities prioritising 'information furnishing', at the cost of their normal and regular duties.)*

6. Therefore, the appellant is advised to visit the office of the respondent and inspect the record on any working day and obtain the information.

7. This is the first date of hearing , and the appellant is absent, therefore, one more opportunity is given to him to appear before the Commission and state his case. It is made clear that in case the appellant does not appear on the next date of hearing , appropriate order in his absence shall be passed.

8. To come up on **18.02.2019 at 11.00 AM**. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

**Sd/-**

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 24.01.2019**

**(Preety Chawla)**  
**State Information Commissioner**



