



Sh. Lajpat Rai, S/o Sh.HarbasLal,  
H No-B-3/287, Romana Street,  
Jaitho, Distt.Faridkot.

... Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o EO, MC,  
Jaitho, District Faridkot..

...Respondent

**Complaint Case No. 634 of 2020**

**PRESENT: Sh.Lajpat Rai as the Complainant**  
**None for the Respondent**

**ORDER: Facts of the case:-**

That the complainant through RTI application dated 03.06.2020 has sought information regarding action taken against Ramesh Kumar, Prem Kumar, Davinder Kumar & others after receipt of vigilance enquiry report in vigilance case No.29/18 relating to misplacement of record and enquiry report on DDLG letter No.3714 dated 01.08.2019 – copies of enquiry report on the complaints received by the officers against clerk Davinder Kumar in Jan., Feb, March, May & June – copies of receipt books No.1082(55 to 60), 142(20-30), 144(50-60) etc. and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of EO-MC Jaitho, District Faridkot. The complainant was not provided with the information after which the complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 09.09.2020.

That the case first came up for hearing on 31.05.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information.

The respondent was absent.

The RTI application of the complainant was not legible. The appellant was directed to send a legible typed copy of the RTI application for me to pursue this case further.

That on the date of last hearing on **21.09.2021**, the appellant sent a legible copy of the RTI application which was taken on the file of the Commission.

That the respondent was absent and the order dated 31.05.2021 sent to the PIO had been returned on 02.07.2021 with the remarks of postal authority "Refused due to strike". The PIO however vide email informed that the appellant was asked to vide letter dated 16.06.2020 to deposit a fee of Rs.1700/- which the appellant did not deposit and the information was not provided.

As per the appellant, the PIO did not mention the detail of the total number of pages in the letter while raising the fee which is a violation of the rules which prescribe how to raise the fee.

Having gone through the file, the appellant's plea was found correct that the PIO had arbitrarily raised the fee without giving the details of the number of pages. Moreover, there has been an enormous delay in providing the information for which the PIO was issued a **show caused notice under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 for the arbitrary raising of fees, for constant non-appearance before the Commission as well as non supplying of the information within the statutorily prescribed time as prescribed under section 7 of the RTI Act. and directed to file a reply on an affidavit.**

**Complaint Case No. 634 of 2020**

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

The respondent is absent nor has filed a reply to the show cause as well as not complied with the order of the Commission to provide the information, hence it is presumed the PIO has nothing to say on the matter nor is interested in executing the order of the commission to provide the information.

The responsibility to ensure the timely transmission of the information to the appellant lies on the PIO. As per information from the office of NC-Jaito, Sh.Balwinder Singh Bhunter was the PIO-NC Jaito when the RTI application was filed (from 03.06.2020 till 31.07.2020), now posted in the office of ADC(UD) Barnala and Sh.Gurdas Singh-EO-NC Jaito has been the PIO-NC Jaito from 03.08.2020 till 10.05.2021(full charge) and from 11.05.2021 till date(addl. Charge).

In this case, the Commission concludes that there are two PIOs involved in causing the delay in providing the information.

- a) Sh.Balwinder Singh Bhunter was the PIO when the RTI application was filed(03.06.2020 to 31.07.2020) who did not supply the information within 30 days and violated section 7(2) of the RTI Act. Sh.Balwinder Singh(earlier PIO-NC Jaito) is hereby **show caused 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 person(s) of the show cause and direct them to appear before the Commission along with the written replies.
- b) Sh.Gurdas Singh-has been the PIO for maximum period (from 03.08.2020 to till date) and constantly violating the order of the Commission to provide the information as well as not responding to the show cause notice issued to him on 21.09.2021. It appears that Sh.Gurdas Singh has nothing to say on the matter.

From the facts, it is clear that Sh.Gurdas Singh-EO-cum-PIO, NC Jaito has violated Section 7(3)(a) of the RTI Act and is responsible for delay and not providing the information to the complainant, and continuous non-appearance at the hearings.

Hence, given the above facts a penalty of **Rs.15,000/-** is imposed on Sh.Gurdas Singh-EO-cum-PIO, NC Jaito which will be deposited in the Govt. Treasury. The PIO is directed to duly inform the Commission about the compliance of the orders by producing a copy of the challan as evidence of depositing the penalty in the Govt Treasury.

Further a copy of the order is being sent to the ADC(UD), Faridkot with the direction to ensure compliance of the order by the PIO.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **31.05.2022 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Faridkot.

Chandigarh  
Dated :24.01.2022

Sd/-  
(Khushwant Singh)  
State Information Commissioner

CC to :1. Sh.Balwinder Singh Bhunter,  
O/o ADC(UD), Barnala.

2. Addl Deputy Commissioner,  
Urban Development,  
Faridkot.

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

... Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o EO, MC,  
Jaito, District Faridkot

... Respondent

**Complaint Case No. 635 of 2020**

**PRESENT: Sh. Lajpat Rai as the Complainant**  
**None for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The complainant through RTI application dated 03.06.2020 has sought information on 14 points regarding Ajay Singh, clerk-resolution No.383-13.02.2018- Davinder Kumar, Ramesh Kumar relating to a wrong statement - and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of EO-MC Jaito, District Faridkot. The complainant was not provided with the information after which the complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 09.09.2020.

The case last came up for hearing on 31.05.2021. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent was absent.

The RTI application of the complainant was not legible. The appellant was directed to send a legible typed copy of the RTI application for me to pursue this case further.

On the date of the last hearing on **21.09.2021**, the appellant sent a legible copy of the RTI application which was taken on the file of the Commission.

The respondent was absent and the order dated 31.05.2021 sent to the PIO had been returned on 02.07.2021 with the remarks of postal authority "Refused due to strike".

The PIO was directed to appear personally before the Commission on the next date of hearing along with the reasons for not attending to the RTI application as well as refusing to take notice of the Commission.

A copy of the order was sent to the Deputy Commissioner, Faridkot with the direction to ensure that the notice of the Commission is served to the PIO and the PIO appears before the Commission on the next date of hearing.

**Hearing dated 24.01.2022:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The appellant claims that the PIO has supplied the information.

The respondent is absent nor is represented.

**Complaint Case No. 635 of 2020**

Earlier order stands. The case is adjourned.

To come up for further hearing on **31.05.2022 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Faridkot.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated :24.01.2022**

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

**CC to: 1. Deputy Commissioner, Faridkot.**

**2. Addl Deputy Commissioner,**  
**Urban Development,**  
**Faridkot.**



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

... Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o EO, MC,  
Jaito, District Faridkot

...Respondent

**Complaint Case No. 636 of 2020**

**PRESENT: Sh.Lajpat Rai as the Complainant**  
**None for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The complainant through the RTI application dated 27.07.2020 has sought information on 10 points regarding Ramesh Kumar, Prem Kumar, Kaushal – a copy of letter No.7/20 – letter No.26/95 dated 26.10.2018 and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of EO-MC Jaito, District Faridkot. The complainant was not provided with the information after which the complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 09.09.2020.

The case first came up for hearing on 31.05.2021. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information.

The respondent was absent.

The RTI application of the complainant was not legible. The appellant was directed to send a legible typed copy of the RTI application for me to pursue this case further.

On the date of the last hearing on **21.09.2021**, the appellant sent a legible copy of the RTI application which was taken on the file of the Commission.

The respondent was absent and the order dated 31.05.2021 sent to the PIO had been returned on 02.07.2021 with the remarks of postal authority "Refused due to strike". The PIO however vide email informed that the appellant was asked to vide letter dated 16.06.2020 to deposit a fee of Rs.5400/- which the appellant did not deposit and the information was not provided.

As per the appellant, the PIO did not mention the detail of the total number of pages in the letter while raising the fee which is a violation of the RTI Act.

Having gone through the file, the appellant's plea was found correct that the PIO had arbitrarily raised the fee without giving the details of the number of pages. Moreover, there has been an enormous delay in providing the information for which the PIO was issued a **show cause notice under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 for the arbitrary raising of fees, for constant non-appearance before the Commission as well as non supplying of the information within the statutorily prescribed time as prescribed under section 7 of the RTI Act and directed to file reply on an affidavit.**

**Hearing dated 24.01.2022:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The appellant claims that the PIO has supplied the information.

The respondent is absent nor is represented as well as not filed the reply to the show-cause notice.

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

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **31.05.2022 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Faridkot.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated :24.01.2022**

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

**CC to: Addl Deputy Commissioner,**  
**Urban Development,**  
**Faridkot.**



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

... Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o EO, MC,  
Jaito, District Faridkot

...Respondent

**Complaint Case No. 637 of 2020**

**PRESENT: Sh. Lajpat Rai as the Complainant**  
**None for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The complainant through RTI application dated 27.07.2020 has sought information on 16 points regarding the transfer of property in register 1979-80, 1985 wherein the property was transferred on 21.03.2002 in the name of Surinder Kumar, Sunderpal, Mahinderpal and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of EO-MC Jaito, District Faridkot. The complainant was not provided with the information after which the complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 09.09.2020.

The case first came up for hearing on 31.05.2021. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information.

The respondent was absent.

The RTI application of the complainant was not legible. The appellant was directed to send a legible typed copy of the RTI application for me to pursue this case further.

On the date of the last hearing on **21.09.2021**, the appellant sent a legible copy of the RTI application which was taken on the file of the Commission.

The respondent was absent the order dated 31.05.2021 sent to the PIO had been returned on 02.07.2021 with the remarks of postal authority "Refused due to strike".

The PIO was directed to appear personally before the Commission on the next date of hearing alongwith the reasons for not attending to the RTI application as well as refusing to accept the notice of the Commission.

A copy of the order was sent to the Deputy Commissioner, Faridkot with the direction to ensure that the order of the Commission is served to the PIO and the PIO appears before the Commission on the next date of hearing.

**Hearing dated 24.01.2022:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The appellant claims that the PIO has supplied the information.

The respondent is absent nor is represented.

Earlier order stands. The case is adjourned.

To come up for further hearing on **31.05.2022 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Faridkot.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated :24.01.2022**

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

**CC to: 1. Addl Deputy Commissioner,**  
**Urban Development,**  
**Faridkot.**

**2. Deputy Commissioner, Faridkot.**





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

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o SSP,  
Faridkot.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o SSP,  
Faridkot.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 2564 of 2020**

**PRESENT: Sh.Lajpat Rai as the Complainant**  
**Sh.Ramesh Kumar, ASI-Incharge RTI Branch O/o SSP Faridkot for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant through RTI application dated 26.05.2020 has sought information regarding case No.80 dated 30.05.2019 police station Jaito relating to a cross-case – enquiry report, statement of witnesses –CDs and other documents – status report on the action taken till 27.05.2020 and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of SSP Faridkot. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 30.05.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 31.05.2021. The respondent present pleaded that the information has already been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 08.07.2020 and 12.02.2021.

As per appellant, the information was incomplete. Having gone through the RTI application and hearing both the parties, the following was concluded:

|             |   |   |  |
|-------------|---|---|--|
| Point-1 & 2 | As per respondent enquiry is pending and information cannot be provided | -   | Merely stating that the enquiry is pending is not the correct way to deny the information. The PIO is directed to justify the usage of exemptions in section 8 and give it in writing that why disclosure of information will hamper the investigation. process and pass a speaking order. |
| Point-3     | As per respondent, the information has been provided                    | The appellant has not received the information  | PIO to provide information   |
| Point-4     | As per the respondent, the information has been provided                | As per respondent the information is incomplete | PIO to sort out the discrepancies as per the RTI application and provide complete information.   |

**Appeal Case No. 2564 of 2020**

**On the date of the** last hearing on **21.09.2021**, the respondent informed that the information relating to points 1 & 2 is ready and the information on points 3 & 4 has been provided to the appellant.

The appellant was not satisfied and informed that the PIO has not supplied the complete information as per the order of the Commission as well as not supplied CD and photographs as asked for in point-1

The respondent informed that the CD is not available with them.

The PIO was given one last opportunity to comply with the earlier order of the Commission and remove the discrepancies and provide complete information whatever available in the record to the appellant within 15 days and send a compliance report to the Commission otherwise the Commission will be constrained to initiate proceedings against the PIO under section 20 of the RTI Act.

If the information is not available, give it in writing on an affidavit. The affidavit should be on stamp paper duly signed by PIO.

**Hearing dated 24.01.2022:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. As per the respondent, the available information has been provided and no further information is available in the record.

As per the appellant, the information is still incomplete and discrepancies have already been informed to the PIO.

Earlier order stands. The PIO is given one last opportunity to give in writing on an affidavit that the information that has been provided is true, complete and no further information is available in the record relating to this RTI application. The affidavit should be on a stamp paper duly signed by the PIO and attested by the competent authority.

To come up for further hearing on **31.05.2022 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Faridkot.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated :24.01.2022**

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



Sh. Lajpat Rai, S/o Sh.Harbas Lal,  
H No-B-3/287, Romana Street,  
Jaitho, Distt.Faridkot.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o SSP,  
Faridkot.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o SSP,  
Faridkot.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 2567 of 2020**

**PRESENT:** Sh.Lajpat Rai as the Complainant  
Sh.Ramesh Kumar, ASI-Incharge RTI Branch O/o SSP Faridkot for the  
Respondent

**ORDER:**

The appellant through RTI application dated 27.09.2019 has sought information regarding action taken report on the complaints of RTI Activists Association filed against employees of MC Jaitho on 04.06.2019 – enquiry report in case No.80/2019 –Sunita Devi – witness statement dated 20.06.2019 as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of SSP Faridkot. The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 31.10.2019 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 31.05.2021. The respondent present pleaded that the information has already been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 12.02.2021.

As per the appellant, the information was incomplete. Having gone through the RTI application and hearing both the parties, the following was concluded:

|         |   |   |   |
|---------|---|---|---|
| Point-1 | As per the respondent, the information has been provided                | As per the appellant, the information is incomplete since the PIO has not provided copies of applications | The PIO is directed to sort out the discrepancies   |
| Point-2 | As per respondent enquiry is pending and information cannot be provided | As per the appellant, the enquiry has been completed but the PIO is not providing the information         | Merely stating that the enquiry is pending is not the correct way to deny the information. The PIO is directed to justify the usage of exemptions in section 8 and give it in writing that why disclosure of information will hamper the investigation process and pass a speaking order. |

|             |  |   |   |
|-------------|--|---|---|
| Point-3     | As per the respondent, the information has been provided       | As per the appellant, the information is incomplete | The PIO is directed to sort out the discrepancies |
| Point-4 & 5 | As per respondent, the information(55 pages) has been provided |   | Provided  |

On the date of last hearing on **21.09.2021**, the respondent informed that the complete information as per order has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 10.06.2021.

As per the appellant, the information on point-3 was incomplete.

The PIO was given one last opportunity to comply with the earlier order of the Commission and remove the discrepancies and provide complete information whatever available in the record to the appellant within 15 days and send a compliance report to the Commission otherwise the Commission will be constrained to initiate proceedings against the PIO under section 20 of the RTI Act.

If the information is not available, to give in writing on an affidavit. The affidavit should be on stamp paper duly signed by PIO.

#### **Hearing dated 24.01.2022:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. As per the respondent, the available information has been provided and no further information is available in the record.

As per the appellant, the information is still incomplete and discrepancies have already been informed to the PIO.

Earlier order stands. The PIO is given one last opportunity to give in writing on an affidavit that the information that has been provided is true, complete and no further information is available in the record relating to this RTI application. The affidavit should be on a stamp paper duly signed by the PIO and attested by the competent authority.

To come up for further hearing on **31.05.2022 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Faridkot.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated :24.01.2022**

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



Sh Madan Lal. S/o Sh Om Prakash,  
Jain Niwas, MCB Zone-2, H No-10803,  
Street no-18, Parinda Road-18,  
Guru Teg Bahadur Nagar, Bathinda.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o EO, Nagar Council,  
**Jaito**, Distt. Faridkot.

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

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 1638 of 2020**

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

**ORDER:**

The appellant through RTI application dated 28.12.2019 has sought information regarding a copy of correspondent done relating to promotion of Ramesh Kumar, Prem Kumar, Kewal Sharma from 07.04.2017 till date – case file of case no.21/2011 against Kewal Sharma copy of audit report of Finance department, Central Audit department from 04/2005 to 03/2007, 11.08.2010 to 07.10.2010 & 04/2007 to 03.2010 - action taken report against an employee for missing record relating to book No.120 – computerized CD for deposit of property tax – case file of FIR No.29/18 & 80/30/5/19 against Davinder Kumar clerk and other information concerning the office of EO, NC Jaito. The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the first appellate authority on 20.02.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 02.11.2020 through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent was absent.

Having gone through the RTI application, the Commission observed that the information that had been asked for by the appellant appeared to be the service record of employees Sh. Ramesh Kumar, Sh.Prem Kumar and Sh.Kewal Sharma as well as very voluminous information. The Commission advised the appellant to revise his RTI application and seek that information, which is not personal, and not voluminous and does not divert the resources of the public authority.

During the course of the hearing, it came to the notice that two appellants Sh.Madan Lal and Sh. Chander Shekhar, had filed similar appeal cases (No.1638/2020 & 1697/2020) for seeking exactly the same information. The Commission did not allow the appellants to pursue such malpractices especially if said matter comes to the notice that the RTI applications are being fixed amongst various applicants, as during the hearing, it came to notice that both appellants are closely associated with each other.

The same matter was brought to the notice of the appellant who then requested that the cases be clubbed. In the interest of justice, both the cases were clubbed and the EO, NC Jaito was directed to provide only one set of information to Sh. Madan Lal by raising requisite fee as per provisions of RTI Act. Since the appellant had also been advised to submit a revised RTI application, the fee is raised once the appellant submits the revised RTI application and information be provided after a deposit of the requisite fee.

The Commission also warned both the appellants not to repeat this practice of fixing RTI applications; otherwise, the Commission will be constrained to reject such applications in the future.

On the date of the hearing on **04.01.2021**, as per the earlier order of the Commission, the appellant had revised the RTI application. However, due to a network problem the hearing could not be completed.

On the date of last hearing on **16.08.2021**, the respondent present pleaded that since the information as sought by the appellant is personal information, it cannot be provided and the appellant has already been sent a reply again on 19.03.2021.

The appellant pleaded that he has already sent a revised RTI application but the PIO has not supplied the information.

Having gone through the RTI application, the PIO was directed to provide:-

- Point-1            To only provide a certified copy of rules in connection with promotion of peons  
The rest of the information sought in point 1 is personal information and not to be provided.
- Point-2            To provide the audit report
- Point-3            To provide the information as available on record. Otherwise, reply appropriately
- Point-4            Not to be provided
- Point-5            To provide if available on record. Otherwise, reply appropriately.

**Hearing dated 24.01.2022:**

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

The respondent is absent nor has complied with the order of the Commission to provide the information. There has been an enormous delay of more than two years in providing the information. The Commission has taken a serious view of this and hereby directs the PIO to **show cause why penalty be not imposed under section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 for not transferring the RTI application in a proper way and secondly 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 person(s) of the show cause and direct them to appear before the Commission along with the written replies.

The PIO is again directed to provide information to the appellant within ten days of the receipt of the order.

To come up for further hearing on **31.05.2022 at 11.00 AM** through a video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Bathinda. The PIO to appear through VC at DAC Faridkot.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated 24.01.2022**

**Sd/-**  
**(KhushwantSingh)**  
**State Information Commissioner**



Sh Lajpat Rai, S/o Sh Harbans Lal,  
Romana Street, Jaito,  
Tehsil & Distt Faridkot.

... Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o DSP, Jaito,  
Distt. Faridkot.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o SSP,  
Faridkot.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 1865 of 2021**

**PRESENT: Sh.Lajpat Rai as the Appellant**  
**Sh.Prem Pal Singh, ASI for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant through an RTI application dated 26.09.2020 has sought information regarding enquiry reports on applications submitted by the appellant, Bimla Devi, Sunita Devi as per diary register from 29.05.2019 – enquiry reports filed by MC Jaitu employees against the appellant or Sunita Devi – statement of Sunita Devi including an affidavit, statement of MC employees in FIR No.80 dt.30.05.2019 and other information as enumerated in the RTI application from the office of DSP Jaito. The appellant was not provided with the information provided after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the first appellate authority on 24.12.2020 which took no decision on the appeal. The appellant had filed an appeal under Life & Liberty; however, the Hon'ble CIC has ordered to consider the case under the general category.

The case last came up for hearing on 04.10.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. As per the appellant, the PIO had not supplied the information.

The respondent pleaded that since the information sought by the appellant was not specific since it was not clear what the appellant sought. Thereafter after having discussions with the appellant, the sought information was clarified and the respondent was assured to provide the information within 15 days.

**Hearing dated 24.01.2022:**

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

The respondent present pleaded that the appellant has not specified the information.

During the earlier hearing on 04.10.2021, the appellant had clarified the information and the respondent (Sh.Sanjeev Kumar, DSP) had assured to provide the information. The PIO is given one last opportunity to comply with the earlier order of the Commission and provide complete information to the appellant, failure of which, can attract a show-cause notice to the PIO as per provisions of section 20 of the RTI Act.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **31.05.2022** at 11.00 AM through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Faridkot.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 24.01.2022**

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

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,**  
**Sector 16, Chandigarh.**  
**Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - [psic30@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic30@punjabmail.gov.in)**  
**Visit us: - [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)**



Sh Lajpat Rai, S/o Sh Harbans Lal,  
Romana Street, Jaito,  
Tehsil & Distt Faridkot.

... Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o DSP, Jaito,  
Distt Faridkot.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o SSP,  
Faridkot.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 1866 of 2021**

**PRESENT: Sh.Lajpat Rai as the Appellant**  
**Sh.Prem Pal Singh, ASI for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant through an RTI application dated 26.09.2020 has sought information regarding the DSP Staff duty list, mobile number including journey order – Receipt/dispatch register /RTI Register, SDM office, DC Office, Human Right Commission SC Commission, SSP Office etc. from 01.05.2019 to 31.09.2020 - list of enquiries done, pending up to date with complete record No.908/PC/8/19 dt.03.06.2019 and other information as enumerated in the RTI application from the office of DSP Jaito. The appellant was not provided with the information provided after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the first appellate authority on 26.12.2020 which took no decision on the appeal. The appellant had filed an appeal under Life & Liberty, however, the Hon'ble CIC has ordered to consider the case under the general category.

The case last came up for hearing on 04.10.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. As per the appellant, the PIO did not supply the information.

The respondent pleaded that the information sought by the appellant was not specific and it was not clear what the appellant sought. Thereafter after having discussions with the appellant the sought information had been clarified and the respondent had assured to provide the information within 15 days.

Regarding information on point-5, the commission was in agreement with the respondents' contention that providing the entire logbook will not be in the public interest as it contains information regarding ongoing investigations, secret visits, etc. Since this concern was valid, the commission directed the PIO to not provide the entire logbook, however, allow inspection of the logbook and provide only that information that was relevant to the appellant's reasons for asking for records of the logbook.

**Hearing dated 24.01.2022:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Faridkot. The respondent present pleaded that the appellant has not come for inspection of the logbook as well as not specified the information.



**Appeal Case No. 1866 of 2021**

During the earlier hearing on 04.10.2021, the appellant had clarified the information and the respondent (Sh.Sanjeev Kumar, DSP) had assured to provide the information. Hence earlier stands. The PIO is given one last opportunity to comply with the earlier order of the Commission and provide complete information to the appellant, failure of which, can attract a show-cause notice to the PIO as per provisions of section 20 of the RTI Act.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **31.05.2022** at 11.00 AM through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Faridkot.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 24.01.2022**

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