### Sh. Yogesh Mahajan, (9814354649)

S/o Late Sh. Kuldip Raj Mahajan, (President of Anti Corruption Council, Opp. Water Tank, Municipal Market, Mission Road, Pathankot. Versus

## Public Information Officer

O/o XEN, Construction Division No 1, PWD B&R, Jalandhar.

### First Appellate Authority

O/o Superintending Engineer, PWD B&R, Construction Circle No 1, Jalandhar Cantt.

# Appeal Case No.1645 of 2021

#### (Cisco Webex Proceedings)

| : | 06-01-2021 |
|---|------------|
| : | 12-01-2021 |
| : | 08-01-2021 |
| : | 23-02-2021 |
|   | :          |

Present: Appellant: Sh. Yogesh Mahajan

Respondent: Sh. Navdeep Bansal (SDE) (On telephone Call) (8054030030)

### ORDER:

- 1. The Appellant/Complainant filed above mentioned appeal/complaint cases in the Commission dated 31.03.2021. Accordingly, the cases are fixed for today.
- 2. Appellant: Sh. Yogesh Mahajan has acknowledged that the sought information has been provided to him and is satisfied with the same.
- **3.** As the information stands supplied therefore, no cause of action is required in this case. Hence, the instant appeal case is **disposed & closed**.

Chandigarh Dated: 24.08.2021 Sd/-(Maninder Singh Patti) State Information Commissioner, Pb.



.....Appellant/Complainant

.....Respondent



#### Smt. Parminder Kaur, (7355225555)

W/o Sh. Mandeep Singh, Village Saipli, P.O Panmour, Tehsil Bassi Pathana, Distt Fatehgarh Sahib.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

.....Respondent

**Public Information Officer** O/o Senior Superintendent of Police, Fatehgarh Sahib.

#### Complaint Case No.353 of 2021 (Cisco Webex Proceedings)

| RTI | applicati  | on filed | on | : | 08-02-2021 |
|-----|------------|----------|----|---|------------|
| PIO | replied of | n        |    | : | -          |

Present: Complainant: Absent Respondent: ASI Ranjit Singh (8360834611)

## ORDER:

- 1. The Appellant/Complainant filed above mentioned appeal/complaint cases in the Commission dated 19.03.2021. Accordingly, the cases are fixed for today.
- 2. Respondent, ASI Ranjit Singh the sought information has been furnished to the appellant to his best extent and no any other information pertaining to this RTI can be provided.
- 3. The complainant has approached the Commission under the provision of Section 18 of the RTI Act, 2005; no directions for providing further information can be given by the Commission.

In complaint case under Section 18 of the RTI Act , 2005, the Commissioners have no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for an access to the information which is as under:- (31. We uphold the said contention and do not find any error in the impugned judgment of the High Court whereby it has been held that the Commissioner while entertaining a complaint under Section 18 of the said Act has no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for access to the information).

- 3. Since there is an alternative and efficacious remedy of first appeal available to the Complainant under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, which has not been availed in the instant case and the First Appellate Authority has not had the occasion to review the decision of the PIO, as envisaged under the RTI Act by passing a detailed well reasoned speaking order.
- 4. If, however, the complainant does not feel satisfied with the decision of the First Appellate Authority, he will be at liberty to file a Second Appeal before the Commission under Section 19(3) of the RTI Act, 2005.
- 5. In view of the observations noted above, the instant case is remanded to the concerned First Appellate Authority along with a copy of RTI application for their ready reference. The appeal is disposed of accordingly, with the above observations.

Chandigarh Dated: 24.08.2021 Sd/-(Maninder Singh Patti) State Information Commissioner, Pb.



#### Smt. Parminder Kaur, (7355225555)

W/o Sh. Mandeep Singh, Village Saipli, P.O Panmour, Tehsil Bassi Pathana, Distt Fatehgarh Sahib. Versus

.....Appellant/Complainant

.....Respondent

**Public Information Officer** O/o Senior Superintendent of Police, Fatehgarh Sahib.

## Complaint Case No.354 of 2021

|     | (Cisco Webex Proceedings) |       |    |  |   |            |
|-----|---------------------------|-------|----|--|---|------------|
| RTI | application               | filed | on |  | : | 08-02-2021 |
| PIO | replied on                |       |    |  | : | _          |

Present: Complainant: Absent Respondent: ASI Ranjit Singh (8360834611)

### ORDER:

- 1. The Appellant/Complainant filed above mentioned appeal/complaint cases in the Commission dated 19.03.2021. Accordingly, the cases are fixed for today.
- 2. Respondent, ASI Ranjit Singh the sought information has been furnished to the appellant to his best extent and no any other information pertaining to this RTI can be provided.
- 3. The complainant has approached the Commission under the provision of Section 18 of the RTI Act, 2005; no directions for providing further information can be given by the Commission.

In complaint case under Section 18 of the RTI Act , 2005, the Commissioners have no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for an access to the information which is as under:- (31. We uphold the said contention and do not find any error in the impugned judgment of the High Court whereby it has been held that the Commissioner while entertaining a complaint under Section 18 of the said Act has no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for access to the information).

- 4. Since there is an alternative and efficacious remedy of first appeal available to the Complainant under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, which has not been availed in the instant case and the First Appellate Authority has not had the occasion to review the decision of the PIO, as envisaged under the RTI Act by passing a detailed well reasoned speaking order.
- **5.** If, however, the complainant does not feel satisfied with the decision of the First Appellate Authority, he will be at liberty to file a Second Appeal before the Commission under Section 19(3) of the RTI Act, 2005.
- **6.** In view of the observations noted above, the instant case is remanded to the concerned First Appellate Authority along with a copy of RTI application for their ready reference. The appeal is disposed of accordingly, with the above observations.

Chandigarh Dated: 24.08.2021 Sd/-(Maninder Singh Patti) State Information Commissioner, Pb.



#### Smt. Parminder Kaur, (7355225555)

W/o Sh. Mandeep Singh, Village Saipli, P.O Panmour, Tehsil Bassi Pathana, Distt Fatehgarh Sahib.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

.....Respondent

**Public Information Officer** O/o Senior Superintendent of Police, Fatehgarh Sahib.

#### Complaint Case No.355 of 2021 (Cisco Webex Proceedings)

| RTI | applicat | tion | filed | on | : | 08-02-2021 |
|-----|----------|------|-------|----|---|------------|
| PIO | replied  | on   |       |    | : | -          |

Present: Complainant: Absent Respondent: ASI Ranjit Singh (8360834611)

## ORDER:

- 1. The Appellant/Complainant filed above mentioned appeal/complaint cases in the Commission dated 19.03.2021. Accordingly, the cases are fixed for today.
- 2. Respondent, ASI Ranjit Singh the sought information has been furnished to the appellant to his best extent and no any other information pertaining to this RTI can be provided.
- 3. The complainant has approached the Commission under the provision of Section 18 of the RTI Act, 2005; no directions for providing further information can be given by the Commission.

In complaint case under Section 18 of the RTI Act , 2005, the Commissioners have no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for an access to the information which is as under:- (31. We uphold the said contention and do not find any error in the impugned judgment of the High Court whereby it has been held that the Commissioner while entertaining a complaint under Section 18 of the said Act has no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for access to the information).

- 4. Since there is an alternative and efficacious remedy of first appeal available to the Complainant under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, which has not been availed in the instant case and the First Appellate Authority has not had the occasion to review the decision of the PIO, as envisaged under the RTI Act by passing a detailed well reasoned speaking order.
- **5.** If, however, the complainant does not feel satisfied with the decision of the First Appellate Authority, he will be at liberty to file a Second Appeal before the Commission under Section 19(3) of the RTI Act, 2005.
- **6.** In view of the observations noted above, the instant case is remanded to the concerned First Appellate Authority along with a copy of RTI application for their ready reference. The appeal is disposed of accordingly, with the above observations.

Chandigarh Dated: 24.08.2021 Sd/-(Maninder Singh Patti) State Information Commissioner, Pb.