



Sh.Sanjeev Goyal S/o Sh Ashok Kumar,  
# 148, Model Town, Phase-1,  
Near TV Tower, Bathinda.

... Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o DC,  
Bathinda .

...Respondent

**Complainant case No.405 of 2020**

**PRESENT: Sh.Sanjeev Goyal as the Complainant**  
**Smt.Saroj Aggarwal-DRO O/o DC Bathinda for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The complainant through RTI application dated 27.01.2020 has sought information on 12 points regarding joining of Deputy Commissioner at Bathinda along with his visits to Cattle pond Harraipur – the name of employees accompanied with DC while on tour to Harraipur – log books of vehicles deputed for the visit to Har Raipur - cattle that died in cattle pond Har Raipur from 01.04.2019 – record register of cattle died in Har Raipur from 01.01.2018 and other information as enumerated in the RTI application from the office of DC Bathinda. The complainant was not satisfied with the reply of the PIO dated 11.02.2020 after which the complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 03.07.2020.

The case first came up for hearing on **03.02.2021** through video conferencing at DAC Bathinda. The respondent present from the office of BDPO pleaded that the RTI application was transferred to them by the DC office and the information concerning them relating to points 4 to 10 has been provided to the appellant and the appellant has received the same.

The appellant,, however, pleaded that the information on points 1, 2 3, 11 & 12 has not been provided. As per record, the PIO-DC Bathinda had asked the appellant to deposit a requisite fee of Rs.68/- for information relating to point-11 which was not deposited by the appellant.

The case was sent back to the PIO- DC Bathinda to provide the sought information to the appellant on points 1,2,3, & 12. Regarding point 11 , the appellant was directed to deposit the requisite fee of Rs.68/- as demanded by the PIO vide letter dated 11.02.2020 and get the information.

On the date of the hearing on **24.05.2021**, the respondent informed that the information had been provided to the appellant on 05.02.2021 and 19.02.2021.

As per appellant, the information on point-2 & 12 was not provided and the information provided on point-11 was not legible.

Hearing gone through the RTI application and hearing both the parties, the PIO was directed to provide the following information:

- Point-2                      - To provide details of officials, if any accompanied with the Deputy Commissioner during his visit to Har Raipur
- Point-12                    - As per the respondent, the complaints received from the appellant were sent to MC Bathinda since the matter related to them. The PIO is directed to give this in writing to the appellant.
- Point-11                    - PIO to provide legible copies of information.

The rest of the information stands provided.

On the date of last hearing on **22.09.2021**, the respondent informed that the complete information has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 12.08.2021 with a copy to the Commission.

The appellant was not satisfied with the information relating to point-12 and stated that he has asked for action taken on his complaints sent to the Deputy Commissioner Bathinda alongwith notings/correspondence. The appellant also informed that the PIO has not supplied the legible copies of information relating to point-11.

The PIO was given last opportunity to provide whatever action has been taken on the complaints of the appellant alongwith notings/correspondence relating to point-12 and also supply legible copies of the information relating to point-11 within 15 days of the receipt of order otherwise the Commission will be constrained to take action against the PIO under section 20 of the RTI Act.

**Hearing dated 25.01.2022:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Bathinda. The respondent present informed that in compliance with the order of the Commission, the information on point-12 has been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 04.10.2021 (25 pages) and information on point-11 has again been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 08.10.2021 with a copy to the Commission.

Having gone through the RTI application and the reply of the PIO regarding point-12, the Commission finds that point-12 of the RTI application has been sufficiently replied and no further interference of the Commission is required.

The case is **disposed of and closed**.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 25.01.2022**

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



Sh.Sukhwinder Singh, S/o Sh.Shamsher Singh,  
Village Chouke, Tehsil Maur,  
Distt. Bathinda.

Complainant.

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o J.E, Nagar Panchayat, Chouke,  
Tehsil Maur, Distt.Bathinda.

...Respondent

**Complaint Case No. 458 of 2020**

**PRESENT:   None for the appellant**  
**None for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The complainant through RTI application dated 08.01.2020 has sought information regarding order issued for manufacturing bakery products in residential houses in village Koke – instalments released – documents asked for the construction of houses for poor people – work completed from 01.01.2019 to 31.12.2019 and other information as enumerated in the RTI application from the office of JE, Nagar Panchayat, Chauke, Tehsil Maur, Distt.Bathinda. The complainant was not provided with the information after which the complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 21.07.2020.

The case first came up for hearing on **03.02.2021** through video conferencing at DAC Bathinda. Both the parties were absent.

The PIO was directed to provide the information to the complainant within 15 days.

A copy of the order was sent to the DC Bathinda with the direction to ensure that the concerned PIO provides the information to the complainant as per the RTI Act.

On the date of the last hearing on **24.05.2021**, **both** the parties were absent.

The Commission received a copy of a letter from the APIO-O/o DC Bathinda vide which the APIO sent the notice of the Commission to the Joint Deputy Director, Local Govt. Bathinda and BDPO Bathinda with the direction to attend the hearing in the Commission on 24.05.2021 since the Nagar Panchayat Chauke after de-notification, has been converted into Gram Panchayat.

From the above, it was transpired that the information lies in the custody of BDPO-Bathinda or Joint Deputy Director, Local Govt. Bathinda. A copy of the RTI application was sent to PIO-BDPO Bathinda and PIO-Joint Deputy Director, Local Govt. Bathinda and the PIOs are directed to look at the RTI application and provide the information to the complainant.

On the date of hearing on **22.09.2021** none was present on behalf of the BDPO Bathinda and Joint Deputy Director Local Govt.. Bathinda as well as for the complainant.

The commission again received a copy of a letter dated 07.07.2021 from the office of DC Bathinda vide which DC Bathinda directed the Joint Deputy Director, Local Govt Bathinda to attend the hearing in the Commission.

**Complaint Case No. 458 of 2020**

In an another complaint case No.363/2020(Hardyal Singh v/s PIO-EO, Nagar Panchayat, Chouke), Sh.Jagjit Singh, Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat, Chouke appeared on behalf of BDPO Rampura and informed that the Nagar Panchayat Chouke has been denotified in December 2020 and converted into a Gram Panchayat which is under the control of BDPO Rampura and the BDPO-Rampura is the PIO in this case.

Further as per information from the office of Local Govt. Pb Chandigarh, Sh.Bhartvir Singh was the EO-cum-PIO, Nagar Panchayat Chouke at the time of filing of RTI application (05.12.2019) till July 2020 who had been transferred and posted as EO-Nagar Panchayat, Mehraj, District Bathinda.

Sh.Bhartvir Singh, EO-Nagar Panchayat Mehraj(earlier PIO-cum-EO Nagar Panchayat Chouke) was directed to appear before the commission on the next date of hearing and explain the reasons for not attending to the RTI application within the time prescribed under the RTI Act.

Further, since the Nagar Panchayat Chouke had been denotified and converted into a Gram Panchayat which is under the control of BDPO Rampura, the PIO-BDPO Rampura was directed to file a detailed reply and appear personally before the Commission on the next date of hearing.

The complainant was absent.

Since the notices of the commission were refused by the concerned public authority, a copy of the order-cum notice was sent to the ADC(D), Bathinda with the direction to ensure that the order is served to the PIO under whose custody the record exists and the RTI application is attended to as per the RTI Act. as well as to ensure that the information that is available on record is provided to the appellant.

**Hearing dated 25.01.2022:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Bathinda. The respondent is absent and vide letter received in the Commission on 29.11.2021 has informed that the information has been supplied to the complainant and the complainant has acknowledged having received the information. The PIO has also sent an acknowledgement of the appellant which has been taken on the file of the Commission.

The complainant is continuously absent on all hearings nor is represented.

Since the information has been provided, no further course of action is required. The case is **disposed of and closed**.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated 25.01.2022**

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

CC to: 1. Sh.Bharatvir Singh, EO-Nagar Panchayat,  
Mehraj, Distt.Bathinda  
(Earlier EO-cum-PIO, Nagar Panchayat Chouke)

2. BDPO-Maur Road, Rampura, District Bathinda

3. ADC(D), Bathinda.



Sh.Sukhwinder Singh, S/o Sh.Shamsher Singh,  
Village Chouke, Tehsil Maur,  
Distt.Bathinda.

Complainant.

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o J.E,  
Nagar Panchayat, Chouke,  
Tehsil Maur, Distt.Bathinda.

...Respondent

**Complaint Case No. 459 of 2020**

**PRESENT:   None for the appellant**  
**None for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The complainant through RTI application dated 08.01.2020 has sought information regarding tender called from 01.01.2019 to 31.12.2019 - amount deposited in the bank - works undertaken and completed from 01.01.2019 to 31.12.2019 and other information as enumerated in the RTI application from the office of JE, Nagar Panchayat, Chauke, Tehsil Maur, Distt.Bathinda. The complainant was not provided the information after which the complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 21.07.2020.

The case first came up for hearing on **03.02.2021** through video conferencing at DAC Bathinda. Both the parties were absent.

The PIO was directed to provide the information to the complainant within 15 days.

A copy of the order was sent to the DC Bathinda with the direction to ensure that the concerned PIO provides information to the complainant as per the RTI Act.

On the date of the last hearing on **24.05.2021**, both the parties were absent.

The Commission received a copy of the letter from the APIO-O/o DC Bathinda vide which the APIO sent the notice of the Commission to the Joint Deputy Director, Local Govt. Bathinda and BDPO Bathinda with the direction to attend the hearing in the Commission on 24.05.2021 since the Nagar Panchayat Chauke after de-notification, has been converted into Gram Panchayat.

From the above, it was transpired that the information lies in the custody of BDPO-Bathinda or Joint Deputy Director, Local Govt. Bathinda. A copy of the RTI application was sent to PIO-BDPO Bathinda and PIO-Joint Deputy Director, Local Govt. Bathinda and the PIOs were directed to look at the RTI application and provide the information to the complainant.

On the date of last hearing on **22.09.2021**, none was present on behalf of the BDPO Bathinda and Joint Deputy Director Local Govt.. Bathinda as well as for the complainant.

The commission again received a copy of letter dated 07.07.2021 from the office of DC Bathinda vide which DC Bathinda had directed the Joint Deputy Director, Local Govt Bathinda to attend the hearing in the Commission.

**Complaint Case No. 459 of 2020**

In an another complaint case No.363/2020(Hardyal Singh v/s PIO-EO, Nagar Panchayat, Chouke), Sh.Jagjit Singh, Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat, Chouke appeared on behalf of BDPO Rampura and informed that the Nagar Panchayat Chouke has been denotified in December 2020 and converted into a Gram Panchayat which is under the control of BDPO Rampura and the BDPO-Rampura is the PIO in this case.

Further as per information from the office of Local Govt. Pb Chandigarh, Sh.Bhartvir Singh was the EO-cum-PIO, Nagar Panchayat Chouke at the time of filing of RTI application (05.12.2019) till July 2020 who had been transferred and posted as EO-Nagar Panchayat, Mehraj, District Bathinda.

Sh.Bhartvir Singh, EO-Nagar Panchayat Mehraj(earlier PIO-cum-EO Nagar Panchayat Chouke) was directed to appear before the commission on the next date of hearing and explain the reasons for not attending to the RTI application within the time prescribed under the RTI Act.

Further, since the Nagar Panchayat Chouke had been denotified and converted into a Gram Panchayat which is under the control of BDPO Rampura, the PIO-BDPO Rampura was directed to file a detailed reply and appear personally before the Commission on the next date of hearing.

The complainant was absent.

A copy of the order was sent to the ADC(D), Bathinda with the direction to ensure that the order is served to the PIO under whose custody the record exists and the RTI application is attended to as per the RTI Act. as well as to ensure that the information that is available on record is provided to the appellant.

**Hearing dated 25.01.2022:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Bathinda. The respondent is absent and vide letter received in the Commission on 29.11.2021 has informed that the information has been supplied to the complainant and the complainant has acknowledged having received the information. The PIO has also sent an acknowledgement of the appellant which has been taken on the file of the Commission.

The complainant is continuously absent on all hearings nor is represented.

Since the information has been provided, no further course of action is required. The case is **disposed of and closed**.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated 25.01.2022**

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

CC to: 1. Sh.Bharatvir Singh, EO-Nagar Panchayat,  
Mehraj, Distt.Bathinda  
(Earlier EO-cum-PIO, Nagar Panchayat Chouke)

2. BDPO-Rampura, District Bathinda

3. ADC(Rural), Bathinda.



Sh. Gurinder Singh S/o sh. Harnek Singh,  
R/o Bhagta Bhaika, Tehsil Phul,  
Distt Bathinda.

... Appellant

Versus

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

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o IGP, Bathinda Range,  
Bathinda.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 2616 of 2020**

**PRESENT: Sh.Gurinder Singh as the Appellant**  
**Sh.Satnam Singh, DSP-Rampuraphul for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant through the RTI application dated 2.03.2020 has sought information regarding copies of the logbook of vehicle No.PB03A2329 from 01.09.2018 to 02.02.2019 as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of SSP Bathinda. The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 21.07.2020 which disposed of the appeal on 02.09.2020 with the decision that as per the report of SSP Bathinda, the information cannot be provided since the said vehicle is being used by the Police Department for secret duties and for investigation of complicated cases and disclosure of information may hamper the investigation as well as risk to the life of witnesses.

The case was first heard on 01.06.2021. The Commission received a reply of the PIO on 16.02.2021 which was taken on the file of the Commission.

On the date of the last hearing on **22.09.2021**, the respondent reiterated his earlier plea that the information cannot be provided since the said vehicle is being used by the Police Department for secret duties and for investigation of complicated cases and disclosure of information may hamper the investigation as well as risk the life of witnesses.

The appellant pleaded that the information that he has sought cannot hamper any investigation since he has sought the record of some vehicles of Bathinda police which is covered under section 2(f) of the RTI Act. Further, the PIO can apply section 10(1)(a) and provide part of the record after severance of the record containing information which is exempt from disclosure.

The appellant also brought to the notice of the commission whereby he alleged that his crop was forcibly harvested by police officials and this information would help him to get justice.

From the arguments, it was concluded that though the sought information is for personal reasons, it can enable the appellant to prove his above allegation and get whatever justice he is seeking. However, at the same time, this bench is of the view that the appellant only requires that part of the log book which helps him achieve his goal and hence the acquisition of information further than what is required is a waste of time and pointless.

Given the above, the PIO was directed to allow the appellant to inspect the logbook pertaining to the visits of vehicle No.PB03A2329 to the location of his land situated at Dayalpur, Kalyan Sadda & Bhagta Bhai ( from 1.09.2018 to 02.02.2019) and provide the relevant information.

**Hearing dated 25.01.2022:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Bathinda. As per the respondent, the appellant had inspected the record and the available information has been supplied to the appellant vide letter dated 19.10.2021.

The appellant claims that he was produced the record from 01.10.2018 to 02.02.2019 whereas he has asked for information from 01.09.2018 to 02.20.2019.

As per the respondent, the record from 01.09.2018 to 30.09.2018 is missing and a copy of DDR filed for the missing record has been supplied to the appellant.

The Commission, however, does not consider the record missing until an enquiry is conducted and the enquiry report is submitted which establishes that the record is missing and the responsibility has been fixed for the person under whose custody the record went missing. The PIO is directed to conduct an enquiry into the matter and fix the responsibility for the persons under whose custody the record went missing.

Information stands provided.

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

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated :25.01.2022**

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





Sh. Gurinder Singh S/o Sh. Harnek Singh,  
R/o Bhagta Bhaika, Tehsil Phul,  
Distt.Bathinda.

... Appellant

Versus

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

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o IGP, Bathinda Range,  
Bathinda.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 2617 of 2020**

**PRESENT: Sh.Gurinder Singh as the Appellant**  
**Sh.Satnam Singh, DSP-Rampuraphul for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant through RTI application dated 17.02.2020 has sought information regarding case No.144 dated 21.10.2018 – date of SFL testing of empty bullet cartridges recovered during enquiry - RC number, Docket Number and deposit receipt of the cartridge along with final result as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of SSP Bathinda. The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 21.07.2020 which disposed of the appeal on 02.09.2020 with the decision that as per the report of SSP Bathinda, since the SFL report has not yet been received and the case is still under investigation, the information cannot be provided.

The case first came up for hearing on 01.06.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Bathinda. The Commission received a letter from the PIO on 16.02.2021 vide which the PIO informed that since the SFL report relating to case No.144 was not received and the information was not provided. Thereafter the appellant filed the first appeal on 21.07.2020 which was disposed of by the First Appellate Authority on 02.09.2020.

As per the appellant, the PIO had given wrong information since the First Appellate Authority vide letter dated 02.09.2020 stated that the SFL report has not been received whereas vide letter dated 09.10.2020, the PIO had informed that the empty cartridges are yet to be sent to SFL Lab for inspection.

Hearing both the parties, the PIO was directed to provide the following:

1. Date of sending of empty cartridge for testing in the SFL Lab
2. If the case is still under investigation at the time of the hearing, it may be held back

**Appeal Case No. 2617 of 2020**

On the date of the last hearing on **22.09.2021**, the respondent reiterated his earlier plea that since the case is still under investigation, the information cannot be provided.

The Commission also received a letter dated 20.09.2021 from the PIO stating that as per report of Chief Officer, Thana Dayalpura, the case No.144 dated 21.10.2018 is being investigated by a special investigating team and since the investigation is pending, the information cannot be provided.

**Part-1**

The reply of the PIO was not sustainable since an interim order has already been passed to provide-

- (1) date of sending of empty cartridges for testing in the SFL Lab.
- (2) if the case is still under investigation at the time of the hearing, the information may be held back.

The PIO was directed to provide the information within fifteen days on point one.

**Part-2**

The appellant claimed that the PIO had given misleading information since the First Appellate Authority vide letter dated 02.09.2020 stated that the SFL report has not been received whereas vide letter dated 09.10.2020, the PIO had informed that the empty cartridges are yet to be sent to SFL Lab for inspection.

The observation of the appellant was marked to the First appellate authority, Inspector General of Police, Bathinda Range, Bathinda to enquire as to why two replies are at a variance. Accountability be fixed as per rules.

**Hearing dated 25.01.2022:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Bathinda. As per the respondent, in compliance with the order of the Commission, the information has been supplied to the appellant vide letter dated 18.10.2021 with a copy to the Commission through email.

As per the appellant, it has been confirmed from the letter dated 18.10.2021 that the PIO has supplied misleading information and has pleaded for initiating action against the PIO under the RTI Act.

The Commission has also received a letter from the office of IGP Bathinda Range, Bathinda on 24.01.2022 which has been taken on record. In the said letter, it has been mentioned that an enquiry was conducted through SSP Bathinda regarding variance in two different replies filed by the PIO in the Commission and as per the report of the SSP Bathinda, Sh.Malkit Singh, ASI(now retired) has been found responsible for providing misleading information for which departmental enquiry has been marked vide letter dated 28.12.2021 to be conducted by Sh.Sanjeev Singla, DSP-Bathinda(Local).

No further interference of the commission is required in the matter. The case **disposed of and closed.**

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated :25.01.2022**

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

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



Sh. Gurinder Singh S/o sh. Harnek Singh,  
R/o Bhagta Bhaika, Tehsil Phul,  
Distt.Bathinda.

... Appellant

Versus

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

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o IGP, Bathinda Range,  
Bathinda.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 2620 of 2020**

**PRESENT: Sh.Gurinder Singh as the Appellant**  
**Sh.Satnam Singh, DSP-Rampuraphul for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant through the RTI application dated 03.03.2020 has sought information regarding the copy of DDR relating to case Jasbir Singh dated 21.10.2018 PS Diyalpura relating to departure, return etc. and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of SSP Bathinda.. The appellant was not satisfied with the reply of the PIO dated 13.07.2020 whereby the PIO denied the information stating that since the information sought relates to case No.144/2018 which is pending for enquiry, the information cannot be provided. Thereafter the appellant filed the first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 21.07.2020 which disposed of the appeal on 02.09.2020 upholding the PIOs view.

The case first came up for hearing on 01.06.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Bathinda. The respondent informed that the information has been provided to the appellant.

The appellant informed that he has received the information relating to the departure(Ravangi) of Jasbir Singh but information relating to his return (Vapsi) was been provided.

The PIO was directed to provide the remaining information to the appellant within 10 days and send a compliance report to the commission.

On the date of last hearing on **22.09.2021**, the appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information as per the order of the Commission.

The Commission received a reply of the PIO vide letter dated 20.09.2021 stating that the information has been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 06.07.2021 and a copy of same being sent to the commission.

In the letter dated 06.07.2021, the PIO mentioned that as per the report of Chief officer, Thana Dayalpura, the official Sh.Jasbir Singh had come back within the time on 21.10.2018 but no specific time of return was recorded in the Rojnamcha. However, his entry and exit on 21.10.2018 relating to duties in other cases had been mentioned in the Rojnamcha.

The appellant also claimed that in a different letter (No.29/RTI dated 09.02.2020) of the Chief Officer, Thana Dayalpura, Sh.Jasbir Singh No.1701 was not present in the police station on 21.10.2018. The appellant also sent a copy of the letter dated 09.02.2020 which was taken on the file of the Commission.

From the above, there was prima-facie evidence that there are two different pieces of information being provided by the PIO to the appellant.

The PIO was directed to file a reply in the matter on an affidavit that out of the two replies, which one is the correct information. That correct information to be provided on the same affidavit.

**Hearing dated 25.01.2022:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Bathinda. The respondent present informed that in compliance with the order of the Commission, an affidavit has been provided to the appellant with a copy to the Commission through email.

As per the appellant, the affidavit is without a date. The appellant has further informed through email that the PIO has given misleading information since, in the affidavit, the PIO has confirmed that Sh.Jasvir Singh-ASI was present in police station Dayalpura on 21.10.2018 and there was no record of his return whereas as per letter No.29/RTI dated 09.02.2020, Sh.Jasvir Singh was not present on 21.10.2018.

The PIO is directed to provide an affidavit in original to the appellant duly signed by the PIO with date and attestation.

Further, to the observation of the appellant, this order being is marked to the Inspector General of Police, Bathinda Range, Bathinda to conduct an enquiry into the matter for giving false information and fix accountability as per rules and send a copy of the enquiry report to the Commission.

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

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated :25.01.2022**

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

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



Sh. Gurinder Singh S/o sh. Harnek Singh,  
R/o Bhagta Bhaika, Tehsil Phul,  
Distt.Bathinda.

... Appellant

Versus

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

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o IGP, Bathinda Range,  
Bathinda.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 2627 of 2020**

**PRESENT: Sh.Gurinder Singh as the Appellant**  
**Sh.Satnam Singh, DSP-Rampuraphul for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant through RTI application dated 18.01.2020 has sought information regarding case No.144 dated 21.10.2018 – PS Dialpura – a copy of statement recorded under section 161 relating to recovery of the empty bullet as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of SSP Bathinda. The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 21.07.2020 which disposed of the appeal on 02.09.2020 with the decision that as per the report of SSP Bathinda dated 14.08.2020, the enquiry is still pending, the information cannot be provided.

The case first came up for hearing 01.06.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Bathinda. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information.

The Commission received a reply from the PIO on 16.02.2021 which was taken on the file of the Commission. The reply was not justified since the appellant had sought a copy of the statement recorded under section 161 relating to the recovery of an empty bullet cartridge.

The respondent was willing to provide the information and assured to provide the said document within 15 days. The PIO was directed to provide information to the appellant within 15 days and send a compliance report to the Commission.

On the date of the last hearing on **22.09.2021**, the respondent reiterated his earlier plea that since the case is still under investigation, the information cannot be provided.

The Commission also received a letter dated 20.09.2021 from the PIO stating that as per the report of Chief Officer, Thana Dayalpura, the case No.144 dated 21.10.2018 is being investigated by a special investigating team and since the investigation is pending, the information cannot be provided.

**Appeal Case No. 2627 of 2020**

The reply of the PIO was not sustainable since the order has already been passed to provide the information and the respondent at the last hearing had assured to provide the document.

The PIO was given one last opportunity to comply with the earlier order of the commission which still stands and provide information to the appellant within 15 days with a copy to the Commission, otherwise the Commission will be constrained to initiate action against the PIO under section 20 of the RTI Act.

**Hearing dated 25.01.2022:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Bathinda. As per the respondent, the information has been provided.

The appellant has received the information and is satisfied.

Since the information has been provided, no further course of action is required. The case is **disposed of and closed**.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated :25.01.2022**

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

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



Sh Jasbir Singh,  
Guru Nanak Nagar, Village Bholapur,  
Jhabewal, P.O Ramgarh, Distt Ludhiana.

... Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o Civil Surgeon,  
Fatehgarh Sahib.

...Respondent

**Complaint Case No. 903 of 2021**

**PRESENT:   None for the Appellant**  
**None for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant through RTI application dated 10.05.2021 has sought information regarding purchase of Corona related items like sanitizer, soap, handwash, medicines etc. and its distribution from Jan and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of Civil Surgeon, Fatehgarh Sahib. The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 21.07.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

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

The appellant vide email has informed that he has received the information and is satisfied.

Since the information has been provided, no further course of action is required. The case is **disposed of and closed**.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated 25.01.2022**

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