

Sh.Ankit Jain, S/o Sh.Yashpal Jain, # 1006, Morni Wala Khoo, Dera Bassi, Mohali.

... Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer, O/o Chief Administrator, GMADA, Mohali.

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 528 of 2018

Present: Sh.Ankit Jain as Complainant Sh.Gulshan Kumar, PIO GMADA for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on **20.08.2018**. The PIO was also directed to be present personally on the next date of hearing and explain the reasons for not providing the information within the time prescribed under RTI Act. and why the RTI was not attended to."

The case was again heard on **17.09.2018**. The PIO was directed to be present personally on the next date of hearing and explain the reasons for providing mismatching information and also delay in responding to the RTI application. The reply should come on an affidavit.

The case again came up for hearing on **03.10.2018.** The respondent submitted a reply explaining the reasons for delay in responding to the RTI Application. Since the reply was not on an affidavit, the PIO was directed to send affidavit in a proper form. The PIO was further directed to enquire into the matter whether the RTI application was received from the post office and submit the enquiry report to the Commission on the next date of hearing."

The case was further heard on **20.11.2018**. The respondent present pleaded that in compliance with the orders of the Commission, the enquiry has been conducted and the action has been recommended against the erring official (diary clerk) for not passing on the RTI application to the concerned PIO. The respondent further informed that the information has been provided to the complainant. The complainant was not satisfied with the information. The PIO was directed to relook at the RTI application and provide the information to the complainant within 10 days.

The case was last heard on **08.01.2019.** The order is reproduced hereunder:

"The respondent is absent. The Commission has received a letter diary No.24232 dated 3.12.2018 from the PIO stating therein that the information has been sent to the appellant. The appellant stated that he has received only a forwarding letter but without information. The appellant further stated that after the receipt of this letter, he visited the office of the PIO and collected the information regarding point No1 which however, is not certified. The appellant further information regarding point No.2 has not been provided.

The PIO is directed to provide certified copy of the information regarding point No1 and also send the information regarding point No.2 to the appellant within a week otherwise non-compliance of this order will attract action as per RTI Act."

Hearing dated 25.02.2019:

The respondent present pleaded that the information regarding point-1 has been provided to the appellant. The appellant stated that the information is not certified. The PIO is directed to provide certified copy of the information regarding point-1.

Regarding information relating to point-2, the respondent informed that the FIR has been registered with the Police Department and once the FIR is registered, the department has nothing to do with it. The appellant if wants to seek the action taken report on the FIR, the appellant should go to the police department. The plea of the PIO is accepted.

No further course of action is required. The case is **disposed off and closed**.

Sd/-

Chandigarh Dated: 25.02.2019 (Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner



Er Satwant Singh, H No-827, Phase-3B1, Mohali.

Versus

... Complainant

Public Information Officer, O/o Estate Officer, GMADA, Sector-62, Mohali.

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 925 of 2018

Present: None for the Complainant Sh.Gulshan Kumar, PIO- GMADA Mohali for the Respondent

Order:

The case was first heard on **14.11.2018**. The respondent present brought the action taken report. The complainant wqas absent. The respondent was directed to send the action taken report to the complainant through registered post. The PIO was also directed to be present personally on the next date of hearing and explain the reasons for delay in attending to the RTI application as per RTI Act.

The case was last heard on **08.01.2019.** The order is reproduced hereunder:

"The respondent present pleaded that the action taken report has been provided to the complainant. The complainant is not satisfied and stated that the information is not as per the RTI application since the PIO has not taken action on all the legal notices sent by the complainant.

To ask for action on legal notices sent by the complainant is not in the ambit of the RTI Act. The PIO is directed to relook at the RTI application and provide action taken report on all the legal notices of the complainant within 10 days and send compliance report to the Commission."

Hearing dated 25.02.2019:

The respondent present pleaded that the appropriate action as per GMADA rules has been taken and the information has been provided to the complainant. The appellant is absent and vide letter received in the Commission on 11.02.2019 has informed that the PIO has not provided action taken report.

The PIO is directed to file reply to the sequence of the events of providing information after the RTI application was filed by the complainant.

The case is adjourned. Both the parties to be present **on 25.03.2019 at 11.00 AM** for further hearing.

Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner



Sh. Nonihal Singh, Ward No-13, Sodhi Farm, Zirakpur.

Versus

... Complainant

Public Information Officer, O/o Chief Administrator, GMADA, Mohali.

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 949 of 2018

Present: Sh.Arshdeep Singh Sodhi representative of Sh.Nonihal Singh Complainant Sh.Gulshan Kumar, PIO, GMADA for the Respondent

Order:

The case was first heard on **14.11.2018**. The respondent present pleaded that since the information is voluminous, the complainant was asked to specify the information he wants vide letter dated 04.09.2018 but he did not turn up. The appellant was absent to plead his case. The respondent was also directed to bring proof of dispatch of this letter.

The case was last heard on **08.01.2019.** Since both the parties were absent, the case was adjourned.

Hearing dated 25.02.2019:

The respondent pleaded that since the complainant has sought information regarding unauthorized colonies in the jurisdiction of MC Zirakpur and the information pertains to the office of Deputy Director, Local Bodies, Patiala, they have transferred the RTI application to the Dy Director, Local Bodies, Patiala, on 25.10.2018.

The appellant informed that he has not received the information. The PIO-MC-Zirakpur and the PIO-Dy.Director, Local Bodies Patiala are directed to look at the RTI application and provide the information that is under their custody. Should information be voluminous, the respective authority shall allow inspection of the record by fixing mutually convenient date and time and provide the appellant with the relevant information of not more than 50 pages.

To come up on 25.03.2019 at 11.00 AM for further hearing.

Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner

Chandigarh Dated: 25.02.2019

CC to 1. PIO-MC-Zirakpur 2. PIO-Dy.Director, Local Bodies Patiala



Sh.Abhishek Garg, S/o Sh. Rakesh Kumar, # 49/13, Street No-1, Lalheri Road, Gurbachan Colony, Khanna, Distt Ludhiana . Versus

... Appellant

Public Information Officer,

Labour Welfare Commissioner, Pb, Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority, Labour Welfare Commissioner, Pb, Chandigarh.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1717 of 2018

Present: Sh.Abhishek Garg as Appellant Sh.Sunil Kumar Bhoriwal, ALC Ludhiana for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on **30.08.2018.** The respondent Sh.Deepak Kumar from the office of ALC Khanna pleaded that the information has been sent to the appellant on 19.06.2018 relating to their office. The appellant pleaded that he has not received the same. The respondent provided a copy of the same information, which however, was not a certified copy. The respondent was directed to provide.

The respondent Ms.Neelam from Labour Welfare Board, Chandigarh, pleaded that the information is not available with them and the same is available and has to be provided by ALC, Circle-6, Ludhiana.

The respondent Ms.Harpreet Kaur from ALC-Ludhiana-6 informed that the reply has been sent to the appellant on 29.05.2018. The appellant however informed that he has not received the same. The respondent again handed over the information to the appellant at the hearing.

The appellant pleaded that the information has been delayed as it was required by them for claiming labour welfare fund under Factories Act. The delay in information may cause a hindrance in availing the benefits.

The PIO was directed to explain the reasons for delay in providing the information and be present on the next date of hearing.

The case was again heard on **25.09.2018:** The respondent Ms.Harpreet Kaur pleaded that the certified copy of the information that was sent to the appellant on 19.06.2018, was again provided to the appellant at the last hearing. The appellant was absent and vide email informed that he was not provided the certified copy of the information The PIO was directed to send the certified copy of the information through registered post to the appellant within 3 days.

The respondent present from ALC-Ludhiana-6 pleaded that the information was sent to the appellant in time on 29.05.2018. However, the PIO did not explain the reasons for delay in providing the information. The PIO ALC-Ludhiana-6 was given last opportunity to be personally present on the next date of hearing and explain the reasons for delay in providing the information within the prescribed time under the RTI Act. The reply be filed on an affidavit.

Appeal Case No. 1717 of 2018

The case again came up for hearing on **06.11.2018**. The appellant was absent and vide email informed that he has not received the certified copy of the information. The PIO was directed to send certified copy of the information as per directions of the Commission.

The respondent was absent. The PIO was issued **show cause notice for not supplying the information within the statutorily prescribed period of time** and for not complying with the orders of the Commission, and was directed to 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 persons of the show cause and direct them to appear before the Commission along with the written replies.

The case was last heard on **08.01.2019.** The appellant was absent and vide email informed that he has not received the certified copy of the information.

The PIO was also absent and neither sent any reply to the show cause notice. The PIO was afforded one more opportunity to reply to the show cause notice. The PIO was also directed to send certified copy of the information to the appellant as well as bring the same on the next date of hearing.

Hearing dated 25.02.2019

The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant says that the information is not certified. The PIO is directed to resend certified copy of the information by registered post to the appellant.

Regarding reply to the show cause notice, the respondent has submitted an affidavit stating that the appellant had filed RTI application to the Labour Welfare Commissioner, Punjab, Chandigarh which transferred it to ALC Circle-6 Ludhiana on 10.05.2018, and Sh.S.S. Randhawa who was the PIO-cum-ALC at that time further sent the RTI application to Labour Enforcement Officer Samrala on 22.05.2018. The Labour Enforcement Officer Samrala has already sent the information to the appellant on 29.05.2018.

Regarding order of the Commission to appear personally on 06.11.2018, the respondent pleaded that he has only joined as ALC on 01.02.2019 and previously Sh.Swaran Singh was the ALC Circle -6 Ludhiana. The respondent further informed that Sh.Swaran Singh is now posted as Labour Commissioner-cum-Conciliation Officer Fatehgarh Sahib and its office is at Mandi Gobindgarh.

The information stands provided. However, there has been enormous delay in providing the information and since the respondent has joined as ALC-cum-PIO recently and the delay is on the part of the previous PIO, Sh.Swaran Singh, Labour Commissioner-cum-Conciliation Officer (Previously ALC-cum-PIO Circle-6 Ludhiana) is hereby directed to appear personally before the Commission on the next date of hearing and explain the reasons for not providing the information within the statutory prescribed period of time and for not complying with the order of the Commission. He should file an affidavit in this regard.

The case is adjourned. To come up on 30.04.2019 at 11.00 AM for further hearing Sd/-

Chandigarh Dated: 25.02.2019 (Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner

CC to Sh.Swaran Singh, Labour Commissioner-cum-Conciliation Officer, (Previous PIO-cum-ALC Circle 6 Ludhiana) Mandi Gobindgarh, Distt.Fatehgarh Sahib



Sh Sarabjeet Singh Gill, H No-60/35-P/376-1, Street No-8, Maha Singh Nagar, P.O Dhandari Kalan, Ludhiana.

Appellant.

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o CA-Cum-Director, PUDA, Mohali.

First Appellate Authority, O/o CA-Cum-Director, PUDA, Mohali.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 2950 of 2018

Present: None for the Appellant Sh.Gulshan Kumar, PIO for the respondent

Order:

The case was first heard on **13.11.2018.** The respondent present submitted a letter dated 12.11.2018 of the APIO vide which the appellant was asked to contact the the Municipal Committee since the information relates to them. However, the respondent did not transfer the RTI application to the concerned PIO. The respondent was also without any authority letter and has no clue of complete case file.

The PIO was directed to forward the RTI application to the PIO of the concerned Municipal Committee and the PIO concerned was directed to send the information to the appellant before the next date of hearing as per RTI application. The PIO- PUDA was also directed to explain the reasons for not forwarding the RTI application to the concerned PIO within the time prescribed under the RTI Act and be present on the next date of hearing.

The case was last heard on **08.01.2019.** The order is reproduced hereunder:

"The respondent present pleaded that since the information relates to the office of MC Nayagaon, the RTI application has been transferred to them vide letter dated 22.11.2018.

The PIO-MC Nayagaon is absent and has not provided the information. The PIO-MC Nayagaon is directed to provide the information to the appellant as per RTI application forwarded by the PIO-PUDA on 22.11.2018, within 15 days and be present personally on the next date of hearing.

The PIO-PUDA is also directed to explain the reasons for delay in forwarding the RTI application to the concerned PIO within the time prescribed under the RTI Act. The explanation be sent to the Commission within a week by registered post."

Hearing dated 25.02.2019

The respondent present pleaded that since the information relates to MC Nayagaon, the RTI application has been transferred to them.

At the last hearing, the PIO-MC Nayagaon was directed to provide the information and be present on the next date of hearing. The PIO-MC Nayagaon is absent. The appellant is also absent. Since is it is not clear whether the information has been provided or not, the case is adjourned with the directions that the PIO-MC Nayagaon to appear personally before the Commission on the next date of hearing failing which the Commission will be constrained to take action as per the RTI Act.

Regarding delay in transferring the RTI application, the respondent pleaded that since the information relates to MC Nayagaon, the appellant was informed vide letter dated 12.11.2018 to contact the concerned authority. However, inadvertently, the RTI application was not sent to the concerned authority. The RTI application has now been transferred to the concerned PIO-MC Nayagaon.

Since the matter pertains to MC Nayagaon, the PIO-PUDA is exempted and his reply about the delay in transferring the application is accepted.

To come up for further hearing on 02.04.2019 at 11.00 AM.

Sd/-

Chandigarh Dated: 25.02.2019 (Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner



Sh.Gurdip Singh, S/o Sh.Chanan Singh, # 215-Ajit Nagar, Sultarnwind Road, Amritsar.

... Appellant

Public Information Officer,

President, Chief KhalsaDiwan, GT Road, Amritsar.

First Appellate Authority,

President, Chief KhalsaDiwan, GT Road, Amritsar.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No.1362/2018

Present: Sh.Gurdip Singh as Appellant Sh.Manish Prabhakar, advocate on behalf of the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on **20.06.2018**. Sh.Inderjit Sing, Under Secretary was present for the respondent

Sh.Inderjit Singh was directed to submit list of all properties against which the benefit of exemption in stamp duty has been availed and Govt land, if any, allotted on concessional rates to the Society or any other financial aid from the Government. He was also directed to submit copy of constitution under which act the society is registered, name and position of nominee of the State Govt or SGPC, if any, to the Commission before 25.7.2018 and be present on the next date of hearing.

The case was again heard on **01.08.2018**: The respondent was represented through their counsel Sh.Manish Parabhakar.

During the hearing, the appellant submitted certain more documents which he said were further evidences to establish his earlier point. which is that CKDCS is a regular beneficiary of government aid and hence its functioning should be made transparent. The evidences the appellant produced were taken on record.

In the **Interim Order, a**part from the documents asked in the previous hearing on 20.06.2018, the respondent was further directed to submit in writing (i) whether CKDCS has, for any of its institutions, ever been allotted free land, availed grants, grants-in-aid or concessions from the State Govt since independence (15th, August 1947). If so, it was directed to furnish full details of the all lands/plots allotted, and what stands on them as of August of 2018. If buildings have been constructed, what are they being used for?

(ii) The names of all the educational institutions, which are beneficiaries of grants, along with the amount in rupees each institute has received as well as the total percentage of the grant in the budget of these institutions.

(iii) Details of any other grants given by various governments from to time for the functioning of CKDCS.

The case again came up for hearing on **26.09.2018**. The counsel representing the Chief Khalsa Diwan Charitable Society did not bring the documents which were asked in the interim orders dated 20.06.2018 & 01.08.2018 but pleaded that the documents could not be submitted since the appellant has not provided the documents which the appellant has submitted before the Commission as evidences to establish his case that CKDCS is a public authority. The documents were provided to the advocate from the file of the Commission. The respondent was directed to submit the documents as per order dated 20.06.2018 and order dated 01.08.2018.

The case was further heard on **13.11.2018**. The counsel could not produce documents as per previous orders and pleaded that due to sudden demise of the spouse of Sh.Narinder Singh Khurana who is holding office of the main authority, the documents could not be collected.

The CKDCS was granted one last opportunity to bring the record as per the previous orders which still stands.

The case was last heard on **07.01.2019.** The order is reproduced hereunder:

"The counsel representing the CKDCS has submitted an affidavit stating the following therein:

- i) that CKDCS has never been allotted free land or availed grants, grants in aid on regular basis from the State Govt. since independence 15.08.1947;
- ii) that no educational institution owned by CKDCS is beneficiary of grants;
- iii) that no substantial and regular grant has been given by the Govt. of State as well Centre for the functioning of CKDCS

The Commission finds that the affidavit is not in order and as per the order of the Commission. It is ambiguous, misleading and is a play of words and not a concrete submission of the information as desired by the Commission. The Commission directs the CKDCS to file fresh affidavit clarifying the following:

- 1. Details of each and every property against which the benefit of exemption in stamp duty has been availed and Govt land, if any, allotted on concessional rates to the Society or any other financial aid from the Government.
- 2. Whether CKDCS has, for any of its institutions, ever been allotted free land, availed grants, grants-in-aid or concessions from the State Govt since independence (15th, August 1947). If so, to furnish full details of the each and every land/plot allotted, and what stands on them as of August of 2018. If buildings have been constructed, what are they being used for?
- 3. The names of all the educational institutions, which are beneficiaries of grants along with the amount in rupees each institute has received as well as the total percentage of the grant in the budget of these institutions.
- 4. Details of any other grants given by various governments from to time for the functioning of CKDCS."

Also submit copy of constitution under which act the society is registered, name and position of nominee of the State Govt or SGPC, if any, to the Commission."

Hearing dated 25.02.2019

The counsel representing the CKDCS has sought adjournment pleading that the general election of the Chief Khalsa Dewan Cheritable Society was held on 17.02.2019 and the elected members have not yet taken their respective charge.

The case is adjourned. The PIO is directed to comply with the earlier order of the Commission which still stands.

To come up for further hearing on **30.04.2019 at 11.00** AM for further hearing.

Chandigarh Dated: 25.02.2019 Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner



Sh.Gagandeep Garg, Chamber No-113, District Court, Barnala..

Appellant.

Versus

Public Information Officer, DPI (SE), P.S.E.B, Phase-8, Mohali.

First Appellate Authority, DPI (SE), P.S.E.B, Phase-8, Mohali

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1800 of 2018

Present: Sh.Darshan Kumar representative of Sh.Gagandeep Garg for the Appellant Smt.Jyoti Chawla, PIO-DPI(SE) for the respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on **28.08.2018**. Since both the parties were absent. In the interest of justice, the case was adjourned.

The case was again heard on **08.10.2018.** Sh.Yadvinder Singh, JA from the office of DEO Mansa was present. The respondent pleaded that he has been deputed for attending the hearing. He further pleaded that the information relates to the office of DPI(SE) P.S.E.B. Mohali. The Commission observed that the respondent present had nothing to do with the information and wasting the time of the Commission. The PIO –DPI(SE) was directed to be present personally on the next date of hearing and explain the reasons for delay in attending the RTI application in accordance with the RTI Act.

The case again came up for hearing on **20.11.2018.** The appellant informed that no information has been provided to him. The respondent was absent. The Commission directed the PIO to provide the information to the appellant within 15 days. The PIO was also directed to be present personally on the next date of hearing with explanation for delay in attending to the RTI application within the time prescribed under the RTI Act.

The case was last heard on **15.01.2019.** The appellant informed that no information has been provided to him. The PIO was absent on 4th consecutive hearing and did not abide by the order of the Commission. The **PIO DPI(SE)**, **P.S.E.B. Mohali was issued a show cause notice** and was directed appear personally on the next date of hearing and file written reply on an affidavit.

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

Hearing dated 25.02.2019:

The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant has received the information and is satisfied. Regarding delay in providing the information, the respondent pleaded that the delay has happened on the part of PIO-DEO Mansa and they shall be careful in future.

Taking a lenient view, the plea of the respondent is accepted and the case is closed. However, the higher authority is directed to take note of the conduct of the PIO-DEO(SE) Mansa and take appropriate disciplinary action against the erring PIO so that the RTI Act is not floated in future.

No further course of action is required. The case is **disposed off and closed**.

Sd/-

Chandigarh Dated: 25.02.2019 (Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner



Smt Paramjit Kaur, W/o Sh Joginder Singh, R/o Kalyan Vihar, Gill road, Moga.

.....Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,

O/o Estate Officer, GMADA, Sector-62, Mohali.

First Appellate Authority,

O/o Estate Officer, GMADA, Sector-62, Mohali.

...Respondent

Appellant Case No. 3365 of 2018

Present: None for the Appellant Sh.Gulshan Kumar, PIO and Sh.Amarjit Singh,Sr. Assistant for the Respondent

Order: The case was last heard on 07.01.2019. The order is reproduced hereunder:

"The appellant through RTI application dated 12.08.2016 has sought information regarding draw of plot against application no.113740 in ECO city and other information concerning the office of GMADA Mohali. The appellant was not provided the information after which he filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 04.06.2018 which took no decision on the appeal.

The respondent present has informed that the information has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 28.12.2018. The respondent on being asked the reasons for enormous delay in providing the information, stated that they received the RTI application alongwith the notice of the Commission and they do not know why the RTI application was not attended to by the earlier PIOs. The Commission has taken a serious view of this and directs the PIO to provide a detailed report into the delay of handing this RTI and fix accountability of the PIOs previous or the present responsible for delay in attending to this RTI application. The enquiry report be submitted on the next date of hearing."

Hearing dated 25.02.2019:

The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided. The appellant is absent. The appellant vide letter received in the Commission on 12.02.2019 has pointed out minor mistake in the forwarding letter. The PIO is directed to rectify the mistake and resend it.

The PIO has not brought detailed report about the delay in handling the RTI application. The Commission cannot ignore such enormous delay in providing the information. The PIO is given last opportunity to provide detailed enquiry report into the delay in providing the information.

To come up on 25.03.2019 at 11.00 AM for further hearing.

Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner



Sh Prem Kumar Rattan, H o-78/8, Park Road, New Mandi, Dhuri, Dist Sangrur

Appellant.

...Respondent

Public Information Officer, O/o Chairman, PSPCL,

Patiala.

First Appellate Authority, O/o Chairman, PSPCL, Patiala

Appeal Case No. 3385 of 2018

Present: None for the Appellant Sh.Jaswinder Singh, UDC, PSPCL (circle Mohali),for the Respondent

Order: The case was last heard on 07.01.2019. The order is reproduced hereunder:

Versus

"The appellant through RTI application dated 07.07.2018 has sought information regarding service tax deducted on any payments made by all the distribution circles of the PSPCL Punjab from the year 2010 till the date of RTI application and other information concerning the office of Chairman, PSPCL Patiala. The appellant was not provided the information after which he filed first appeal with the First appellate Authority on 10.08.2018 which took no decision on the appeal.

The respondent present has brought the reply whereby it is stated that since the information sought was concerning with the different distribution circles of the PSPCL, the Nodal Officer-cum-Chief Engineer transferred the RTI application vide letter dated 16.08.2018 to the concerned departments to provide the information. The information has already been sent to the appellant directly by the concerned departments. The respondent further informed that during this period, the appellant filed first appeal with the First Appellate Authority which after fixing two dates for hearing i.e. 31.10.2018 & 04.12.2018, where the appellant did not turn up, disposed off the appeal stating that the appellant is absent on both the hearings on 07.07.2018 and presuming that the appellant is satisfied with the information provided by the departments.

The appellant is absent and vide email has sought exemption for personal appearance. The appellant has further informed that the information has not been provided as per the RTI application."

Hearing dated 25.02.2019:

The respondent present reiterated that the information has been sent to the appellant. The appellant is absent and has sought exemption because of his mother's illness. The appellant further informed that he has not received the information. However, having gone through the entire reply of the PIO, the Commission is satisfied that the information has been provided to the best possible extent.

No further course of action is required. The case is **disposed off and closed**.

Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner



Sh Suba Singh, Village Gawalia, P.O Dinanagr, Distt Gurdaspur.

Versus

.... Appellant.

Public Information Officer,

O/o Addl SE, Operational, (Rural Circle), PSPCL, Pathankot.

First Appellate Authority,

O/o SE, PSPCL, Pathankot.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3393 of 2018

Present: Sh.Suba Singh as Appellant None for the Respondent

Order:

The case was last heard on 07.01.2019. The order is reproduced hereunder:

"The appellant through RTI application dated 11.05.2018 has sought information regarding action taken on the applications dated 22.11.2016, 9.12.2016, 09.02.2017, 03.04.2017,08.05.2017 & 10.05.2017 and other information concerning the office of Addl. SE (Operational), Rural Circle, PSPCL,Pathankot. The appellant was not provided the information after which he filed first appeal with the First appellate Authority on 13.06.2018 which took no decision on the appeal.

Since both the parties are absent, in the interest of justice, one more opportunity is granted and the case is adjourned."

Hearing dated 25.02.2019:

The appellant informed that no information has been provided. The respondent is absent without intimation to the Commission.

The PIO is directed to respond to the RTI application and provide the information. The PIO is directed to be present personally or through representative 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 2005.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on 01.04.2019 at 11.00 AM through video conference facility available in the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Gurdaspur. Copies of the order be sent to the parties *through registered post*.

Sd/-(Khushwant Singh) State Information Commissioner