**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**Red Cross Building (Next to Rose Garden)**

**Sector-16, Chandigarh**

**Contact No. 0172-2864115, Fax No. 0172-2864125**

**Visit us @** [**www.infocommpunjab.com**](http://www.infocommpunjab.com), **Email-ID** [**psic25@punjabmail.gov.in**](mailto:psic25@punjabmail.gov.in)

**Sh. Varinder Kumar**

S/o Sh. Satpal,

R/o Bhaipura, Tehsil Phul

District Bathinda Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**

O/o SDO, Water Supply & Sanitation,

Bhagata Bhai, Bathinda Respondent

**COMPLAINT CASE NO. 1191 of 2017**

**Date of Institution: 30.10.2017**

**Date of Decision: 25.04.2018**

**Present:** Nobody present.

**ORDER**

1. Both the parties are absent without any intimation to the Commission for today’s hearing.
2. After examining the case file, I found that requisite information has already been supplied to the complainant dated 19.12.2017. Complainant, Sh. Varinder Kumar was also absent on the previous hearings held on 17.01.2018 and 15.03.2018. On hearing held on 15.03.2018, last opportunity was given to the complainant to represent this case in person or through any of his representative(s) on the next date of hearing i.e. today but the complainant failed to do so. It is presumed that either complainant is satisfied with the supplied information or complainant has lost his interest in this case.
3. In wake of above, no further cause of action is required. Therefore, the instant complaint case is **disposed of & closed.**
4. Announced in the Court, copy of the order to be sent to the parties.

**Chandigarh (Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)**

**Dated: 25.04.2018(11:00 AM) State Information Commissioner**
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**Sh. Manoj Kumar**

**(Regd. Post)** C/o Sh. Pankaj Garg

#844, Phase No. 7, Sector-61,

Mohali. (9888004488) Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**

O/o Registrar Societies and Firms Punjab,

Building 17 Bays, 3rd floor, Room No. 12,

Sector-17, Chandigarh Respondent

**Complaint Case No. 1065 of 2017**

**Present:** Nobody on behalf of the complainant.

For the respondent: Sh. Satnam Singh (SA).

**ORDER**

1. Respondent, Sh. Satnam Singh states that he has brought the requisite information to hand it over to the complainant.
2. Neither the complainant, Sh. Manoj Kumar is present for today’s hearing nor did he file any written reply in this regard.
3. After hearing the respondent and examining the case file, I found that brought information is unattested and last opportunity is given to the respondent PIO is directed to send the attested copy of the requisite information to the complainant by the next date of hearing. It is also observed that on the first hearing held on 05.12.2017, Sh. Satnam Singh (SA) was appeared on behalf of the respondent assured that requisite information will be provided to the complainant. On the next hearing held on 13.02.2018, respondent PIO was absent without any intimation to the Commission and respondent PIO was directed to provide the requisite information along with directions to represent this case in appear or through any of his representative(s) and complainant was also advised to point out the deficiencies in written after receiving the requisite information. On hearing held on 15.03.2018, Sh. Satnam Singh was appeared on behalf of the respondent requested for an adjournment in this case. Last opportunity was given to the respondent PIO to supply the requisite information to the complainant before the next date of hearing, failing to which action under Section 20(1) will be initiated against him. He was also directed to appear in person on the next date of hearing i.e. today but the respondent PIO failed to do so.
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1. I am of the view that after giving several opportunities, respondent PIO failed to compliance with the orders of the Commission and due to evasive attitude of the respondent PIO concerned, the complainant has suffered a lot of detriments for not getting the requisite information, I am of the view that compensation be awarded to the complainant, Sh. Manoj Kumar.
2. Hence, I award a compensation of Rs. 2,000/- (Two Thousand) to the complainant. The compensation amount must be paid by the respondent PIO concerned through cheque or demand draft in favour of Manoj Kumar from the account of Public Authority and not from the individual’s account.
3. Respondent PIO is directed to produce a copy of the cheque or demand draft on the next date of hearing.
4. Another opportunity is given to the complainant, Sh. Manoj Kumar to represent this case in person or through any of his representative(s) on the next date of hearing positively. A copy of this order be sent to him through **registered post** for his ready reference.
5. The matter is adjourned for further hearing on **23.05.2018 at 11.00 AM**.
6. Announced in the Court, copy of the order to be sent to the parties.

**Chandigarh (Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)**

**Dated: 25.04.2018(11:00 AM) State Information Commissioner**

2/2

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**Red Cross Building (Next to Rose Garden)**

**Sector-16, Chandigarh**

**Contact No. 0172-2864115, Fax No. 0172-2864125**

**Visit us @** [**www.infocommpunjab.com**](http://www.infocommpunjab.com), **Email-ID** [**psic25@punjabmail.gov.in**](mailto:psic25@punjabmail.gov.in)

**Sh. Yogesh Aggarwal**

Senior Citizen & RTI Activists.

Gali Vaid Tirath Ram, Opp. Civil

Hospital Moga -142001 (94175-33921) Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**

O/o Secretary, District BAR Association,

Moga 142001.

**First Appellate Authority**

O/o President, District BAR Association,

Moga 142001. Respondent

**APPEAL CASE NO. 2055 of 2017**

**Present:** Sh. Yogesh Aggarwal, the applicant in person.

For the respondent: Advocate, Gurmanpreet Singh.

**ORDER**

1. Applicant, Sh. Yogesh Aggarwal states that no reply has been received from the respondent PIO till date. He submits a written reply in connection with Appeal Case No. 2055 of 2017 and Appeal Case No. 2121 of 2017 dated 25.04.2018, which is taken on record.
2. On this, respondent, Advocate, Gurmanpreet Singh states that New President took charge of the District Bar Association on 11.04.2018 and election petition has been filed by one advocate. He submits a written reply dated 24.04.2018 signed by Sh. Rajpal Sharma, President, District Bar Association, Moga in connection with appeal case no. 2055 of 2017 and appeal case no. 2121 of 2017, which is taken on record.
3. After hearing both the parties and examining the case file, I found that on the hearing held on 14.11.2017, respondent, Sh. Sukhwinder Singh (DBA, Moga) intimated the Commission through telephonic message that requisite information is ready with him nut he is unable to attend hearing and requested for an adjournment. On the request of the respondent, another opportunity was given to the respondent PIO to supply the requisite information to the applicant by registered post by the next date of hearing and matter was adjourned for further hearing on 13.12.2017.
4. On hearing held on 13.12.2017, respondent PIO was absent, Last opportunity was given to the respondent PIO to supply the requisite information to the applicant and applicant was directed to point out deficiencies in written to the respondent PIO and also to
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the Commission once he received the requisite information from the respondent PIO and matter is adjourned for further hearing on 23.01.2018. Applicant, Sh. Yogesh Agagrwal appeared after the hearing was over and read out the above said order.

1. On hearing held on 23.01.2018, applicant, Sh. Yogesh Aggarwal stated that no information has been supplied to him by the respondent till date. Respondent PIO was absent without any intimation to the Commission. **Show Cause** notice was issued to the concerned respondent PIO along with an opportunity of personal hearing. A copy of order dated 23.01.2018 was sent to President, District Bar Association, Moga through **registered post** to look into the matter and matter was adjourned for further hearing in this case.
2. On next hearing held on 15.03.2018, Advocate, Gurmanpreet Singh was appeared on behalf of the respondent, submits a written reply dated 15.03.2018 in connection with Appeal Case No. 2055 of 2017 and Appeal Case no. 2121 of 2017 signed by Sh. Devinder Singh Sandhu, President, District Bar Association, Moga and Sh. Arun Sood, Vice President, District Bar Association, Moga stating that District Bar Association Moga is neither established, constituted, owned, controlled or substantially financed by funds provided directly or indirectly by the Central Government or by the State Government nor is a body or institution of self Government constituted by any law made by Parliament or by State Legislature or by the notification issued or order made by the Government. It was taken on record. Respondent PIO was directed to send the reply as submitted to the Commission through registered post to the applicant before the next date of hearing. Applicant, Sh. Yogesh Aggarwal Yogesh Aggarwal was not present and intimated the undersigned bench through telephonic message that he will be late for hearing. Applicant, Sh. Yogesh Aggarwal was directed to go through the reply, once he has received the reply from the respondent. He was also advised to reach in time on the next date of hearing to clear the facts positively, failing to which case will be decided in his absence. Matter was adjourned for further hearing on 25.04.2018 i.e. today.
3. I am of the view that after giving several opportunities, respondent PIO failed to compliance with the orders of the Commission and due to evasive attitude of the respondent PIO concerned, the complainant has suffered a lot of detriments for not getting the requisite information, I am of the view that compensation be awarded to the applicant, Sh.Yogesh Aggarwal.
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1. Hence, I award a compensation of Rs. 3,000/- (Three Thousand) to the applicant. The compensation amount must be paid by the respondent PIO concerned through cheque or demand draft in favour of Yogesh Aggarwal from the account of Public Authority and not from the individual’s account.
2. Respondent PIO is directed to produce a copy of the cheque or demand draft on the next date of hearing. Last opportunity is given to the respondent PIO to supply the requisite information to the applicant as per queries raised by him in RTI application by the next date of hearing positively, failing to which action will be initiated against the concerned respondent PIO.
3. The matter is adjourned for further hearing on **23.05.2018 at 11.00 AM**.
4. Announced in the Court, copy of the order to be sent to the parties.

**Chandigarh (Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)**

**Dated: 25.04.2018(11:00 AM) State Information Commissioner**
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**Sh. Yogesh Aggarwal**

Senior Citizen & RTI Activists.

Gali Vaid Tirath Ram, Opp. Civil

Hospital Moga -142001 (94175-33921) Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**

O/o Secretary, District BAR Association,

Moga 142001

**First Appellate Authority**

O/o President, District BAR Association,

Moga 142001 Respondent

**Appeal case No. 2121 of 2017**

**Present:** Sh. Yogesh Aggarwal, the applicant in person.

For the respondent: Advocate, Gurmanpreet Singh.

**ORDER**

1. Applicant, Sh. Yogesh Aggarwal states that no reply has been received from the respondent PIO till date. He submits a written reply in connection with Appeal Case No. 2055 of 2017 and Appeal Case No. 2121 of 2017 dated 25.04.2018, which is taken on record.
2. On this, respondent, Advocate, Gurmanpreet Singh states that New President took charge of the District Bar Association on 11.04.2018 and election petition has been filed by one advocate. He submits a written reply dated 24.04.2018 signed by Sh. Rajpal Sharma, President, District Bar Association, Moga in connection with appeal case no. 2055 of 2017 and appeal case no. 2121 of 2017, which is taken on record.
3. After hearing both the parties and examining the case file, I found that on the hearing held on 14.11.2017, respondent, Sh. Sukhwinder Singh (DBA, Moga) intimated the Commission through telephonic message that requisite information is ready with him nut he is unable to attend hearing and requested for an adjournment. On the request of the respondent, another opportunity was given to the respondent PIO to supply the requisite information to the applicant by registered post by the next date of hearing and matter was adjourned for further hearing on 13.12.2017.
4. On hearing held on 13.12.2017, respondent PIO was absent, Last opportunity was given to the respondent PIO to supply the requisite information to the applicant and applicant was directed to point out deficiencies in written to the respondent PIO and also to
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the Commission once he received the requisite information from the respondent PIO and matter is adjourned for further hearing on 23.01.2018. Applicant, Sh. Yogesh Agagrwal appeared after the hearing was over and read out the above said order.

1. On hearing held on 23.01.2018, applicant, Sh. Yogesh Aggarwal stated that no information has been supplied to him by the respondent till date. Respondent PIO was absent without any intimation to the Commission. **Show Cause** notice was issued to the concerned respondent PIO along with an opportunity of personal hearing. A copy of order dated 23.01.2018 was sent to President, District Bar Association, Moga through **registered post** to look into the matter and matter was adjourned for further hearing in this case.
2. On next hearing held on 15.03.2018, Advocate, Gurmanpreet Singh was appeared on behalf of the respondent, submits a written reply dated 15.03.2018 in connection with Appeal Case No. 2055 of 2017 and Appeal Case no. 2121 of 2017 signed by Sh. Devinder Singh Sandhu, President, District Bar Association, Moga and Sh. Arun Sood, Vice President, District Bar Association, Moga stating that District Bar Association Moga is neither established, constituted, owned, controlled or substantially financed by funds provided directly or indirectly by the Central Government or by the State Government nor is a body or institution of self Government constituted by any law made by Parliament or by State Legislature or by the notification issued or order made by the Government. It was taken on record. Respondent PIO was directed to send the reply as submitted to the Commission through registered post to the applicant before the next date of hearing. Applicant, Sh. Yogesh Aggarwal Yogesh Aggarwal was not present and intimated the undersigned bench through telephonic message that he will be late for hearing. Applicant, Sh. Yogesh Aggarwal was directed to go through the reply, once he has received the reply from the respondent. He was also advised to reach in time on the next date of hearing to clear the facts positively, failing to which case will be decided in his absence. Matter was adjourned for further hearing on 25.04.2018 i.e. today. Applicant, Sh. Yogesh Agagrwal appeared after the hearing was over and read out the above said order.
3. I am of the view that after giving several opportunities, respondent PIO failed to compliance with the orders of the Commission and due to evasive attitude of the respondent PIO concerned, the complainant has suffered a lot of detriments for not getting the requisite
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information, I am of the view that compensation be awarded to the applicant, Sh.Yogesh Aggarwal.

1. Hence, I award a compensation of Rs. 2,000/- (Two Thousand) to the applicant. The compensation amount must be paid by the respondent PIO concerned through cheque or demand draft in favour of Yogesh Aggarwal from the account of Public Authority and not from the individual’s account.
2. Respondent PIO is directed to produce a copy of the cheque or demand draft on the next date of hearing. Last opportunity is given to the respondent PIO to supply the requisite information to the applicant as per queries raised by him in RTI application by the next date of hearing positively, failing to which action will be initiated against the concerned respondent PIO.
3. The matter is adjourned for further hearing on **23.05.2018 at 11.00 AM**.
4. Announced in the Court, copy of the order to be sent to the parties.

**Chandigarh (Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)**

**Dated: 25.04.2018(11:00 AM) State Information Commissioner**
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**Sh. Dilbagh Singh, S/o Sh. Mohinder Singh**

**(Regd. Post)** VPO – Palheri, Tehsil Kharar

District Mohali – (81969-38337). Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer/APIO**

O/o Divisional Engineer, Lining Division No. 8,

Punjab Water Resource Management and

Development Corp. Ltd, Bathinda.

**First Appellate Authority**

O/o Divisional Engineer, Linning Division No. 8,

Punjab Water Resource Management and

Development Corp. Ltd, Bathinda.

**Public Information Officer/APIO**

O/o Civil Surgeon,

Bathinda. Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 2536 of 2017**

**Date of Institution: 13.09.2017**

**Date of Decision: 25.04.2018**

**Present:** Nobody on behalf of the applicant.

For the respondent: Sh. Inder Singh (SDE) along with Sh. Tirath Batra (Steno).

**ORDER**

1. Respondent, Sh. Inder Singh states that he has brought the affidavit as per the last order of the Commission to hand it over to the applicant. He submits a copy of an affidavit dated 23.04.2018, which is taken on record.
2. Neither the applicant, Sh. Dilbagh Singh is present for today’s hearing nor did he file any written reply in this regard.
3. After hearing the respondent and examining the case file, I found on the last hearing held on 15.03.2018, on the request of the respondent, through telephonic message that he is unable to attend hearing and requested for an adjournment, another opportunity was given to the respondent PIO to appear in person on the next date of hearing along with directions to file an affidavit stating that requisite information (regarding bills etc.) is not available in the official record along with reason why requisite information is not available and matter was adjourned for further hearing on 25.04.2018 i.e. today.
4. Respondent PIO is directed to send the affidavit in original to the applicant, Sh. Dilbagh Singh and to send copy of postal receipt to the Commission.

1/2

**Appeal Case No. 2536 of 2017**

**Date of Institution: 13.09.2017**

**Date of Decision: 25.04.2018**

1. Respondent, Sh. Inder Singh assures that he will supply the original affidavit to the applicant as per the order of the Commission.
2. On the assurance of the respondent, no further cause of action is required in this case. Hence, the instant appeal case is **disposed of & closed.**
3. Announced in the Court, copy of the order to be sent to the parties.

**Chandigarh (Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)**

**Dated: 25.04.2018(11:00 AM) State Information Commissioner**
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**Sh. Prem Singh (94782-86495)**

S/o Sh. Bant Singh

R/o Village Nandgarh, Tehsil Rajpura

District Patiala Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**

O/o SDO, Water Supply & Sanitation,

Sub Division, Rajpura

**First Appellate Authority**

O/o XEN, Water Supply & Sanitation,

Sub Division, Rajpura Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 2847 of 2017**

**Present:** Advocate, Mukesh Singla on behalf of the applicant.

For the respondent: Sh. Adarsh (SDO), Sh. Jaspal Singh (Sarpanch) and Advocate, C.L. Premy.

**ORDER**

1. Advocate, C.L. Premy handed over the pending information to the applicant during the hearing.
2. After going through the supplied information, representative of the applicant, Sh. Mukesh Singla states he is satisfied with the information in connection with point no. 5. He further added that information in connection with point no. 2, 3 and 6 is still pending from the respondent PIO.
3. After querying from the respondent regarding the compensation which was awarded to the applicant, Sh. Prem Singh vide order dated 15.03.2018, respondent, Sh. Adarsh He orally states that compensation may be charged from Chairman, Water Supply & Sanitation Committee Nandgarh (GPWSC) not from the SDE, W/S & Sanitation, Sub Division, Rajpura. He submits a written reply letter no. 451 dated 05.04.2018 signed by SDE, W/S and Sanitation, Sub Division Rajpura, which is taken on record.
4. After hearing both the parties and examining the case file, last opportunity is given to the respondent PIO to supply the pending information relates with point no. 2,3 and 6 along with directions to compliance with the order of the Commission dated 15.03.2018 and compensation will be paid by Sarpanch from the Public Account not from an individual account, failing to which action will be initiated against him.
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1. The matter is adjourned for further hearing on **23.05.2018 at 11.00 AM**.
2. Announced in the Court, copy of the order to be sent to the parties.

**Chandigarh (Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)**

**Dated: 25.04.2018(11:00 AM) State Information Commissioner**
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**Sh. Jang Bahadur S/o Sh. Jai Chand,**

R/o Mandi Ameenganj, Roranwali,

Tehsil and District Fazilka (98768-18803) Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**

O/o SE, W/S and Sanitation Division,

Ferozepur.

**Public Information Officer**

O/o Secretary, Department of W/S

And Sanitation Punjab, Mini Secretariat,

Sector 9, Chandigarh.

**First Appellate Authority**

O/o CE (Central),

Punjab W/S and Sanitation Department,

Patiala. Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 2972 of 2017**

**Present:** Nobody on the behalf of the applicant.

For the respondent: Sh. Bhupinder Kumar (Technician Grade I)

**ORDER**

1. Respondent, Sh. Bhupinder Singh states that respondent PIO is unable to attend today’s hearing and requested for an adjournment in this case.
2. Applicant, Sh. Jung Bahadur is not present for today’s hearing but a letter has been received from the applicant in the Commission vide diary no. 8118 dated 19.04.2018 stating that requisite information has not been supplied by the respondent PIO along with a copy of letter no. 730 dated 8.12.2017, which are taken on record.
3. After hearing the respondent and examining the case file, I found on the hearing held on 12.12.2017, Sh. Sukhminder Singh was appeared on behalf of the respondent stated that he has brought the requisite information to hand it over to the applicant. Applicant, Sh. Jang Bahadur was not present but an a letter was received from the applicant in the Commission vide diary no. 28034 dated 08.12.2017 stating that he had demanded the requisite information from the PIO, O/o Secretary, Department of Water Supply & Sanitation, Punjab and RTI application was transferred to the Chief Engineer (Central) Punjab, Patiala and further transferred RTI application to Superintending Engineer, Water Supply and Sanitation, Circle Ferozepur but no response from the respondent till date. In that letter he also mentioned that he is unable to attend today’s hearing and demanded the
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requisite information. It was taken on record. Respondent PIO was directed to send the requisite information to the applicant through registered post. Matter was adjourned for further hearing on 23.01.2018 at 11.30 am with the advice to the applicant to represent this case in person or through any of his representative(s) on the next date of hearing positively. He was also advised to point out the deficiency, if any, in written to the respondent PIO within one week along with a copy to the Commission after receiving the requisite information. Copies of this order were sent to the parties through registered post.

1. On the next hearing held on 23.01.2018, respondent, Sh. Sukhminder Singh stated that requisite information has already been supplied to the applicant in appeal case no. 2363 of 2017 which was decided by the present bench (PKS) dated 12.12.2017.

He submitted a written reply letter no. 372 dated 22.01.2018 signed by XEN, W/S and Sanitation Circle, Fazilka in connection with the present case (Appeal Case No. 2972 of 2017) along with supporting documents, which were taken on record.

He also submitted a copy of written reply letter no. 12123 dated 06.11.2017 signed by XEN, W/S and Sanitation Circle, Fazilka in connection with the Appeal Case No. 2363 of 2017 along with supporting documents, which were also taken on record.

Applicant, Sh. Jang Bahadur was not present for today’s hearing but an email was received from the applicant in the Commission dated 20.01.2018 stating that requisite information is still pending from the respondent, which was taken on record.

After hearing the respondent and examining the case file, it was found that applicant; Sh. Jang Bahadur is absent consecutively second time. Last opportunity was given to the respondent PIO to represent his case in person on the next date of hearing to clear the facts of this case, failing to which case will be decided in his absence and matter is adjourned for further hearing. Copy of this order was sent to the applicant through registered post.

1. On next hearing held on 15.03.2018, Sh. Sukhminder Singh was appeared on behalf of the respondent stated that requisite information had already been supplied to the applicant.

Applicant, Sh. Jung Bahadur was not present for today’s hearing but an email was received from the applicant by the undersigned bench dated 12.03.2018 (Email ID- [deepakmudgil1@gmail.com](mailto:deepakmudgil1@gmail.com)) consisting a letter signed by the applicant, Sh. Jung Bahadur
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stating that requisite information has not been supplied to him by the respondent PIO till date. In that letter he further mentioned that respondent, Sh. Sukhminder Singh informed the Commission that requisite information has been supplied to the applicant in appeal case no. 2363 of 2017 but no file notice has been supplied in that case. It was taken on record.

After hearing the respondent and examining the case file, I found that applicant was absent on previous hearings held on 12.12.2017, 23.01.2018 and 15.03.2018 i.e. today. On hearing held on 23.01.2018, last opportunity was given to the applicant, Sh. Jung Bahadur to represent this case in person on next date of hearing i.e. today but the applicant failed do so. One more opportunity was given to the applicant to appear in person on the next date of hearing to represent his case, failing to which case will be closed. A copy of this order was sent to him through registered post and matter was adjourned for further hearing on 25.04.2018 at 11:00 AM i.e. today.

1. Request of the respondent is granted; another opportunity is given to the respondent PIO to appear in person on the next date of hearing to clear the facts of this case.
2. One more opportunity is given to the applicant, Sh. Jang Bahadur to represent his case in person or through any of his representative(s) on the next date of hearing, failing to which case will be decided on merits.
3. The matter is adjourned for further hearing on **23.05.2018 at 11.00 AM**.
4. Announced in the Court, copy of the order to be sent to the parties.

**Chandigarh (Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)**

**Dated: 25.04.2018(11:00 AM) State Information Commissioner**
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**Sh. Tarsem Lal Jindal (Neeli Chatri Wala)**

**(Regd. Post)** H. No. 306, Aastha Colony, Dhanaula Road,

Barnala, Punjab (98551-51985) Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**

O/o Director, Local Govt., Punjab,

Plot No. 3 Municipal Bhawan,

Sector-35 A, Chandigarh.

**First Appellate Authority**

O/o Director, Local Govt., Punjab,

Plot No. 3 Municipal Bhawan,

Sector-35 A, Chandigarh. Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 2992 of 2017**

**Present:** Nobody on behalf of the applicant.

For the respondent: Sh. Jasvir Singh (Superintendent cum PIO) along with Sh. Abhishek (SA-Local Govt., Branch 2).

**ORDER**

1. Respondent, Sh. Jasvir Singh states that RTI application was transferred to the concerned branch, which is Superintendent, I. A. S. Branch. He submits a copy of letter dated 04.09.2017, which is taken on record.
2. Neither the applicant, Sh. Tarsem Lal jindal is present for today’s hearing nor did he file any written reply in this regard.
3. After hearing the respondent and examining the case file, I am of the view that **PIO, O/o Superintendent, I. A. S. Branch, Punjab Civil Secretariat, Chandigarh** be impleaded as necessary party in this case. A copy of this order be snet to the Superintendent, I. A. S. Branch, Punjab Civil Secretariat, Chandigarh along with RTI request through **registered post** for his ready reference.
4. Applicant, Sh. Tarsem Lal Jindal is advised to represent his case in person or through any of his representative(s) on the next date of hearing positively to clear the facts of this case. A copy of this order be sent to him through **registered post** for his ready reference.
5. The matter is adjourned for further hearing on **23.05.2018 at 11.00 AM**.
6. Announced in the Court, copy of the order to be sent to the parties.

**Chandigarh (Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)**

**Dated: 25.04.2018(11:00 AM) State Information Commissioner**

**Regd. Post**

**Public Information Officer**

O/o Superintendent, I. A. S. Branch,

Punjab Civil Secretariat,

Chandigarh

**Encl.** RTI Request.

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**Red Cross Building (Next to Rose Garden)**

**Sector-16, Chandigarh**

**Contact No. 0172-2864115, Fax No. 0172-2864125**

**Visit us @** [**www.infocommpunjab.com**](http://www.infocommpunjab.com), **Email-ID** [**psic25@punjabmail.gov.in**](mailto:psic25@punjabmail.gov.in)

**Sh. Baldev Singh**

S/o Sh. Surjan Singh

R/o Village Dhal ke, Near OBC Bank,

Tehsil & District Moga Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer**

O/o DC, Moga

**First Appellate Authority**

O/o DC, Moga Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 423 of 2018**

**Date of Institution: 22.01.2018**

**Date of Decision: 25.04.2018**

**Present:** Nobody on behalf of the applicant.

For the respondent: Sh. Joginder Singh (Superintendent cum APIO).

**ORDER**

1. Respondent, Sh. Joginder Singh handed over the requisite information to the applicant during the hearing. He submits a written reply letter no. 411 dated 24.04.2018 signed by APIO, O/o Deputy Commissioner, Moga along with a copy of an order passed by the Additional Deputy Commissioner cum First appellate Authority dated 15.11.2017, which is taken on record.
2. On this, applicant, Sh. Baldev Singh states that no reply was supplied to him by the BDPO.
3. After discussing and examining the case file, respondent Sh. Joginder Singh states that time to time reply was sent to the applicant and requisite information relates with an inquiry which is handed over to him after completion.
4. After discussing with the applicant, Sh. Baldev singh, he admits that he is satisfied with the supplied information. As the information stands supplied, no further cause of action is required in this case. Therefore, the instant appeal case is **disposed of & closed.**
5. Announced in the Court, copy of the order to be sent to the parties.

**Chandigarh (Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)**

**Dated: 25.04.2018(11:00 AM) State Information Commissioner**