



Sh H.S Hundal, 203, Judicial Courts,  
Sector-76, Mohali. (9878500082).

...Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o Tehsildar, Moga.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o SDM,  
Moga.

.....Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 866 of 2020**

**PRESENT: None for the Appellant**  
**Smt. Rajwinder Kaur, Suptd. O/o DC Moga for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant through RTI application dated 31.10.2019 has sought information regarding a copy of orders designating revenue officers as circle Revenue officers in the Districts with names, designation and tenures of CROs in the entire district – a copy of notification/provisions of Govt as per which circle revenue officers are appointed/designated – register maintained as per section 6(3) of Punjab Transparency Act – details of services in which CRO is designated officer – details of all cases that were taken up suo moto either by the appellate authority or by the commission and other information concerning the office of Tehsildar Moga. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the first appellate authority on 01.12.2019 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case came up for hearing first on 06.10.2020 through video conferencing at DAC Moga. Both the parties were absent.

The Commission observed that there has been an enormous delay of eleven months in attending to the RTI application. The Commission taking a serious view of this directed the PIO to provide the information and be present on the next date of hearing along with the explanation for the delay in attending to the RTI application.

On the date of hearing on 28.01.2021, as per the respondent, the information has been provided to the appellant on 22.11.2020. As per the appellant, no information was provided by the PIO despite his many visits to the office of the PIO.

The PIO was given one last opportunity to send the complete information to the appellant through a registered post with a copy to the Commission within 10 days of the receipt of the order.

On the date of hearing on **07.05.2021**, the appellant was present via a mobile phone and informed that the PIO has not provided the information. The Commission also received an email from the appellant in this regard which has been taken on the file of the Commission.

The respondent present from the office of Tehsildar Moga assured to provide the complete information within ten days.

The PIO was given one last opportunity to remove the discrepancies as pointed out by the appellant on 16.07.2020 and send the complete information in a sealed envelope to the Commission. The information should reach the Commission by Friday the 14<sup>th</sup> May.

The appellant may collect the information from the office of the Commission.

On the date of the last hearing on **10.08.2021**, the appellant informed that despite visiting the office of PIO many times, the discrepancy has not been removed and complete information has not been provided by the PIO.

The PIO did not comply with the order of the Commission to sort out the discrepancies and send complete information in a sealed envelope to the Commission by 04.05.2021 and has brought nothing.

The Commission observed that since there was constant disagreement on the information that had been provided and what was sought, under the powers vested under section 18(2) of the RTI Act, the case was marked to the Deputy Commissioner, Moga to enquire into the matter and submit a complete report that whether the information that has been provided is true, complete and in accordance with the information that has been sought.

On the date of last hearing on **14.12.2021**, the Commission received an email from the DRO Moga vide which the DRO sought adjournment on the plea that as per the order of the Deputy Commissioner, Moga, the enquiry in appeal case No.514, 515, 666 & 866 of 2020 has been allotted and is being conducted by the DRO but the enquiry has not yet been completed due to strike by the staff of their office.

The appellant was absent. The case was adjourned.

**Hearing dated 25.04.2022:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Moga. The respondent present pleaded that as per the order of the Commission, the enquiry was marked to DRO Moga who has completed the enquiry and a copy of the enquiry report has been sent to the Commission through email. The commission has received a copy of the enquiry report of DRO which has been taken on record. It may be mentioned that an inquiry had been marked after the Commission had observed a constant disagreement on the information that had been provided and what was sought. It was marked under the powers vested under section 18(2) of the RTI Act, to the Deputy Commissioner, Moga to enquire into the matter and submit a complete report that whether the information that has been provided is true, complete and in accordance with the information that has been sought.

The appellant is absent on 2<sup>nd</sup> consecutive hearing nor is represented.

Since the enquiry, which was marked to the Deputy Commissioner in the case has been conducted by the DRO and the enquiry report has been received, no further interference from the Commission is required. A copy of the enquiry report, in Appeal case No.514/2020, 515/2020, 666/2020 & 866/2020 which are clubbed together is being sent to the appellant.

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

Chandigarh  
Dated: 25.04.2022

Sd/-  
(Khushwant Singh)  
State Information Commissioner

CC to Deputy Commissioner, Moga



Sh. H.S Hundal,  
203, Judicial Courts,  
Sector-76, Mohali. (9878500082).

...Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o Tehsildar, Moga.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/oSDM,  
Moga.

.....Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 666 of 2020**

**PRESENT: None for the Appellant**  
**Smt. Rajwinder Kaur, Suptd. O/o DC Moga for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The case was first heard on 06.10.2020. Both the parties were absent.

The Commission observed that there has been an enormous delay of eleven months in attending to the RTI application. The Commission taking a serious view of this directed the PIO to provide the information and be present or be represented at the next date of hearing along with the explanation for the delay in attending to the RTI application.

On the date of hearing on 28.01.2021, as per the respondent, the information had been provided to the appellant on 22.11.2020. As per the appellant, no information was provided by the PIO despite his many visits to the office of the PIO.

The PIO was given one last opportunity to send the complete information to the appellant through a registered post with a copy to the Commission within 10 days of the receipt of the order.

On the date of the last hearing on **07.05.2021**, the appellant was present via a mobile phone and informed that the PIO has not provided the information. The Commission also received an email from the appellant in this regard which has been taken on the file of the Commission.

The respondent present from the office of Tehsildar Moga assured to provide the complete information within ten days.

The PIO was given one last opportunity to remove the discrepancies as pointed out by the appellant on 16.07.2020 and send complete information in a sealed envelope to the Commission. The information should reach the Commission by Friday the 14<sup>th</sup> May 2020.

The appellant may collect the information from the office of the Commission.

On the date of the last hearing on **10.08.2021**, the appellant informed that despite visiting the office of PIO many times, the discrepancy has not been removed and complete information has not been provided by the PIO.

The PIO did not comply with the order of the Commission to sort out the discrepancies and send complete information in a sealed envelope to the Commission by 04.05.2021 and brought nothing.

The Commission observed that since there was constant disagreement on the information that had been provided and what was sought, under the powers vested under section 18(2) of the RTI Act, the case was marked to the Deputy Commissioner, Moga to enquire into the matter and submit a complete report that whether the information that has been provided is true, complete and in accordance with the information that has been sought.

On the date of last hearing on **14.12.2021**, the Commission received an email from the DRO Moga vide which the DRO sought adjournment on the plea that as per the order of the Deputy Commissioner, Moga, the enquiry in appeal case No.514, 515, 666 & 866 of 2020 has been allotted and is being conducted by the DRO but the enquiry has not yet been completed due to strike by the staff of their office.

The appellant was absent. The case was adjourned.

**Hearing dated 25.04.2022:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Moga. The respondent present pleaded that as per the order of the Commission, the enquiry was marked to DRO Moga who has completed the enquiry and a copy of the enquiry report has been sent to the Commission through email. The commission has received a copy of the enquiry report of DRO which has been taken on record. It may be mentioned that an inquiry had been marked after the Commission had observed a constant disagreement on the information that had been provided and what was sought. It was marked under the powers vested under section 18(2) of the RTI Act, to the Deputy Commissioner, Moga to enquire into the matter and submit a complete report that whether the information that has been provided is true, complete and in accordance with the information that has been sought.

The appellant is absent on 2<sup>nd</sup> consecutive hearing nor is represented.

Since the enquiry, which was marked to the Deputy Commissioner in the case has been conducted by the DRO and the enquiry report has been received, no further interference from the Commission is required. A copy of the enquiry report, in Appeal case No.514/2020, 515/2020, 666/2020 & 866/2020 which are clubbed together is being sent to the appellant.

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

Chandigarh  
Dated: 25.04.2022

Sd/-  
(Khushwant Singh)  
State Information Commissioner

CC to Deputy Commissioner, Moga



Sh H.S Hundal,  
# 203, Judicial Courts, Sector-76,  
Mohali.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o Tehsildar,  
Moga.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o SDM,  
Moga.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 515 of 2020**

**PRESENT:**   None for the Appellant  
                  Smt.Rajwinder Kaur, Suptd. O/o DC Moga for the Respondent

**ORDER:**

The case was first heard on 07.07.2020. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 06.07.2020. The appellant was absent and vide email has informed that he had received a photocopy of the reply on his WhatsApp from the PIO, which however was incorrect and wrong facts had been mentioned in the reply.

The appellant was directed to point out the discrepancies if any in writing to the PIO with a copy to the Commission. The PIO was directed to remove the discrepancies.

On the date of the hearing on **01.09.2020**, both the parties were absent. The appellant vide email has informed that the discrepancies in the information has been pointed out to the PIO O/o Tehsildar Moga vide email dated 16.07.2020 with a copy to the Commission. The appellant further informed that he contacted Mr.Mangaljit Singh, Reader to the Tehsildar Moga who informed that the entire staff had been on strike and had requested for some more time to provide the information. The appellant stated that he has no objection if the Hon'ble Court grants additional time to the PIO to provide the complete point-wise information.

The PIO was directed to sort out the discrepancies as pointed out by the appellant via email dated 16.07.2020.

On the date of hearing on 28.01.2021, as per the respondent, the discrepancies as pointed out by the appellant had been sorted out and the information had been provided to the appellant on 22.11.2020. As per the appellant, no information was provided by the PIO despite his many visits to the office of the PIO.

The PIO was given one last opportunity to sort out the discrepancies as pointed out by the appellant and send complete information to the appellant through a registered post with a copy to the Commission within 10 days of the receipt of the order.

On the date of the last hearing on **07.05.2021**, the appellant who was present on mobile phone and informed that despite orders of the Commission to provide information within ten days, the PIO has not provided the complete information but sent a copy of same reply/letter dated 20.12.2020 via registered mail which was signed by previous PIO who has already relieved on 15.12.2020 and that 20.12.2020 happens to be a Sunday. The Commission also received an email from the appellant in this regard which was taken on the file of the Commission.

The respondent present from the office of Tehsildar Moga assured to provide the complete information within ten days.

The PIO was given one last opportunity to remove the discrepancies as pointed out by the appellant on 16.07.2020 and send complete information in a sealed envelope to the Commission. The information should reach the Commission positively by Friday the 14<sup>th</sup> May, 2020, otherwise, the Commission will be constrained to issue a show-cause notice to the PIO under section 20 of the RTI Act. The appellant may collect the information from the office of the Commission.

On the date of the last hearing on **10.08.2021**, the appellant informed that despite visiting the office of PIO many times, the discrepancy has not been removed and complete information has not been provided by the PIO.

The PIO did not comply with the order of the Commission to sort out the discrepancies and send complete information in a sealed envelope to the Commission by 04.05.2021 and brought nothing.

The Commission observed that since there was constant disagreement on the information that had been provided and what was sought, under the powers vested under section 18(2) of the RTI Act, the case was marked to the Deputy Commissioner, Moga to enquire into the matter and submit a complete report that whether the information that has been provided is true, complete and in accordance with the information that has been sought.

On the date of last hearing on **14.12.2021**, the Commission received an email from the DRO Moga vide which the DRO sought adjournment on the plea that as per order of the Deputy Commissioner, Moga, the enquiry in appeal case No.514, 515, 666 & 866 of 2020 has been allotted and is being conducted by the DRO but the enquiry has not yet been completed due to strike by the staff of their office.

The appellant was absent. The case was absent.

**Hearing dated 25.04.2022:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Moga. The respondent present pleaded that as per the order of the Commission, the enquiry was marked to DRO Moga who has completed the enquiry and a copy of the enquiry report has been sent to the Commission through email. The commission has received a copy of the enquiry report of DRO which has been taken on record. It may be mentioned that an inquiry had been marked after the Commission had observed a constant disagreement on the information that had been provided and what was sought. It was marked under the powers vested under section 18(2) of the RTI Act, to the Deputy Commissioner, Moga to enquire into the matter and submit a complete report that whether the information that has been provided is true, complete and in accordance with the information that has been sought.

The appellant is absent on 2<sup>nd</sup> consecutive hearing nor is represented.

Since the enquiry, which was marked to the Deputy Commissioner in the case has been conducted by the DRO and the enquiry report has been received, no further interference from the Commission is required. A copy of the enquiry report, in Appeal case No.514/2020, 515/2020, 666/2020 & 866/2020 which are clubbed together is being sent to the appellant.

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

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 25.04.2022**

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

**CC to Deputy Commissioner, Moga**



Sh H.S Hundal,  
# 203, Judicial Courts, Sector-76,  
Mohali.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o Tehsildar,  
Moga.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o SDM,  
Moga.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 514 of 2020**

**PRESENT:   None for the Appellant**  
**Smt.Rajwinder Kaur, Suptd. O/o DC Moga for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The case was first heard on 07.07.2020 through video conferencing at DAC Moga. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 06.07.2020. The appellant was absent and vide email informed that he has received a photocopy of the reply on his whatsapp from the PIO, which however was incorrect and wrong facts had been mentioned in the reply.

The appellant was directed to point out the discrepancies if any in writing to the PIO with a copy to the Commission. The PIO was directed to remove the discrepancies.

On the date of the hearing on **01.09.2020**, both the parties were absent. The appellant vide email has informed that the discrepancies in the information have been pointed out to the PIO O/o Tehsildar Moga vide email dated 16.07.2020 with a copy to the Commission. The appellant further informed that he contacted Mr.Mangaljit Singh, Reader to the Tehsildar Moga who informed that the entire staff had been on strike and had requested some more time to provide the information. The appellant stated that he has no objection if the Hon'ble Court grants additional time to the PIO to provide the complete point-wise information.

The PIO was directed to sort out the discrepancies as pointed out by the appellant via email dated 16.07.2020.

On the date of hearing on 28.01.2021, as per the respondent, the discrepancies as pointed out by the appellant had been sorted out and the information was provided to the appellant on 22.11.2020. As per the appellant, no information was provided by the PIO despite his many visits to the office of the PIO.

The PIO was given one last opportunity to sort out the discrepancies as pointed out by the appellant and send the complete information to the appellant through a registered post with a copy to the Commission within 10 days of the receipt of the order.

On the date of hearing on **07.05.2021**, the appellant who was present via a mobile phone informed that the PIO has not provided the complete information after the discrepancies were pointed out. The Commission also received an email from the appellant in this regard which was taken on the file of the Commission.

**Appeal Case No. 514 of 2020**

The PIO was given one last opportunity to remove the discrepancies as pointed out by the appellant on 16.07.2020 and send complete information in a sealed envelope to the Commission. The information should reach the Commission by Friday the 14<sup>th</sup> May, 2020,.

The appellant may collect the information from the office of the Commission.

On the date of the last hearing on **10.08.2021**, the appellant informed that despite visiting the office of PIO many times, the discrepancy has not been removed and complete information has not been provided by the PIO.

The PIO did not comply with the order of the Commission to sort out the discrepancies and send complete information in a sealed envelope to the Commission by 04.05.2021 and has brought nothing.

The Commission observed that since there was constant disagreement on the information that had been provided and what was sought, under the powers vested under section 18(2) of the RTI Act, the case was marked to the Deputy Commissioner, Moga to enquire into the matter and submit a complete report that whether the information that has been provided is true, complete and in accordance with the information that has been sought.

On the date of last hearing on **14.12.2021**, the Commission received an email from the DRO Moga vide which the DRO sought adjournment on the plea that as per the order of the Deputy Commissioner, Moga, the enquiry in appeal case No.514, 515, 666 & 866 of 2020 has been allotted and is being conducted by the DRO but the enquiry has not yet been completed due to strike by the staff of their office.

The appellant was absent. The case was adjourned.

**Hearing dated 25.04.2022:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Moga. The respondent present pleaded that as per the order of the Commission, the enquiry was marked to DRO Moga who has completed the enquiry and a copy of the enquiry report has been sent to the Commission through email. The commission has received a copy of the enquiry report of DRO which has been taken on record. It may be mentioned that an inquiry had been marked after the Commission had observed a constant disagreement on the information that had been provided and what was sought. It was marked under the powers vested under section 18(2) of the RTI Act, to the Deputy Commissioner, Moga to enquire into the matter and submit a complete report that whether the information that has been provided is true, complete and in accordance with the information that has been sought.

The appellant is absent on 2<sup>nd</sup> consecutive hearing nor is represented.

Since the enquiry, which was marked to the Deputy Commissioner in the case has been conducted by the DRO and the enquiry report has been received, no further interference from the Commission is required. A copy of the enquiry report, in Appeal case No.514/2020, 515/2020, 666/2020 & 866/2020 which are clubbed together is being sent to the appellant.

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

Chandigarh  
Dated: 25.04.2022

Sd/-  
(Khushwant Singh)  
State Information Commissioner

CC to Deputy Commissioner, Moga





Sh. Surjit Singh,  
Village.Aujla Dhak,  
P.O Lidhar Kalan, Distt. Jalandhar.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o XEN,  
Water Supply and Sanitation Division-2,  
Amritsar.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o SE,  
Water Supply and Sanitation Circle,  
Amritsar.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 2141 of 2020**

**PRESENT:**                    **None for the Appellant**  
                                     **Sh.Harpreet Singh, SDO for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant through RTI application dated 16.03.2020 has sought information regarding details of tenders issued for work got done from 01.03.2019 to 15.03.2020 in sub-divisions under Amritsar Division2 –a copy of bills passed for the work done for annual maintenance - a copy of cash books – a copy of quotation registers – the name of SDOs along with monthly travelling allowance bills and other information as enumerated in the RTI application from the office of Xen Water Supply and Sanitation Division No.2 Amritsar The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the first appellate authority on 28.04.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 25.02.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Amritsar. Due to a technical fault in VC at Amritsar, the hearing could not take place. The case was adjourned.

On the date of the hearing on **18.05.2021**, both the parties were absent. The case was adjourned.

On the date of the hearing on **31.08.2021**, the appellant was absent and vide email informed that the PIO has not supplied the information.

The respondent was absent on 2<sup>nd</sup> consecutive hearing nor had supplied the information. There has been an enormous delay of more than one year and five months in attending to the RTI application. The PIO was issued a **show-cause notice under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 and directed to file a reply on an affidavit**. The PIO was again directed to provide information to the appellant within 10 days of the receipt of the order and send a compliance report to the Commission.

On the date of the hearing on **22.11.2021**, both the parties were absent.

**Appeal Case No. 2141 of 2020**

The PIO also did not file a reply to the show-cause notice. The PIO was given one last opportunity to file a reply to the show-cause notice otherwise it will be presumed that he has nothing to say in the matter and the case will be decided ex-parte.

On the date of the hearing on 02.02.2022, the respondent was again absent nor had filed a reply to the show-cause notice.

To secure an erring PIO's presence before the commission, a bailable Warrant of the Sh.Mandeep Singh-PIO-cum-Xen, Water Supply & Sanitation Division No.2, Amritsar was issued Under Section 18(3) of the RTI Act through Senior Superintendent of Police Amritsar for his presence before the Commission on **21.03.2022**.

The PIO was also directed to provide the information within ten days of receipt of this order. The PIO- Xen, Water Supply & Sanitation Division No.2, Amritsar was also directed to be present along with the relevant record on the next date of hearing.

On the date of the last hearing on **21.03.2022**, Sh.Mandeep Singh, Xen-Water Supply & Sanitation Division No.2, Amritsar appeared and informed that the complete information has been supplied to the appellant vide letter dated 07.03.2022 and the appellant has acknowledged having received the information.

The appellant was absent.

The PIO has, however, did not file a reply to the show-cause notice. The PIO was given one last opportunity to file a reply to the show-cause notice otherwise it will be presumed that the PIO has nothing to say on the matter and the Commission will take the decision on penal action against the PIO under section 20 of the RTI Act.

**Hearing dated 25.04.2022:**

Sh.Harpreet Singh, SDO is present on behalf of the PIO and informed that the information has already been provided to the appellant and the appellant has acknowledged having received the information. The respondent has also sent a reply to the show-cause notice which has been received in the Commission on 05.04.2022.

The appellant has been absent on all the hearings.

Since the information has been provided, the show cause is dropped and the case is **disposed of and closed**.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 25.04.2022**

**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](mailto:psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in)**  
**Visit us: - [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)**



Sh Vijay Kumar, s/o Sh Babu Ram,  
VPO Rupana, Tehsil & Distt Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o DFSC,  
Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o Director,  
Food and Supply Deptt,  
Ferozepur.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 3762 of 2021**

**PRESENT: Sh.Vijay Kumar as the Appellant**  
**Sh.Subhash Kumar, Jr Auditor for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant, through an RTI application dated 16.04.2021, has sought information regarding a copy of the stay order of the court for the issue of ration cards in village Rupana in the year 2009 as enumerated in the RTI application from the office of DFSC Sri Mukatsar Sahib. The appellant was not provided with the information, after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the first appellate authority on 19.06.2021, which did not decide on the appeal.

The case last came up for hearing on 15.02.2022 through video conferencing at DAC Sri Mukatsar Sahib. Due to a technical fault in the VC, the hearing could not take place. The case was adjourned.

**Hearing dated 25.04.2022:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Sri Mukatsar Sahib. The respondent present pleaded that as per the statement of Sh.Gursewak Singh, Inspector and Sh.Gurpal Singh, AFSO, there is no copy of the stay order available with them.

Having gone through the record, the Commission observes that the appellant is seeking that stay order relating to the issue of ration cards, which the department has denied having in their custody.

Prima-facie it appears that the record should not be in the custody of an individual but in the department's custody. If any such court order exists in the record, it should be provided otherwise the department shall give in writing on an affidavit that the sought stay order does not exist and is not in the custody of the department.

The information be provided within 15 days of the receipt of the order with a copy to the Commission.

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

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 25.04.2022**

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



Sh Narinder pal Singh, S/o Sh Joginder Singh,  
VPO Jandwaala Charat Singh,  
Tehsil Malout, Distt Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o SMO,  
CHC Alamwala.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o Civil Surgeon,  
Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 3766 of 2021**

**PRESENT: Sh.Narinder Pal Singh as the Appellant**  
**Dr.Jagdeep Chawla, SMO Alamwala for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant, through an RTI application dated 26.04.2020 has sought information regarding the date of joining of staff Nurse Pawanjeet Kaur in CHC Alamawala – service period of Pawanjeet Kaur from joining date – Total amount of salary and other allowances given to her during the period as enumerated in the RTI application from the office of SMO, CHC Alamwala Distt. Sri Mukatsar Sahib. The appellant was not satisfied with the reply of the PIO dated 13.06.2020 (asked by the PIO for deposit of requisite fee of around 1250 pages) after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the first appellate authority on 10.08.2020, which took no decision on the appeal.

The case last came up for hearing on 15.02.2022 through video conferencing at DAC Sri Mukatsar Sahib. Due to a technical fault in the VC, the hearing could not take place. The case was adjourned.

**Hearing dated 25.04.2022:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Sri Mukatsar Sahib. As per the respondent, the information is 3<sup>rd</sup> party information and the 3<sup>rd</sup> party has not given its consent to disclose the information, it cannot be provided.

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

- |           |  |
|-----------|--|
| - Point-1 | - To provide the joining date of Staff Nurse Pawanjeet Kaur                                  |
| - Point-2 | - To provide the period of service from the joining date                                     |
| - Point-3 | - To apply section 10 of the RTI Act and provide basic pay and total salary of the employee. |

The information be provided within 15 days of the receipt of the order with a copy to the Commission.

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



Sh. Rajinder Singh, IPS,  
Former DGP, Punjab,  
R/o Green Wood Farms,  
Sector 57, Opposite CASAESPANA,  
Mohali.

... Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o Principal Secretary,  
Department of Social Justice & Minority Affairs  
SCO-6, Phase-1, Mohali.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No.1209 of 2022**

**PRESENT: Sh.Puneet Singh, Advocate for the complainant**  
**Mrs.Veena Devi Suptd.-PIO for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant, through RTI application dated 11.01.2022, has sought information on 08 points regarding appointment to the post of Chairman Punjab SC Commission on 06.01.2022 - a verified copy of the notice issued to members of the selection committee for holding the meeting of the selection committee – proceedings of committee of the selection committee – all file notes including noting and correspondence – dissenting note offered by the Principal Secretary mentioning the civil suit of defamation –legal advice obtained – detailed character antecedents reports and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of Principal Secretary, Department of Social Justice & Minority Affairs, Pb Mohali. The complainant was not satisfied with the reply of the PIO dated 09.02.2022 ( till the completion of final proceedings of the Committee, information cannot be provided ), after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the first appellate authority on 22.02.2022, which did not decide on the appeal.

The case has come up for hearing today before this bench. As per the appellant, the information has not been provided.

The respondent present pleaded that the information was not provided since the proceedings were incomplete at the time of the RTI application (the file was pending with the concerned Minister for decision). The respondent further informed that the file had just been received today (25.04.2022).

Since the sought information is now available and in the custody of the public authority from whom the information has been sought, complete information as per the RTI application is to be provided.

The information is to be provided within 15 days of the receipt of the order.

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

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated:25.04.2022**

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



Sh. Nitin Kumar Garg,  
C/o Police Public Dairy,  
Sector-15-A, Shastri Nagar,  
Model Town, Ludhiana.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o XEN, Water supply and Sanitation,  
Division-1, Roopnagar,  
Anandpur Sahib,

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o SE, Water Supply and Sanitation Circle,  
SCO-44-45, Ground Floor, Phase-2,  
SAS Nagar, Mohali.

... Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 2429 of 2020**

**PRESENT:**     **None for the appellant**  
                  **Sh. Narayan Dass Sr. Assistant on behalf of Sh. Harjit Pal Singh and**  
                  **Sh. Mandeep Singh Suptd. on behalf of Sh. Michel for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

That appellant, through the RTI application dated 30.01.2020, has sought information regarding a copy of the sanction letter/like sports quotation issued for the work of CSR to all SDE in the division from 01.01.2019 to 31.01.2020 from the Xen Water Supply & Sanitation Division. No.1, Rupnagar Anandpur Sahib. The appellant was not provided with the information, after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the first appellate authority on 01.06.2020, which did not decide on the appeal.

The case has been heard on 10.02.2021, 17.05.2021, 24.08.2021, 11.10.2021, 31.01.2022 & 21.03.2022.

On the hearing date on **24.08.2021**, the appellant informed that he has received some information on 05.03.2021, but the information was incomplete and not as per the fee raised by the PIO.

The respondent was absent, nor had sent any reply. Due to a delay of more than one year in providing the information as well as a mismatch between the fee raised by the PIO and the information that had been provided, (PIO raised Rs.800/- for 400 pages but sent only 22 pages of information), the PIO was issued a **show-cause notice under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 for not supplying the information within the statutorily prescribed period as well as raising excess fee than the actual information provided and directed to file reply on an affidavit.**

Since the PIO was absent and did not file a reply to the show-cause notice on the hearing of **11.10.2021 & 31.01.2022**, as well as **not supplied the** complete information, it was concluded that there are two PIOs involved in causing the delay in providing the information.

- a) Sh. Michel was the PIO when the RTI application was filed ((from 30.01.2020 till 20.10.2020), who raised the fee of Rs.800/- for 400 pages vide letter dated 19.02.2020 and even depositing the fee of Rs.800/- by the appellant, the PIO supplied only 22 pages. Hence the PIO violated section 7(3)(a) of the RTI Act.

- b) Sh.Michal(earlier Xen-cum-PIO, Water Supply & Sanitation Division-1, Roopnagar at Anandpur Sahib was **show-caused under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 for the arbitrary raising of fees, as well as non supplying of the information within the statutorily prescribed time as prescribed under section 7 of the RTI Act. and directed to file a reply on an affidavit.**
- c) Sh.Harjitpal Singh has been the PIO for a maximum period (from 20.10.2020 till date) and constantly violating the order of the Commission to provide complete information and not responding to the show cause notice issued to him on 24.08.2021. It appears that Sh.Harjitpal Singh has nothing to say on the matter.

Since Sh.Harjitpal Singh, Xen-cum-PIO Water supply and Sanitation, Division-1, Roopnagar at Anandpur Sahib was found responsible for the delay and not providing the complete information to the appellant and continuous non-appearance at the hearings, a penalty of **Rs.10,000/-** was imposed on Sh.Harjitpal Singh, Xen-cum-PIO Water supply and Sanitation, Division-1, Roopnagar at Anandpur Sahib and directed to produce a copy of the challan as evidence of depositing the penalty in the Govt Treasury.

The PIO- Water supply and Sanitation, Division-1, Roopnagar at Anandpur Sahib was also directed to pay an amount of **Rs.2,500/-** via demand draft as compensation to the appellant for the loss and detriment suffered by him of having to file the appeals and not getting information in time and directed to submit proof of having compensated the appellant.

On the date of last hearing on 21.03.2022, the appellant informed that the PIO has neither supplied information as per the order of the Commission nor had provided compensation as well as not refunded the excess amount of fee raised.

Sh.Harjitpal Singh-PIO Water Supply & Sanitation Division No.1 Anandpur Sahib and Sh.Michel -(earlier PIO-Water Supply & Sanitation Division No.1) were absent. Sh.Harjitpal Singh also did not deposit the penalty as well as not paid compensation to the appellant.

Sh.Jasbir Singh, SDO appeared on behalf of the PIO and informed that the available information had been supplied to the appellant and no further information is available in the record.

The Commission received the reply of Sh.Harjitpal Singh, Xen-cum-PIO Water supply and Sanitation, Division-1, Roopnagar at Anandpur Sahib, incidentally after the penalty's pronouncement under section 19(8)(c) of the RTI Act. The Commission also received a reply of Sh.Michel (earlier Xen-cum-PIO Water supply and Sanitation, Division-1, Roopnagar at Anandpur Sahib) on 17.03.2022, which was taken on record.

Since the order of penalty and compensation had already passed, the plea of Sh.Harjitpal Singh, Xen-cum-PIO Water supply and Sanitation, Division-1, Roopnagar at Anandpur Sahib was rejected and Sh.Harjitpal Singh was directed to comply with the Commission's earlier order and deposit the amount of penalty in the Govt Treasury and pay the compensation amount to the appellant and submit proof thereof.

Further, the reply of Sh.Michel (earlier Xen-cum-PIO Water supply and Sanitation, Division-1, Roopnagar at Anandpur Sahib), was also not found satisfactory, a penalty of **Rs.10,000/-** was also imposed on Sh.Michel (earlier Xen-cum-PIO Water supply and Sanitation, Division-1, Roopnagar at Anandpur Sahib), and directed to produce a copy of the challan as evidence of depositing the penalty in the Govt Treasury.

**Hearing dated 25.04.2022:**

The case has come up today. Sh.Narayan Dass, Sr.Assistant, is present on behalf of Sh.Harjit Pal Singh, PIO Water Supply Division Anandpur Sahib who informed that Sh.Harjit Pal Singh has deposited the penalty amount of Rs.10000/- in the Govt Treasury on 25.04.2022 vide challan dated 25.04.2022 and has paid the compensation amount of Rs.2500/- by way of demand draft No.000932 dated 30.03.2022 and has sent a copy of challan to the Commission.

Sh.Mandeep Singh is present on behalf of Sh.Michel (earlier PIO Div, Anandpur Sahib) informed that Sh.Michel has deposited the amount of penalty in the Govt Treasury vide challan receipt No.2186350 dated 25.04.2022 and has sent a copy of challan to the Commission.

The appellant is absent.

Since the penalty amount has been deposited and the compensation has been paid to the appellant, no further course of action is required. The case is **disposed of and closed**.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 25.04.2022**

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

**CC to Sh.Michal,**  
**O/o Department of Water Supply & Sanitation**  
**SCO-44-45, Ground Floor, Phase-2,**  
**SAS Nagar, Mohali**