



Smt. Jagwinder Kaur,  
W/o Sh.Amarjit Singh,  
V.P.O. Lohara,  
Tehsil Nihal Singh Wala,  
District Moga.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Block Development & Pachayat Officer,  
Moga.

First Appellant Authority  
O/o Distt. Development & Panchayat Officer,  
Moga.

Respondents

**Appeal Case No.2033/2018**

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA	Date of Second Appeal/ Complaint
04.07.2018	Nil	30.11.2017	Nil	14.06.2018

**Present:** Smt. Jagwinder Kaur, Appellant is absent.  
None is present on behalf of respondents.

**ORDER:**

The following order was passed on 16.05.2019:-

*“The Appellant has sought to know the outcome of the complaint made by her against some inhabitants of the village and the B.D.P.O. Moga. Shri Gurjinder Singh, Panchayat Secretary appearing as proxy for the respondents has brought along a copy of forwarding letter vide which the information was transmitted to the appellant. The acknowledgment from the appellant on the receipt register has also been furnished and placed on record. The appellant is desired to react on the submissions made by the respondents, if she desires so”.*

None is present on behalf of the appellant. The Commission is convinced that the appellant has been duly informed. No further intervention is called for.

**Disposed.**

**25.06.2019**

**Sd/-  
( Yashvir Mahajan )  
State Information Commissioner**



Sh. K.N.S Sodhi,  
R/o #1634, Sector-70,  
Mohali.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Municipal Corporation,  
Mohali.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o Director,  
Local Government,  
Plot No.-3, Sector-35-A,  
Chandigarh.

Respondents

**Appeal Case No.979/2019**

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA	Date of Second Appeal/ Complaint
10.07.2018	Nil	24.08.2018	Nil	11.03.2019

**Present:** The Appellant Sh.K.N.S. Sodhi is present.  
None is present on behalf of the respondents.

**ORDER**

The following order was passed on 07.05.2019:-

*"The Appellant has sought detailed information about the tube-wells installed in the jurisdiction of Municipal Corporation, Mohali and some allied information about the overhead reservoir etc. The respondents have brought along the information and handed over on the spot to the Appellant. Meanwhile, the appellant is advised to go through the same and revert in case of any deficiency in the information supplied".*

The case has again come up today.

None is present on behalf of the respondents. The appellant points out that the information sought at Sr.No.9 relating to Division No.2 of Water Supply & Sanitation Department, Mohali, is deficient. The concerned Executive Engineer has failed to provide him the status of the working of tubewells, overhead reservoirs and UGS reservoirs etc. Last opportunity is afforded to him to apprise the appellant of the information sought strictly in terms of his application and explain the delay in providing the information. Further delay shall invite penal consequences.

To come up on **18.07.2019 at 11.30 AM.**

**25.06.2019**

**Sd/-  
(Yashvir Mahajan)  
State Information Commissioner**



S. Jasbir Singh,  
Village- Bholpur,  
Jhabewal, P.O-Ramgarh,  
District-Ludhiana.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Sub District Magistrate,  
District-Fatehgarh Sahib.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o Sub District Magistrate,  
District-Fatehgarh Sahib.

Respondents

**Appeal Case No.982/2019**

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA	Date of Second Appeal/ Complaint
19.12.2018	Nil	21.01.2018	Nil	12.03.2019

**Present:** Sh. Jasbir Singh, Appellant in person.  
Sh.Joginder Kumar, Senior Assistant, O/o SDM, Fatehgarh Sahib -  
for the Respondents.

**ORDER**

The following order was passed on 07.05.2019:-

*"The appellant has sought information about the mandatory disclosure to be made by the Public Authorities in terms of Section 4 of RTI Act and its sub-sections. The respondents say that they have complied with the same, as mandated and the Appellant has been duly intimated about the same. The appellant may like to respond/ counter the submissions made by the respondents, if he so desires".*

The matter is being considered again today.

The Commission observes that the intention of the appellant is to ensure implementation of the provisions of RTI Act in letter & its true spirit. The respondents are again advised to make voluntary disclosures to the extent possible so that public at large is saved from filing uncalled for applications to seek information on each aspect. No further intervention is called for.

The appeal is **disposed**.

**25.06.2019**

**Sd/-**  
**(Yashvir Mahajan)**  
**State Information Commissioner**



Sh. Pal Singh,  
S/o Sh. Charan Singh,  
R/o Village-Bhadla Nicha,  
Tehsil-Khanna,  
District-Ludhiana.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Panchayat Secretary,  
Gram Panchayat, Bhadla Nicha  
Khanna, District-Ludhiana.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o District Development and Panchayat Officer,  
Ludhiana.

Respondents

**Appeal Case No.1002/2019**

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA	Date of Second Appeal/ Complaint
16.05.2018	Nil	09.07.2018	Nil	26.02.2019

Present: Sh.Pal Singh, Appellant in person.  
Ms. Anuradha, Supdt. O/o BDPO Khanna  
Sh.Gurmeet Singh, Panchayat Secretary for respondents.

**ORDER:**

The following order was passed on 07.05.2019:-

*"The appellant has sought information about the various works executed by Gram Panchayat, Bhadla Nicha, Tehsil Khanna, District Ludhiana, out of the grants and compensation received by it against acquisition of their land. The respondents have brought along the information comprising 115 pages which have been handed over on the spot to the appellant. The Appellant may like to go through it and point out deficiencies, if any, before the next date of hearing. The Commission finds that the original application was filed way back in May, 2018. It has almost taken an year for the respondents to provide the information to the appellant. The respondents are, thus, liable for imposition of penalty for the inordinate delay without any apparent reasonable cause.*



-2-

**Appeal Case No.1002/2019**

*The PIO O/o Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat, Bhadla Nicha, Tehsil Khanna, District Ludhiana is issued a show cause notice to explain in a self- attested affidavit as to why a penalty @ Rs.250/- per day of delay subject to maximum of Rs.25,000/- till the complete information is furnished, be not imposed under Section 20(1) of RTI Act, 2005 on him for causing willful delay / denial of the information to the RTI applicant and why the compensation be not awarded to the Appellant under Section 19 (8) (b) of the Act for the detriment suffered by him.*

*In addition to the written reply, the PIO is also given an opportunity under Section 20(1) proviso thereto, for a personal hearing before the imposition of such penalty on the next date of hearing. He may take note that in case he does not file his written reply and does not avail himself of the opportunity of personal hearing on the date fixed, it will be presumed that he has nothing to say and the Commission shall proceed to take further proceedings against him ex parte”.*

Shri Gurmeet Singh, Panchayat Secretary is present. He submits that he has a heavy charge of panchayats and remained mostly occupied with the conduct of Panchayats and Parliamentary elections. He did not have any malafide in delaying the information. He has brought along a copy of the Measurement Book as prepared by the Junior Engineer for various development works and has been handed over on spot to the appellant. The Commission feels that the appellant has been sufficiently informed. The Commission passes a severe reprimand and directs the respondent to be watchful in future.

**Disposed.**

**25.06.2019**

**Sd/-  
(Yashvir Mahajan)  
State Information Commissioner**

Sh. Jatinder Kumar,  
S/o Sh. Ashok Kumar,  
R/o Village-Neelapur,  
Rajpura, District-Patiala.

Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Block Development and Panchayat Officer,  
Rajpura, District-Patiala.

Respondent

**Complaint Case No.261/2019**

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA	Date of Second Appeal/ Complaint
11.07.2018	20.08.2018	Nil	Nil	05.03.2019

**Present:** Sh.Jatinder Kumar, Complainant is absent.  
Smt. Mandeep Kaur, Sudpt., O/o BDPO Rajpura  
for the Respondents.

**ORDER**

The following order was passed on 07.05.2019:-

*Sh.Balbir Singh, Panchayat Secretary submitted a copy of the reply sent to the complainant. He has stated that the respondents have invoked the provisions of Clause-11 & 89 of Chapter-14 of RTI Act.. The Commission is not aware of any such provisions as given in Chapter-14 of the RTI Act. The BDPO is desired to enclose the copies of such provisions and explain his conduct for misleading the complainant and the Commission”.*

The case has come up today on 25.06.2019.

Smt. Mandeep Kaur, Superintendent O/o BDPO Rajpura is present. She regrets that incorrect provisions were got inadvertently quoted on a busy occasion during the conduct of Parliamentary elections. It has further been mentioned that the information sought is in the shape of questionnaire and Explanations for the decisions taken, have been demanded which cannot be provided by the respondents. The Commission agrees with it. The information which is materially available with the public authority and defined in Section 2(f) of the RTI Act, can only be provided. A public authority is not under obligation to provide answers to questions and explanations. The Commission, as such, is not inclined to invoke penalty provisions. The complaint is filed.

**Disposed.**

**25.06.2019**

**Sd/-**  
**(Yashvir Mahajan)**  
**State Information Commissioner**



Sh. Iqbal Singh Rasulpur, General Secretary,  
University Human Rights Organisation  
VPO Rasulpur, Tehsil Jagraon,  
District Ludhiana-142035.

Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Addl. Director General of Police, IVC,  
Punjab, Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority  
O/o Addl. Director General of Police, Punjab  
Chandigarh.

Respondent

**Complaint Case No.19/2017**

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA	Date of Second Appeal/ Complaint
13.06.2016	Nil	Nil	Nil	27.12.2016

**Present:** Sh. Iqbal Singh Rasulpuri, complainant in person.

Sh.Amandeep Singh, Intelligence Assistant – for respondents.

**ORDER:**

The respondents are seeking time to respond to the application of the complainant. According to them, the Security and Intelligence Agencies scheduled under Section 24 of the Act are exempt from the purview of the RTI Act. The complainant has also filed a written submission, a copy of which has already been handed over to the respondents.

The issue shall be argued on **16.07.2019 at 11.30 AM.**

**25.06.2019**

**Sd/-**  
**(Yashvir Mahajan)**  
**State Information Commissioner**



Mr.Amandeep Tiwana,  
R/o VPO Chanarthala Kalan,  
District- Fatehgarh Sahib

Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Sr. Superintendent of Police,  
Sri Fatehgarh Sahib.

Respondent

**Complaint Case No.396/2019**

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA	Date of Second Appeal/ Complaint
09.02.2019	Nil	Nil	Nil	24.04.2019

**Present:** Sh.Aamardeep Singh, complainant is absent.  
ASI Ranjit Singh, I/c RTI, O/o SSP Fatehgarh Sahib –for respondents.

**ORDER:**

On the request of the parties, the matter is adjourned.

Meanwhile, the respondent has submitted a copy of the reply to the Commission with its endorsement to the complainant which has been taken on record.

To come up on **16.07.2019 at 11.30 AM.**

**25.06.2019**

**Sd/-  
(Yashvir Mahajan)  
State Information Commissioner**





Sh. Ranjit Singh,  
S/o Sh. Rewal Singh,  
R/o #63, Phase-3B-1,  
SAS Nagar. 160059.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Block Development and Panchayat Officer,  
Block Nadala,  
Distt. Kapurthala.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o District Development and Panchayat Officer,  
Distt. Kapurthala.

Respondents

**Appeal Case No.647/2019**

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA	Date of Second Appeal/ Complaint
08.10.2018	Nil	09.11.2018	Nil	08.02.2019

**Present:** Sh. Ranjit Singh, Appellant in person.  
Sh.Yousaf Masih, Panchayat Secretary is present for Respondents.

**ORDER**

The following order was passed on 16.05.2019:-

04.042019

*"The appellant had sought an information about the resolutions passed, the streets and drains constructed from a grant of Rs. 8 lakh received by the gram panchayat of Village Saintpur, Block Nadala, District Kapurthala and other connected information.*

*Sh. Yusuf Masih, Panchayat Secretary appearing on behalf of the respondents, denies having received any such grant. The appellant refutes his contention. He has produced a document duly attested by the BDPO, Nadala which refers to a grant of Rs. 8 lakh in respect of the aforesaid village. However, in what context this figure appears, is not clear. The respondents allude it to a demand forwarded to the Government which as yet has not fructified. They are advised to file a written reply in this regard.*

*The Commission feels that in case no grant has been received obviously the rest of the information sought is redundant and cannot be provided. The appellant may like to advert in writing on the submissions made by the respondents before the next date of hearing".*

.....2



-2-

**Appeal Case No.647/2019**

16.05.2019

*The case is again being considered today.*

*The respondents are absent. The Commission believes that they are deployed on election duty. However, it takes a strong exception against the respondents for having failed to file a written reply. They are directed to do the same well before the next date of hearing and come present along with the original record on the issue”.*

The case has again come up today. After hearing the parties, the order is reserved. To be pronounced on **08.08.2019 at 11.30 AM.**

**25.06.2019**

**Sd/-  
( Yashvir Mahajan )  
State Information Commissioner**



Er. R.C.Tondon  
# 146, Urban Estate,  
Phagwara.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o Jalandhar Development Authority,  
Jalandhar.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o Additional Chief Administrator,  
Jalandhar Development Authority,  
Jalandhar.

Respondents

**Appeal Case No.2428/2018**

Date of RTI Application	Date of Reply, if any of SPIO	Date of First Appeal made, if any	Date of order, if any of FAA	Date of Second Appeal/ Complaint
26.02.2018	Nil	03.04.2018	Nil	18.05.2018

**Present:** Er.R.C. Tandon, Appellant in person  
Shri Sanjeev Sharma, SDO, JDA Jalandhar/ PIO.

**ORDER**

This case has been committed to this bench on transfer from the bench of Sh. Khushwant Singh Ld. SIC by the order of the CIC on 30.04.2019. It shall be pertinent to reproduce the last order passed by the Ld. Commissioner, so as to see the things in prospective:

*"The case was first heard The case was first heard on 29.10.2018. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant on 24.09.2018. The appellant was not satisfied and informed that certain measurements are not mentioned in the dimensional plan. The PIO was directed to provide the complete dimensions and also provide the area allowed to be covered under the Rule as well as copy of said rule to the appellant.*

*The case was again heard on 04.12.2018. Sh.Gaurav Mahajan, APIO was present. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been sent to the appellant through registered post. The appellant was absent. The appellant was directed to point out the discrepancies, if any to the PIO and be present on the next date of hearing. The PIO was directed to remove the discrepancies.*

*The case was last heard on 30.01.2019. The order is reproduced hereunder:*

*"The appellant is absent and vide email has sought adjournment. The appellant has further informed that it has not received the information that was sent by the PIO through regd. letter. Contrary to the earlier claim that they have sent the information through registered post, the*



**Appeal Case No.2428/2018**

*respondent present informed that the information was received by Sh.Sukhjinder Singh on behalf of the appellatant. It is a clear case of misleading the court by the APIO claiming at the last hearing, that the information was sent through registered post.*

*The Commission has taken a serious view on this and directs the APIO to explain on this contrary statement. The Commission also directs the PIO to send the information again through registered post within 2 days of the receipt of the order.*

*The Commission also observed that the appellatant was not satisfied with the information sent on 24.09.2018 with a delay of seven months. The PIO to also explain the reasons for delay in attending to the RTI application.*

***Hearing dated 19.03.2019:***

*The respondent present informed that the information has been provided to the appellatant. The appellatant stated that the documents provided by the PIO are not certified and the PIO has not provided the area allowed to be covered under the Rule as well as copy of said rule as per order of the Commission. Having gone through the RTI application, the Commission finds that the dimension plan has been provided to the best possible extent. The PIO is however, directed to resend certified copies of the all previous documents which have been sent and to give reply for delay in providing the information.*

*To come up for further hearing on 27.05.2019 at 11.00 AM for further hearing."*

**25.06.2019**

It is suggested that the available information with the respondents has been provided to the appellatant. The appellatant admits having received it. However, he is questioning the validity of some decisions in terms of rules and laws applicable in the case. This is not within the domain of this forum to examine legality of the decisions. The information has been provided to the appellatant on copious occasions. It is learnt that he had been an employee of the respondent Institution and nurses a grievance. RTI is not the forum to settle one's personal scores. The Commission is convinced that he has been sufficiently informed. No more action is called for. The appeal is **disposed**.

**Sd/-**

**25.06.2019**

**(Yashvir Mahajan)  
State Information Commissioner**

