



Sh. Harmesh Singh, (9478270210)

S/o Sh. Ram Chand, R/o Village Bhalmajra,
Tehsil & Distt Fatehgarh Sahib.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o Block Development and Panchayat Officer, Block Sirhind,
Tehsil & Distt Fatehgarh Sahib.

.....Respondent

Complaint Case No.278 of 2021
(Cisco Webex Proceedings)

RTI application filed on : 22-08-2019
PIO replied on : -

Present: Complainant: Sh.Harmesh Singh
Respondent: Sh. Rajinder Singh (Panchayat Secy.)

ORDER:

1. The Complainant filed above mentioned complaint cases in the Commission dated 04.03.2021. Accordingly, the cases are fixed for today.
2. The complainant has approached the Commission under the provision of Section 18 of the RTI Act, 2005, no directions for providing further information can be given by the Commission.

In complaint case under Section 18 of the RTI Act , 2005, the Commissioners have no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for an access to the information which is as under:- (31. We uphold the said contention and do not find any error in the impugned judgment of the High Court whereby it has been held that the Commissioner while entertaining a complaint under Section 18 of the said Act has no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for access to the information).

3. Since there is an alternative and efficacious remedy of first appeal available to the Complainant under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, which has not been availed in the instant case and the First Appellate Authority has not had the occasion to review the decision of the PIO, as envisaged under the RTI Act by passing a detailed well reasoned speaking order.
4. If, however, the complainant does not feel satisfied with the decision of the First Appellate Authority, he will be at liberty to file a Second Appeal before the Commission under Section 19(3) of the RTI Act, 2005.
5. In view of the observations noted above, the instant case is remanded to the concerned First Appellate Authority cum O/o District Manager, Markfed, Sangrur along with a copy of RTI application for their ready reference.

The appeal is disposed off accordingly, with the above observations.

Chandigarh
Dated: 26.07.2021

Sd/-
(Maninder Singh Patti)
State Information Commissioner, Pb.



Sh. Sushil Kumar Retd. AE, (9814500575)

House No 1410, Phase-I, Urban Estate, Dugri Road,
Ludhiana-141013.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o Police Commissioner,
Ludhiana.

.....Respondent

Complaint Case No.283 of 2021
(Cisco Webex Proceedings)

RTI application filed on : 24-11-2020
PIO replied on : -

Present: Complainant: Sh.Sushil Kumar
Respondent: Sh. Ramesh Kumar (ASI)

ORDER:

1. The Appellant/Complainant filed above mentioned appeal/complaint cases in the Commission dated 04.03.2021. Accordingly, the cases are fixed for today.
2. The complainant has approached the Commission under the provision of Section 18 of the RTI Act, 2005, no directions for providing further information can be given by the Commission.

In complaint case under Section 18 of the RTI Act , 2005, the Commissioners have no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for an access to the information which is as under:- (31. We uphold the said contention and do not find any error in the impugned judgment of the High Court whereby it has been held that the Commissioner while entertaining a complaint under Section 18 of the said Act has no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for access to the information).

3. Since there is an alternative and efficacious remedy of first appeal available to the Complainant under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, which has not been availed in the instant case and the First Appellate Authority has not had the occasion to review the decision of the PIO, as envisaged under the RTI Act by passing a detailed well reasoned speaking order.
4. If, however, the complainant does not feel satisfied with the decision of the First Appellate Authority, he will be at liberty to file a Second Appeal before the Commission under Section 19(3) of the RTI Act, 2005.
5. In view of the observations noted above, the instant case is remanded to the concerned First Appellate Authority cum O/o District Manager, Markfed, Sangrur along with a copy of RTI application for their ready reference.

The appeal is disposed off accordingly, with the above observations.

Chandigarh
Dated: 26.07.2021

Sd/-
(Maninder Singh Patti)
State Information Commissioner, Pb.



Sh. Navpreet Singh, (8437919376)

S/o Sh. Sukhdev Singh, R/o H No 243, Street No 3,
Mohalla Nanaksar, Tedi Road, Shimlapuri,
Distt Ludhiana.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o Police Commissioner,
Ludhiana.

.....Respondent

Complaint Case No.285 of 2021
(Cisco Webex Proceedings)

RTI application filed on : 16-12-2020
PIO replied on : -

Present: Complainant: Sh.Navpreet Singh
Respondent: Sh.Ramesh Kumar (ASI)

ORDER:

1. The Appellant/Complainant filed above mentioned appeal/complaint cases in the Commission dated 05.03.2021. Accordingly, the cases are fixed for today.
2. The complainant has approached the Commission under the provision of Section 18 of the RTI Act, 2005, no directions for providing further information can be given by the Commission.

In complaint case under Section 18 of the RTI Act , 2005, the Commissioners have no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for an access to the information which is as under:- (31. We uphold the said contention and do not find any error in the impugned judgment of the High Court whereby it has been held that the Commissioner while entertaining a complaint under Section 18 of the said Act has no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for access to the information).

3. Since there is an alternative and efficacious remedy of first appeal available to the Complainant under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, which has not been availed in the instant case and the First Appellate Authority has not had the occasion to review the decision of the PIO, as envisaged under the RTI Act by passing a detailed well reasoned speaking order.
4. If, however, the complainant does not feel satisfied with the decision of the First Appellate Authority, he will be at liberty to file a Second Appeal before the Commission under Section 19(3) of the RTI Act, 2005.
5. In view of the observations noted above, the instant case is remanded to the concerned First Appellate Authority cum O/o District Manager, Markfed, Sangrur along with a copy of RTI application for their ready reference.

The appeal is disposed off accordingly, with the above observations.

Chandigarh
Dated: 26.07.2021

Sd/-
(Maninder Singh Patti)
State Information Commissioner, Pb.



Sh. Sawinder Singh, (9814824772; 9417924772)

S/o Sh. Bal Singh, VPO Shutrana, Tehsil Patran,
Distt Patiala-147105.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o Block Development and Panchayat Officer, Patran,
Distt Patiala.

.....Respondent

Complaint Case No.286 of 2021
(Cisco Webex Proceedings)

RTI application filed on : 12-01-2021
PIO replied on : -

Present: Complainant: Sh.Sawinder Singh
Respondent: Absent

ORDER:

1. The Appellant/Complainant filed above mentioned appeal/complaint cases in the Commission dated 05.03.2021. Accordingly, the cases are fixed for today.
2. The complainant has approached the Commission under the provision of Section 18 of the RTI Act, 2005, no directions for providing further information can be given by the Commission.

In complaint case under Section 18 of the RTI Act , 2005, the Commissioners have no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for an access to the information which is as under:- (31. We uphold the said contention and do not find any error in the impugned judgment of the High Court whereby it has been held that the Commissioner while entertaining a complaint under Section 18 of the said Act has no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for access to the information).

3. Since there is an alternative and efficacious remedy of first appeal available to the Complainant under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, which has not been availed in the instant case and the First Appellate Authority has not had the occasion to review the decision of the PIO, as envisaged under the RTI Act by passing a detailed well reasoned speaking order.
4. If, however, the complainant does not feel satisfied with the decision of the First Appellate Authority, he will be at liberty to file a Second Appeal before the Commission under Section 19(3) of the RTI Act, 2005.
5. In view of the observations noted above, the instant case is remanded to the concerned First Appellate Authority cum O/o District Manager, Markfed, Sangrur along with a copy of RTI application for their ready reference.

The appeal is disposed off accordingly, with the above observations.

Chandigarh
Dated: 26.07.2021

Sd/-
(Maninder Singh Patti)
State Information Commissioner, Pb.



Sh. Kartar Singh, (8699734319)

S/o Sh. Krishan Singh, Ward No 16,
Sukhrampur Tapria, Distt Roopnagar.

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o Block Development and Panchayat Officer, Patran,
Distt Patiala.

.....Appellant/Complainant

.....Respondent

Complaint Case No.287 of 2021
(Cisco Webex Proceedings)

RTI application filed on : 26-07-2020
PIO replied on : 25-02-2021

Present: Complainant: Sh.Kartar Singh
Respondent: Absent

ORDER:

1. The Appellant/Complainant filed above mentioned appeal/complaint cases in the Commission dated 05.03.2021. Accordingly, the cases are fixed for today.
2. The complainant has approached the Commission under the provision of Section 18 of the RTI Act, 2005, no directions for providing further information can be given by the Commission.

In complaint case under Section 18 of the RTI Act , 2005, the Commissioners have no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for an access to the information which is as under:- (31. We uphold the said contention and do not find any error in the impugned judgment of the High Court whereby it has been held that the Commissioner while entertaining a complaint under Section 18 of the said Act has no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for access to the information).

3. Since there is an alternative and efficacious remedy of first appeal available to the Complainant under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, which has not been availed in the instant case and the First Appellate Authority has not had the occasion to review the decision of the PIO, as envisaged under the RTI Act by passing a detailed well reasoned speaking order.
4. If, however, the complainant does not feel satisfied with the decision of the First Appellate Authority, he will be at liberty to file a Second Appeal before the Commission under Section 19(3) of the RTI Act, 2005.
5. In view of the observations noted above, the instant case is remanded to the concerned First Appellate Authority cum O/o District Manager, Markfed, Sangrur along with a copy of RTI application for their ready reference.

The appeal is disposed off accordingly, with the above observations.

Chandigarh
Dated: 26.07.2021

Sd/-
(Maninder Singh Patti)
State Information Commissioner, Pb.



Sh. Balvir Singh, (8872056100)

S/o S. Bhag Singh, House No 47, Phase 3,
Aman Park, Ludhiana.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o Managing Director, Milkfed, Punjab,
Sector -34 A, Chandigarh.

.....Respondent

Complaint Case No.297 of 2021
(Cisco Webex Proceedings)

RTI application filed on : 27-01-2021
PIO replied on : -

Present: Complainant: Sh. Balvir Singh
Respondent: Absent

ORDER:

1. The Appellant/Complainant filed above mentioned appeal/complaint cases in the Commission dated 09.03.2021. Accordingly, the cases are fixed for today.
2. The complainant has approached the Commission under the provision of Section 18 of the RTI Act, 2005, no directions for providing further information can be given by the Commission.

In complaint case under Section 18 of the RTI Act , 2005, the Commissioners have no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for an access to the information which is as under:- (31. We uphold the said contention and do not find any error in the impugned judgment of the High Court whereby it has been held that the Commissioner while entertaining a complaint under Section 18 of the said Act has no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for access to the information).

3. Since there is an alternative and efficacious remedy of first appeal available to the Complainant under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, which has not been availed in the instant case and the First Appellate Authority has not had the occasion to review the decision of the PIO, as envisaged under the RTI Act by passing a detailed well reasoned speaking order.
4. If, however, the complainant does not feel satisfied with the decision of the First Appellate Authority, he will be at liberty to file a Second Appeal before the Commission under Section 19(3) of the RTI Act, 2005.
5. In view of the observations noted above, the instant case is remanded to the concerned First Appellate Authority cum O/o District Manager, Milkfed, Sangrur along with a copy of RTI application for their ready reference.

The appeal is disposed off accordingly, with the above observations.

Chandigarh
Dated: 26.07.2021

Sd/-
(Maninder Singh Patti)
State Information Commissioner, Pb.



Sh. Balvir Singh, (8872056100)

S/o S. Bhag Singh, House No 47, Phase 3,
Aman Park, Ludhiana.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o Managing Director, Milkfed, Punjab,
Sector -34 A, Chandigarh.

.....Respondent

Complaint Case No.314 of 2021
(Cisco Webex Proceedings)

RTI application filed on : 28-01-2021

PIO replied on : 17-02-2021

Present: Complainant: Sh. Balvir Singh
Respondent: Absent

ORDER:

1. The Appellant/Complainant filed above mentioned appeal/complaint cases in the Commission dated 10.03.2021. Accordingly, the cases are fixed for today.
2. The complainant has approached the Commission under the provision of Section 18 of the RTI Act, 2005, no directions for providing further information can be given by the Commission.

In complaint case under Section 18 of the RTI Act, 2005, the Commissioners have no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for an access to the information which is as under:- (31. We uphold the said contention and do not find any error in the impugned judgment of the High Court whereby it has been held that the Commissioner while entertaining a complaint under Section 18 of the said Act has no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for access to the information).

3. Since there is an alternative and efficacious remedy of first appeal available to the Complainant under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, which has not been availed in the instant case and the First Appellate Authority has not had the occasion to review the decision of the PIO, as envisaged under the RTI Act by passing a detailed well reasoned speaking order.
4. If, however, the complainant does not feel satisfied with the decision of the First Appellate Authority, he will be at liberty to file a Second Appeal before the Commission under Section 19(3) of the RTI Act, 2005.
5. In view of the observations noted above, the instant case is remanded to the concerned First Appellate Authority cum O/o District Manager, Milkfed, Sangrur along with a copy of RTI application for their ready reference.

The appeal is disposed off accordingly, with the above observations.

Chandigarh
Dated: 26.07.2021

Sd/-
(Maninder Singh Patti)
State Information Commissioner, Pb.



Sh. Gurvinder Singh, (9876330777)
HIG 669-B/ 9 , Phase II (XI),
Mohali-160062.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer
O/o RCS, Cooperative Society, Punjab,
Sector 17, Chandigarh.

.....Respondent

Complaint Case No.301 of 2021
(Cisco Webex Proceedings)

RTI application filed on : 14-10-2020
PIO replied on : -

Present: Complainant: Sh.Gurvinder Singh
Respondent: Sh. Luvjeet Singh (Inspector), 7837050300

ORDER:

1. The Appellant/Complainant filed above mentioned appeal/complaint cases in the Commission dated 09.03.2021. Accordingly, the cases are fixed for today.
2. The complainant has approached the Commission under the provision of Section 18 of the RTI Act, 2005, no directions for providing further information can be given by the Commission.

In complaint case under Section 18 of the RTI Act , 2005, the Commissioners have no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for an access to the information which is as under:- (31. We uphold the said contention and do not find any error in the impugned judgment of the High Court whereby it has been held that the Commissioner while entertaining a complaint under Section 18 of the said Act has no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for access to the information).

3. Since there is an alternative and efficacious remedy of first appeal available to the Complainant under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, which has not been availed in the instant case and the First Appellate Authority has not had the occasion to review the decision of the PIO, as envisaged under the RTI Act by passing a detailed well reasoned speaking order.
4. If, however, the complainant does not feel satisfied with the decision of the First Appellate Authority, he will be at liberty to file a Second Appeal before the Commission under Section 19(3) of the RTI Act, 2005.
5. In view of the observations noted above, the instant case is remanded to the concerned First Appellate Authority cum O/o District Manager, Markfed, Sangrur along with a copy of RTI application for their ready reference.

The appeal is disposed off accordingly, with the above observations.

Chandigarh
Dated: 26.07.2021

Sd/-
(Maninder Singh Patti)
State Information Commissioner, Pb.



Sh. Gurvinder Singh, (9876330777)

HIG 669-B/ 9 , Phase II (XI),
Mohali-160062.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o Chief Auditor , Cooperative Society, Punjab,
Sector -34, Chandigarh.

.....Respondent

Complaint Case No.303 of 2021
(Cisco Webex Proceedings)

RTI application filed on : 14-10-2020
PIO replied on : -

Present: Complainant: Sh.Gurvinder Singh
Respondent: Absent

ORDER:

1. The Appellant/Complainant filed above mentioned appeal/complaint cases in the Commission dated 10.03.2021. Accordingly, the cases are fixed for today.
2. The complainant has approached the Commission under the provision of Section 18 of the RTI Act, 2005, no directions for providing further information can be given by the Commission.

In complaint case under Section 18 of the RTI Act , 2005, the Commissioners have no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for an access to the information which is as under:- (31. We uphold the said contention and do not find any error in the impugned judgment of the High Court whereby it has been held that the Commissioner while entertaining a complaint under Section 18 of the said Act has no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for access to the information).

3. Since there is an alternative and efficacious remedy of first appeal available to the Complainant under Section 19(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, which has not been availed in the instant case and the First Appellate Authority has not had the occasion to review the decision of the PIO, as envisaged under the RTI Act by passing a detailed well reasoned speaking order.
4. If, however, the complainant does not feel satisfied with the decision of the First Appellate Authority, he will be at liberty to file a Second Appeal before the Commission under Section 19(3) of the RTI Act, 2005.
5. In view of the observations noted above, the instant case is remanded to the concerned First Appellate Authority cum O/o District Manager, Markfed, Sangrur along with a copy of RTI application for their ready reference.

The appeal is disposed off accordingly, with the above observations.

Chandigarh
Dated: 26.07.2021

Sd/-
(Maninder Singh Patti)
State Information Commissioner, Pb.