



Sh Naresh Sakhri,  
H No-1906/89, Street N0-1-B,  
Basant Nagar, Near Baghi Stand,  
New Shimlapuri, Ludhiana.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
DCP,  
Ludhiana.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
Police Commissioner,  
Ludhiana.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 3177 of 2018**

**Present: Sh.Naresh Sekhri as Appellant**  
**Sh.Dev Raj, Inspector, O/o DCP Ludhiana for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The case was first heard on 05.12.2018. The respondent present submitted a letter of the PIO dated 30.11.2018 stating that the enquiry is pending with ADCP, Security Ludhiana and the appellant has been informed vide letter dated 27.08.2018. The PIO further stated in the letter that since the enquiry is pending, the information cannot be provided as per section 8(1) of the RTI Act.

Having gone through the RTI application and the reply of the PIO, the PIO was directed to provide information regarding points 1,2 &3. Regarding the information relating to points 4 & 5, the PIO to provide reasons for denial and explain how the information will interrupt the investigation process. The PIO was also directed to provide the information within 15 days and send compliance report to the Commission

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

“The respondent present pleaded that the information regarding points 1 & 2 has been provided and since the enquiry is pending, the information on remaining points cannot be provided u/s 8(1) (h) of the RTI Act. The respondent further informed that the reply was sent to the appellant vide letter dated 07.06.2018 and letter dated 27.08.2018. The appellant claims that he has received the information on point-1 but is not satisfied with the reply of the PIO regarding remaining points. The appellant further claims that he did not receive the letter dated 07.06.2018 which clearly shows malafide on the part of the PIO.

Having gone through the RTI application and the reply of the PIO, the Commission directs the respondent to provide following information to the appellant:

1. Mobile number of the investigating officer regarding point No.2
2. Copy of summons issued to the complainant regarding point No.3
3. Statement of complainant regarding point No.4

Regarding delay in attending to the RTI application, the respondent pleaded that the RTI application was attended on time and the reply to the RTI application was sent to the appellant on 07.06.2018. However, on inspection of the documents, it was observed that the PIO has not listed complete address on the envelope. The appellant claims that this has been done intentionally and incomplete address has been put on the envelope.

**Appeal Case No. 3177 of 2018**

The Commission wants to ascertain whether the incomplete address was written with a malafide intention or was it an error and hereby directs the PIO to submit a reply about this fact on an affidavit.”

**Hearing dated 27.02.2019:**

The respondent present has brought the information as per earlier order of the Commission and handed over to the appellant. Regarding delay in attending to the RTI application, the respondent has submitted an affidavit explaining the reasons for delay which is accepted.

Since the information has been provided, no further course of action is required. The case is **disposed off and closed**.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 27.02.2019**

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

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden, Sector 16, Chandigarh.**  
Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - [sicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:sicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in)  
Visit us: - [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)



Sh.Paramjeet Singh, S/o Sh.Jarnail Singh,  
Ward No-27, Street No-11, Devindra Road,  
Malout, Distt Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

.

Versus

... Appellant

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

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

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 1793 of 2018**

**Present: Sh.Paramjeet Singh as Appellant**  
**Sh.Lalit Kishore Ghai, Assistant Director-cum-PIO for the Respondent**

**ORDER:** The case was first heard on **28.08.2018**. The respondent was absent. The PIO was directed to provide the information in accordance with the RTI Act and be present personally on the next date of hearing with explanation for his absence. The PIO was also directed to explain the reasons for not responding the RTI within the time as per the RTI Act.

The case was again heard on **08.10.2018**. The respondent present pleaded that they received the RTI application only on 15.2.2018 from their RTI cell and they have already transferred the application to DEO Ferozepur on 06.03.2018. The respondent further pleaded that DEO Ferozepur has not provided the information.

Having seen the file, it was observed that since the file is being transferred from desk to desk, the PIO was directed to coordinate with the concerned department and send the information to the appellant as per RTI application within 10 days and be present on the next date of hearing with valid explanation for delay in responding to the RTI application.

The case was again heard on **20.11.2018**. The respondent present submitted a letter of the PIO dated 16.11.2018 whereby the PIO informed the appellant that the Deputy Director (Recruitment) who was appointed as enquiry office for conducting enquiry of Sh.Harpal Singh, Math Teacher, has submitted his enquiry report which is pending for further action. The appellant was not satisfied with the reply of the PIO. The PIO is directed to relook at the RTI application and provide the point-wise information to the appellant within 15 days. The PIO was also directed to be present personally on the next date of hearing with valid explanation for delay in responding to the RTI application.

The case was last heard on **05.02.2019**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The case has come up for hearing today through **video conference facility** available in the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Shri Mukatsar Sahib. The Commission has received a copy of letter diary No.26336 on 21.12.2018 from the PIO vide which the PIO has sent following reply to the appellant:

- Point-a Information provided.
- Point-b The name of Sh.Harpal Singh is not mentioned in the general category list of selection branch.
- Point- c to j Not available in the record

The appellant informed that he wants the merit list of the appointment. From the letter of the PIO that Sh.Harpal Singh, Math teacher has been suspended officially, there appears to be a foul play in the selection of Sh. Harpal Singh.

The PIO is absent and has not filed reply for the delay in attending to the RTI application. The PIO is directed to provide a copy of the merit list which clearly states the teacher selected. The PIO is also directed to be present personally on the next date of hearing with explanation for delay in attending to the RTI application on an affidavit otherwise the Commission will be constrained to take action under the RTI Act.”

**Hearing dated 27.02.2019:**

The respondent pleaded that the information has been provided. The appellant is not satisfied. The appellant reiterates that he wants the merit list of regular appointments of math teachers, which has not been provided in spite of the commission's orders. The respondent is directed, as was in the last order, to provide the merit list of regular appointment of the math teachers of the time period asked by the appellant in the RTI application. To be provided within 5 days of the receipt of the order along with a compliance report to the Commission.

As for the delay in providing the information, the respondent has submitted an affidavit, which is taken on the file of the Commission. The respondent in the affidavit has pleaded that since the large part of the information sought by the appellant was available in the personal file of the concerned employee which remains at the place of posting of individual employee, the RTI application had been transferred to the District Education Officer (SC) Ferozepur on 06.03.2018 with the orders to provide the information.

The respondent further mentioned that delay occurred since the information under the name of Sh. Harpal Singh was found to be suspicious, and after the orders of the commission to provide the information, it was found that the name of Sh.Harpal Singh did not exist in the general category list of selection branch after which he was suspended on 10.12.2018 and the relevant information was sent to the appellant vide letter dated 12.11.2018. The respondent further stated that Sh.B.C.Gupta, a retired Session Judge has hence been appointed on 24.01.2019 to conduct an enquiry as to how Harpal Singh joined as a regular Math teacher despite not being on the merit list.

This has been a unique case where through a RTI application, apparently a scam of someone joining as a regular teacher in a fraudulent manner in Punjab's education department has come to the fore.

Keeping in view the above facts, the Commission is of the view that because of the delay in providing the information the appellant has had to suffer undue inconvenience to get the information and thereby it is a fit case for awarding compensation to the appellant u/s 19(8)(b) of the RTI Act.

The PIO is directed to pay an amount of **Rs.5000/-** via demand draft drawn through Govt. Treasury 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. The PIO is directed to duly inform the Commission of the compliance of the order and submit proof of having compensated the appellant. The appellant is exempted for personal appearance.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing **on 02.04.2019 at 11.00 AM.**

**Sd/-**

**(Khushwant Singh)**

**State Information Commissioner**

**Chandigarh**

**Dated: 27.02.2019**



Sh S.P Goyal, 2-C,  
Sarabha Nagar, Gurudwara Road,  
Ludhiana.

Appellant.

Versus

**Public Information Officer**  
O/o District & Session Judge,  
District Court, Ludhiana.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o District & Session Judge,  
District Court, Ludhiana.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 3271 of 2018**

**Present: Sh.Davinder Pal Singh, Advocate representative for the Appellant**  
**Sh. Om Parkash, Superintendent-cum-PIO O/o District & Session Judge,**  
**District Court, Ludhiana.**

**Order:**

The case was last heard on **28.01.2019**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The appellant through RTI application dated 16.05.2018 has sought information on 3 points regarding dealing of letter No.1461 dated 16.09.2017 of Sh.Jaapinder Singh, CJM Ludhiana, reply of Sh.Jaapinder Singh, CJM letter No.634 dated 19.03.2018 and other information concerning the office of o District & Session Judge, Ludhiana.. The PIO sent reply to the appellant vide letter dated 07.06.2018 as under:

Point No.1 The information being related to judicial functions and duties of the Court is not to be disclosed as per Rule 4(1) of Punjab Subordinate Courts (Right To Information) Rules 2007 and is exempt u/s 8(1)(b) of the RTI Act.

Point No.2&3 - The information already supplied vide letters dated 12.04.2018 & 07.05.2018

The appellant was not satisfied with the reply of the PIO after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 09.06.2018 which disposed off the appeal 16.08.2018 upholding the order of the PIO. The First Appellate Authority further ordered that the appellant may obtain copy of judicial record by applying through copying agency as per rules and orders framed by the Hon'ble High Court of Punjab & Haryana.

The respondent present reiterated the decision of the PIO and the First Appellate Authority.

The appellant is absent and vide email has asked for hearing through Video Conferencing at DC Office, Ludhiana. The case is adjourned.”

**Hearing dated 27.02.2019:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conference facility available in the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Ludhiana.

The Commission observed that the exemptions sought by the PIO in denying the information have not been supported with valid reasons. The Commission also observed that the First Appellate Authority has overlooked the section 22 of the RTI Act while upholding the decision of the PIO for point-1. The information has been rejected by citing rule 4(1) of Punjab Subordinate Courts (Right to Information) Rules 2007. **Section 22 of the RTI Act** expressly provides that the provisions of the **RTI Act** shall have effect notwithstanding anything inconsistent therewith contained in the Official Secrets **Act**, 1923, and any other law for the time being in force or in any instrument having effect by virtue of any law other than the **RTI Act**.

Regarding points 2 & 3 where the respondent has provided partial information and rejected the remaining information by citing that the matter of enquiry is pending, the Commission finds that mere stating that the enquiry is pending is not a valid reason to deny the information. The respondent to clarify that why providing of information will hamper the process of enquiry. The respondent is directed to submit detailed reply on all three points before the next date of hearing.

The case is adjourned. To come up on **24.04.2019 at 11.00 AM** for further hearing.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 27.02.2019**

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

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden, Sector 16, Chandigarh.**  
**Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - [sicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:sicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in)**  
**Visit us: - [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)**



Sh.Arun Garg, S/o Sh Sham Lal,  
# 40-41, Central Town, Village Dad,  
P.O LaltonKalan, Distt Ludhiana.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
Deputy Chief Engineer, DS City West Circle,  
PSPCL, Ludhiana.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
Chief Engineer, DS Central,  
PSPCL, Ludhiana

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 2615 of 2018**

Present: Sh.Arun Garg as Appellant  
Sh.Jaswinder Singh, Addl. SE, O/o Dy. Chief Engineer, PSPCL Ludhiana for the Respondent

**ORDER:** The case was first heard on **30.10.2018**. The respondent present pleaded that the complete information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant was absent and vide email informed that the information which has been provided by the PIO after 9 months of his RTI application is incomplete and incorrect. The PIO was directed to submit explanation with solid reasons for delay in tending to the RTI application on an affidavit. The appellant was directed to point out discrepancy if any and be present on the next date of hearing.

The case was again heard on **04.12.2018**. The respondent present pleaded that the information has already been provided to the appellant. The appellant was absent and vide email pointed out discrepancies in the information provided and a copy of the same was handed over to the respondent to look at it and sort out the discrepancies and provide the information to the best possible extent within 10 days.

The respondent also submitted an affidavit explaining the reasons for delay in attending to the RTI application which was taken on the file of the Commission.

The case was last heard on **23.01.2019**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The respondent present informed that in compliance with the order of the Commission, the available information has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 11.12.2018 and a copy of the same is submitted to the Commission. The appellant is absent and vide email has sought exemption for appearance. The appellant has further informed that the information is incomplete and misleading.

The PIO is directed to send the information once again to the appellant with an affidavit stating that the information provided as per record, is true and correct.”

**Hearing dated 27.02.2019:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conference facility available in the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Ludhiana. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant on 11.12.2018. The appellant stated that the information provided was incomplete since he had sought date-wise action taken on new domestic electric connection application and also the information was provided after filing first appeal. The respondent further informed that in compliance with the order of the Commission, the appellant has also been provided with an affidavit. Having gone through the reply, the Commission directs the PIO to provide complete file of the case from the time of application to the filing of RTI application within 3 days.

**Appeal Case No. 2615 of 2018**

The Commission observed that there has been enormous delay of 9 months in handling the RTI application after which the Commission had asked the PIO to file an affidavit explaining the reasons for delay which he did on 03.12.2018. Having gone through the reply, the Commission observed that the deponent's plea of combining the RTI application and the appellant's complaint for not installation of election connection together is not in order, nor is the PIO's stand of treating a reply to the complaint as a RTI reply. The RTI application has to be dealt with separately and the information has to be provided within 30 days.

Given the above circumstances, the PIO is directed to **show cause why penalty be not imposed on him under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 for not supplying the information within the statutorily prescribed period of time** and for not complying with the order of the Commission, he should file an affidavit in this regard. If there are other persons responsible for the delay in providing the information, the PIO is directed to inform such persons of the show cause and direct them to appear before the Commission along with the written replies. The PIO is also directed to provide information to the appellant within 3 days of the receipt of order.

The PIO in the affidavit has also stated that the appellant has preferred second appeal without filing first appeal. The appellant even though has claimed that he has filed first appeal, the appellant is asked to submit proof of filing first appeal.

To come up for further hearing on **01.04.2019 at 11.00 AM.**

**Sd/-**

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 27.02.2019**

**(Khushwant Singh)**  
**State Information Commissioner**





Sh.Rajinder Kumar,  
Q No-35-L, I.T.I Staff Colony,  
Talwara

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
SDO, PSPCL,  
Sub Division, Haryana,  
DisttHoshiarpur.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
SDO, PSPCL,  
Sub Division, Haryana,  
DisttHoshiarpur.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 3594 of 2018**

**Present:** **Sh.Rajinder Kumar as Appellant'**  
**Sh.Jagdeep Kumar, SDO, PSPCL Haryana, Hoshiarpur for the Respondent**

**Order:** The case was last heard on **04.02.2019**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The appellant through RTI application dated 04.05.2018 has sought information on 5 points regarding electric meter installed in the name of Sh.Balwinder Singh s/o late Sh.Hari Singh and other information concerning the office of PSPCL Sub Division Haryana, Distt.Hoshiarpur. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal with the First Appellate Authority on 12.06.2018. After filing appeal, the PIO sent reply to the appellant vide letter dated 18.06.2018 whereby the PIO denied the information stating that the information is 3<sup>rd</sup> party and it cannot be provided. The First Appellate Authority also disposed off the appeal on 05.10.2018 upholding the PIO's decision.

The respondent present pleaded that since the information is 3<sup>rd</sup> party, it cannot be provided.

Having gone through the RTI application, the Commission directs the PIO to provide information regarding points 2. Rest of the points will be adjudicated at the next date of hearing.”

**Hearing dated 27.02.2019:**

The case has come up for hearing through video conference facility available in the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Hoshiarpur. The respondent informed that as per order of the Commission, the information regarding point-2 has been provided. Regarding information on point-1, the respondent has denied the information stating that the information is 3<sup>rd</sup> party and it cannot be provided.

**Appeal Case No. 3594 of 2018**

Before adjudicating the case, a reasonable opportunity is granted to the 3<sup>rd</sup> party under section 19(4) of the RTI Act and Sh.Baljinder Singh is hereby impleaded as a party to the case. If Sh.Baljinder Singh wants to plead the case, he should appear before the Commission on the next date of hearing. The PIO is also directed to provide information regarding point-4 to the appellant.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing **on 06.05.2019 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Hoshiarpur. Copies of the order be sent to the parties ***through registered post.***

Chandigarh  
Dated: 27.02.2019

Sd/-  
(Khushwant Singh)  
State Information Commissioner

CC to Sh.Baljinder Singh S/o Sh.Hari Singh Saini,  
Village Bassi Mudda, P.O.Baghpur,  
District Hoshiarpur (M-81462-23964)



Sh.Simranjit Singh, S/o ShJagdish Singh,  
# 93/2, Adarsh Nagar, Jalandhar

Versus

Appellant.

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

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o Jalandhar Development Authority,  
Jalandhar.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 3673 of 2018**

**Present: Sh.Simranjit Singh as Appellant**  
**Sh.Chander Shekhar, Superintendent O/o JDA Jalandhar for the**  
**Respondent**

**Order:** The case was last heard on **04.20.2019**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The appellant through RTI application dated 14.07.2018 has sought information on 5 points regarding details of vehicles authorized to Chief Administrator PUDA/JDA alongwith log book and other information concerning the office of Jalandhar Development Authority, Jalandhar. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal with the First Appellate Authority on 14.08.2018. After filing first appeal, the PIO sent reply to the appellant vide letter dated 18.10.2018. On being not satisfied with the reply of the PIO, the appellant filed 2<sup>nd</sup> appeal in the Commission on 30.10.2018.

The respondent present pleaded that the information regarding point 1 has been provided and since the information sought regarding other points is not clear, it cannot be provided.

Having gone through the RTI application and the reply of the PIO, the Commission directs the appellant to clarify for which vehicle the information is being sought as well as to specify the period from which day and year, the information is being sought.”

**Hearing dated 27.02.2019:**

The case has come up for hearing through video conference facility available in the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Jalandhar. The appellant informed that he has specified the vehicle and period from which the information is being sought. The respondent pleaded that the appellant has provided the date today only. The PIO is directed to provide the information within 5 days and send a compliance report to the Commission.

To come up for further hearing on **06.05.2019 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Jalandhar. Copies of the order be sent to the parties **through registered post**.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 27.02.2019**

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



Sh Thakar Dass, S/o Sh Guranditta Mal,  
R/o Village Diwan Khera, Tehsil Abohar,  
Distt Fazilka..

...Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o SDM, Abohar,  
Distt Fazilka.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o DC,  
Fazilka.

...Respondent

**Appellant Case No. 3475 of 2018**

**Present: Sh.Thakar Dass as Appellant**  
**Sh.Deepak Kumar, Clerk O/o SDM Abohar for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The case was last heard on **09.01.2019**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The appellant through RTI application dated 03.04.2018 has sought information regarding reasons for not taking action taken on the application dated 23.07.2015 which was forwarded by the Deputy Commissioner Fazilka to SDM Abohar and other information concerning the office of SDM Abohar. The appellant was not provided the information after after which he filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 28.06.2018 which took no decision on the appeal.

The respondent present pleaded that he has brought some information and handed over to the appellant. The appellant has received the same. The respondent further pleaded that the remaining information shall be provided to the appellant. The appellant pleaded that he had filed RTI application in the month of April whereas the respondent is providing the information after a delay of 9 months.

The PIO is directed to explain the reasons for delay in providing the information on an affidavit. If there is any other official involved in the delay, that person to appear and explain the reasons.”

**Hearing dated 27.02.2019:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conference facility available in the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Fazilka. The respondent present pleaded that the information has already been provided to the appellant during the last hearing . The appellant is not satisfied and informed that the PIO vide his letter dated 18.10.2018 has denied the information stating that the information sought is in question form. The appellant further informed that the information has been provided after a period of 9 months.

**Appellant Case No. 3475 of 2018**

Having gone through the RTI application and hearing both the parties, the Commission finds that the RTI application has been replied to the best possible extent. However, the Commission observed that there has been enormous delay of nine months in providing the information. In the last hearing, the PIO was directed to explain the reasons for delay in providing the information. The PIO is absent and has not complied with the order of the Commission.

The Commission has taken a serious view of this and hereby directs the PIO-SDM Abohar to **show cause why penalty be not imposed on him under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 for not supplying the information within the statutorily prescribed period of time** and for not complying with the order of the Commission, he should file an affidavit in this regard. If there are other persons responsible for the delay in providing the information, the PIO is directed to inform such persons of the show cause and direct them to appear before the Commission along with the written replies.

To come up for further hearing **on 06.05.2019 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Fazilka. The PIO to be present at Chandigarh. Copies of the order be sent to the parties ***through registered post.***

**Sd/-**

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 27.02.2019.**

**(Khushwant Singh)**  
**State Information Commissioner**



Sh Thakar Dass, S/o Sh Guranditta Mal,  
R/o Village Diwan Khera, Tehsil Abohar,  
Distt Fazilka..

....Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o SDM, Abohar,  
Distt Fazilka.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o DC,  
Fazilka.

...Respondent

**Appellant Case No. 3474 of 2018**

**Present: Sh.Thakar Dass as Appellant**  
**Sh.Deepak Kumar, Clerk O/o SDM Abohar for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The case was last heard on **09.01.2019**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

The appellant through RTI application dated 03.04.2018 has sought information regarding action taken on his application submitted during a camp at Abohar which was forwarded by the Hon'ble Judge, Ferozepur vide their letter No.104 dated 19.07.2016 to the office of PIO and other information concerning the office of SDM Abohar. The appellant was not provided the information after after which he filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 28.06.2018 which took no decision on the appeal.

The respondent present pleaded that he has brought some information and handed over to the appellant. The appellant has received the same. The respondent further pleaded that the remaining information shall be provided to the appellant. The appellant pleaded that he had filed RTI application in the month of April whereas the respondent is providing the information after a delay of 9 months.

The PIO is directed to explain the reasons for delay in providing the information on an affidavit. If there is any other official involved in the delay, that person to appear and explain the reasons. “

**Hearing dated 27.02.2019:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conference facility available in the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Fazilka. The respondent present pleaded that the information has already been provided to the appellant during the last hearing . The respondent further informed that as per order of the Commission, remaining information was sent to the appellant vide letter dated 11.01.2019. The appellant is not satisfied with the information. The appellant further informed that the information has been provided after a period of 9 months.

Having gone through the RTI application and hearing both the parties, the Commission finds that the RTI application has been replied to the best possible extent. However, the Commission observed that there has been enormous delay of nine months in providing the information. In the last hearing, the PIO was directed to explain the reasons for delay in providing the information. The PIO is absent and has not complied with the order of the Commission.

**Appellant Case No. 3474 of 2018**

The Commission has taken a serious view of this and hereby directs the PIO-SDM Abohar to **show cause why penalty be not imposed on him under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 for not supplying the information within the statutorily prescribed period of time** and for not complying with the order of the Commission, he should file an affidavit in this regard. If there are other persons responsible for the delay in providing the information, the PIO is directed to inform such persons of the show cause and direct them to appear before the Commission along with the written replies.

To come up for further hearing **on 06.05.2019 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Fazilka. The PIO to be present at Chandigarh. Copies of the order be sent to the parties ***through registered post.***

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 27.02.2019**

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

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**  
**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden, Sector 16, Chandigarh.**  
**Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - [sicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:sicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in)**  
**Visit us: - [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)**



Sh Tejinder Singh, S/o Sh Manvir Singh,  
Village Khilchiya, Tehsil Baba Bakala Sahib,  
Distt Amritsar..

Appellant.

Versus

**Public Information Officer**  
O/o District Revenue officer,  
Amritsar.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o DC,  
Amritsar.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 3111 of 2018**

**Present: Tejinder Singh as the Appellant**  
**Sh.Jashanjeet Singh DRO Sadar Kanoongo O/o DC Amritsar for the**  
**Respondent**

**Order:**

The case was first heard on 27.11.2018. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant on 22.11.2018. The appellant was not satisfied with the information regarding point No.2 & 5. Regarding point 2, the appellant stated that he has been provided incomplete information as he has received copies of 4 stamp papers of Rs.50/- each(worth Rs.200/-) whereas 6 stamp papers of Rs.50/- each (worth Rs.300/-) were attached with the Ikrinama. The PIO was directed to enquire into the matter and send information accordingly. Regarding point 5, the appellant stated that the copy of rojnamcha is not certified. The PIO was directed to provide certified copy of rojnamcha.

The case was last heard on **23.01.2019**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The appellant is absent and vide letter received in the Commission on 13.12.2018, has informed that the information has not been provided as per the order of the Commission.

The respondent present pleaded that the information regarding point No.5 has been provided to the appellant and a copy of the same is submitted to the Commission. The respondent further pleaded that the information regarding point-2 pertains to the DRO Sadar Kanoongo O/o DC Amritsar.

The PIO-DRO (Sadar Kanoongo), O/o DC Amritsar is directed to clarify regarding point No.2 of the RTI application as the appellant has raised objection that the information is incomplete. A copy of the RTI application is enclosed with the order for the PIO-DRO (Sadar Kanoongo), O/o DC Amritsar.”



**Hearing dated 27.02.2019:**

The respondent present pleaded that the available information has been provided to the appellant. However, the appellant says that he has not received the copy of remaining stamp papers regarding point-1 and regarding point-2, in the copy of rojnamcha, the information that he has sought is not mentioned.

The respondent pleaded that no more stamp papers are available in their record and the particular number that the appellant is asking was not entered by the concerned patwari on that date. The PIO is directed to again provide a certified copy of the rojnamcha to the appellant alongwith a forwarding letter mentioning that this particular number was not entered in the rojnamcha on that particular date. The information be provided within 4 days.

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

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 27.02.2019**

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

**CC to: PIO-DRO (Sadar Kanoongo), O/o DC Amritsar**



Sh. Ram Murti, S/o Sh Jaswant Rai,  
Sandhu Colony, H No-77,  
Village Malak Nangar, Tehsil Baba Bakala ,  
Distt Amritsar.

... Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o SDO, PSPCL,  
Mehta Chowk, Amritsar.

...Respondent

**Complaint Case No. 1125 of 2018**

**Present: Sh.Ram Murti as the Complainant**  
**Sh.Ramesh Kumar, SDO, PSPCL Mehta Chowk, Amritsar for the**  
**Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The case was last heard on **14.01.2019**. The order is reproduced hereunder:

“The complainant through RTI application dated 04.09.2018 has sought information regarding action taken on the application dated 11.06.2018 and other information concerning the office of SDO PSPCL Mehta Chowk, Amritsar. The complainant was not provided the information after which he filed complaint with the Commission on 15.10. 2018.

The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the complainant vide letter dated 06.12.2018 and the copy of the same is submitted to the Commission. The complainant is absent and vide letter received in the Commission on 11.01.2019, informed that the information has not been provided by the PIO. The Commission finds that the PIO has not handled the RTI application properly and there is a delay of 3 months in attending to the RTI application. The PIO is directed to explain the reasons for delay in attending to the RTI application.”

**Hearing dated 27.02.2019:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conference facility available in the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Amritsar.

The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the complainant.

In the last hearing, the PIO was directed to explain the reasons for delay in attending to the RTI application which he did not. The PIO is directed to be present on the next date of hearing and submit solid reasons for delay in attending to the RTI application on an affidavit.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **06.05.2019 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of **Deputy Commissoiner, Amritsar**. Copies of the order be sent to the parties **through registered post**.