



Sh. Iqbal Singh, (7015132542)

S/o Sh. Ujagar Singh,
Village Bangi Nihal Singh, Distt Bathinda.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o Assistant Registrar,
Cooperative Societies, Talwandi Saboo,
Bathinda.

.....Respondent

Complaint Case No.127 of 2021
(Cisco Webex Proceedings)

RTI application filed on : 10-07-2020

PIO replied on : -

Present: None

ORDER:

1. The Appellant/Complainant filed above mentioned appeal/complaint cases in the Commission dated 22.01.2021. Accordingly, the cases are fixed for today.
2. **Written Submission by Respondent:** An email dated 26.04.2021 is received by the bench of undersigned vide which the complainant's representative Sh. Nirmal Singh has acknowledged that the sought information has been provided to him and is satisfied with the same. This email is taken on record.
3. As the information stands supplied therefore, no cause of action is required in this case. Hence, the instant complaint case is **disposed & closed**.

Chandigarh
Dated: 27.04.2021

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



Sh. Nitin Kumar Garg, (7814322100)

C/o Police Public Dairy, 15 A,
Shastari Nagar, Model Town, Ludhiana.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer

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

.....Respondent

First Appellate Authority

O/o District Development and Panchayat Officer,
Patiala.

Appeal Case No.549 of 2021
(Cisco Webex Proceedings)

RTI application filed on	:	10-11-2020
PIO replied on	:	-
First appeal filed on	:	14-10-2020
First Appellate Authority order	:	18-11-2020

Present: Appellant: Sh. Nitin Kumar Garg

Respondent: Sh. Sharanpreet Singh (SDE), 9417750447

ORDER:

1. The Appellant/Complainant filed above mentioned appeal/complaint cases in the Commission dated 15.01.2021. Accordingly, the cases are fixed for today.
2. Both the parties are present. Appellant, Sh. Nitin Kumar Garg stated that partial information has been supplied so far. However, Respondent Sh. Sharanpreet Singh pleaded that sought information has already been provided to the appellant and no any other information pertaining to this is available in the office record.
3. After hearing both the parties and going through the records placed in the case file, the Commission directs the PIO to **furnish an affidavit providing therein the factual situation and affirming the position that the information sought by the appellant could not be furnished due to non-availability of records along with the reasons for its non-availability.**

The Appeal stands **disposed** with the above direction.

Chandigarh
Dated: 27.04.2021

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



Sh. Vijay Kumar Zaildar (Retd.), (9814568617)

Village Lamini,

P.O, Tehsil & Distt Pathankot-145001.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o Deputy Commissioner,

Gurdaspur.

.....Respondent

Complaint Case No.120 of 2021
(Cisco Webex Proceedings)

RTI application filed on : 01-04-2020

PIO replied on : -

Present: Appellant: Absent

Respondent: Sh. Anil Kumar (Supt.) 9465562163

ORDER:

1. The Appellant/Complainant filed above mentioned appeal/complaint cases in the Commission dated 19.01.2021. Accordingly, the cases are fixed for today.
2. Appellant, **Sh. Vijay Kumar Zaildar is absent but an acknowledgment email from him dated 27.04.2021 has been received by the bench of undersigned, wherein the appellant has mentioned that sought information has been supplied to him. This email is taken on record.**
3. **Commission is in receipt of the copy of information (via email dated 26.04.2021) so supplied to the appellant, by the respondent authority.**
4. As the information stands supplied therefore, no cause of action is required in this case. Hence, the instant complaint case is **disposed & closed.**

Chandigarh
Dated: 27.04.2021

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



Sh. Karamjit Singh, (9915627404)

S/o Sh. Pritam Singh,
R/o Thuliwal, Distt Barnala.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o Deputy Commissioner,
Gurdaspur.

.....Respondent

Complaint Case No.125 of 2021
(Cisco Webex Proceedings)

RTI application filed on : 29-11-2020
PIO replied on : 01-01-2021

Present: Appellant: Sh. Karamjit Singh
Respondent: Sh. Sanju Singh (Sr. Asst.), 7009371416

ORDER:

1. The Appellant/Complainant filed above mentioned appeal/complaint cases in the Commission dated 21.01.2021. Accordingly, the cases are fixed for today

Information Sought

ਬੇਨਤੀ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਮੈਂ ਮਾਰਚ 2020 ਵਿੱਚ ਹੋਈ ਸਹਿਕਾਰੀ ਸਭਾ ਟੁੱਲੀਵਾਲ ਦੀ ਚੋਣ ਲਈ ਮੈਂਬਰ ਵੱਜੋਂ ਕਾਗਜ਼ ਭਰੇ ਸਨ। ਪਰੰਤੂ ਮੈਂਕੇ ਤੇ ਚੋਣ ਅਧਿਕਾਰੀ ਨੇ ਮੇਰੇ ਕਾਗਜ਼ ਇਸ ਕਰਕੇ ਰੱਦ ਕਰ ਦਿੱਤੇ ਕਿ ਮੈਂ ਸੇਵਾ ਮੁਕਤ ਅਧਿਆਪਕ ਦੀ ਪੈਨਸ਼ਨ ਅਤੇ ਨੰਬਰਦਾਰੀ ਦਾ ਮਾਣ ਭੱਤਾ ਲੈਂਦਾ ਹਾਂ। ਪਰ ਸਸਾਇਟੀ ਦੀ ਚੋਣ ਦੇ ਉਪ ਨਿਯਮ 6 ਵਿੱਚ ਇਹ ਅਯੋਗਤਾ ਕਿਤੇ ਵੀ ਦਰਜ ਨਹੀਂ ਹੈ। ਮੇਰੇ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਮੰਗੀ ਗਈ ਸੂਚਨਾ ਦੇ ਨਿਯਮ 35 ਖ ਅਤੇ ਗ ਜੋ ਦਿੱਤੀ ਗਈ ਹੈ ਉਹ ਪ੍ਰਬੰਧਕੀ ਕਮੇਟੀ ਦੇ ਚੁਣੇ ਗਏ ਮੈਂਬਰ ਵਾਸਤੇ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਉਹ ਸਭਾ ਦੇ ਲਾਭ ਵਾਲੇ ਅਹੁਦੇ ਤੇ ਨਾ ਹੋਵੇ ਅਤੇ ਨਾ ਹੀ ਕਿਸੇ ਸੰਸਥਾ ਦਾ ਤਨਖਾਹਦਾਰ ਮੁਲਾਜ਼ਮ ਹੋਵੇ। ਜਦ ਕਿ ਮੈਂਨੂੰ ਤਾਂ ਪ੍ਰਬੰਧਕੀ ਕਮੇਟੀ ਦਾ ਮੈਂਬਰ ਬਣਨ ਤੋਂ ਰੋਕਣ ਲਈ ਜਾਣ ਬੁੱਝ ਕੇ ਸਸਾਇਟੀ ਦੇ ਕਰਮਚਾਰੀਆਂ ਦੇ ਪ੍ਰਭਾਵ ਅਧੀਨ ਨਿਯਮ 35 ਖ ਅਤੇ ਗ ਦੀ ਗਲਤ ਵਰਤੋਂ ਕਰਕੇ ਮੇਰੇ ਕਾਗਜ਼ ਰੱਦ ਕਰ ਦਿੱਤੇ। ਜਦ ਕਿ ਮੈਂ ਪ੍ਰਬੰਧਕੀ ਕਮੇਟੀ ਦੇ ਮੈਂਬਰ ਬਣਨ ਦੀਆਂ ਸਾਰੀਆਂ ਸਰਤਾਂ ਪੂਰੀਆਂ ਕਰਦਾ ਸੀ।

ਸੋ ਕਿਰਪਾ ਕਰਕੇ ਮੈਂਨੂੰ ਇਨਸਾਫ਼ ਦਿੱਤਾ ਜਾਵੇ ਅਤੇ ਗਲਤ ਇਤਰਾਜ਼ ਲਾਉਣ ਵਾਲੇ ਅਧਿਕਾਰੀ ਵਿਰੁੱਧ ਬਣਦੀ ਮਹਿਕਮਾਨਾ ਕਾਰਵਾਈ ਕੀਤੀ ਜਾਵੇ ਨਹੀਂ ਤਾਂ ਮੈਂ ਮਜਬੂਰੀ ਵੱਸ ਮਾਣਯੋਗ ਯੋਗ ਅਦਾਲਤ ਦਾ ਦਰਵਾਜ਼ਾ ਖੜਕਾਉਣ ਲਈ ਮਜਬੂਰ ਹੋਵਾਂਗਾ। ਜਿਸ ਦੀ ਸਾਰੀ ਜ਼ਿੰਮੇਵਾਰੀ ਮਹਿਕਮੇ ਦੀ ਹੋਵੇਗੀ।

..

2. Grounds for the Complaint: Reply furnished by the PIO was unsatisfactory.
3. Both the parties are present. Respondent, Sh. Sanju Singh had brought the reply/information pertaining to the information sought by the complainant and handed over in the Commission. He further added that no any other information pertaining to this RTI application is available in his office record. On this, Appellant, Sh. Karamjit Singh stated the respondent is misleading the court and he is not satisfied with the reply.

Complaint Case No.125 of 2021
(Cisco Webex Proceedings)

4. On perusal of the RTI application dated 29/11/2020, the Commission noted that the information sought by the Appellant pertained largely to the reasons behind certain administrative actions and decisions.
5. It follows from the aforesaid that only those reasons (for certain administrative actions or decisions), which are available on record, come within the purview of the RTI Act. In view of the reasons enumerated above, the information sought by the Appellant in the RTI application dated 29/11/2010 is not 'information' under Section 2(f) of the RTI Act.

Further, Section 2(f) of the RTI Act, which defines "information" provides as follows:

"2. Definitions.- In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires,- ...

(f) "information" means any material in any form, including records, documents, memos, e-mails, opinions, advices, press releases, circulars, orders, logbooks, contracts, reports, papers, samples, models, data material held in any electronic form and information relating to any private body which can be accessed by a public authority under any other law for the time being in force;"

4. However, the PIO is directed to furnish a modified reply to the Appellant with a copy to the Commission, within 10 days of receipt of the order, in the form of affidavit, **providing therein the factual situation and affirming the position that the information sought by the appellant could not be furnished due to non-availability of records along with the reasons for its non-availability.**

Accordingly, the complaint case is dismissed/closed.

Chandigarh
Dated: 27.04.2021

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