



Sh. Harjap Singh Boparai, (9814375105)

VPO Ghudani Kalan, Tehsil Payal,
Distt Ludhiana-141419.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o Secretary, Cooperative Society,
Village Amrala, Block Khamano, Distt Fatehgarh Sahib.

.....Respondent

Complaint Case No.323 of 2021

(Cisco Webex Proceedings)

RTI application filed on : 08-01-2021

PIO replied on : -

Present: None

ORDER:

1. The Appellant/Complainant filed above mentioned appeal/complaint cases in the Commission dated 15.03.2021. 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).

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. In view of the observations noted above, the instant case is remanded to the concerned First Appellate Authority along with a copy of RTI application for their ready reference. The appeal is disposed off accordingly, with the above observations.

Sd/-

(Maninder Singh Patti)

State Information Commissioner, Pb.

Chandigarh
Dated: 27.07.2021



Smt Kiran Rekha, (9780560940)

W/o Sh. Sudesh Kumar,
R/o 26C, Railway Colony , C Block,
Amritsar.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o Senior Superintendent of Police,
Pathankot.

.....Respondent

Complaint Case No.368 of 2021
(Cisco Webex Proceedings)

RTI application filed on : 22-02-2019

PIO replied on : -

Present: Complainant: Absent

Respondent: Sh. Sulakhan Singh (ASI), 9417440105

ORDER:

1. The Appellant/Complainant filed above mentioned appeal/complaint cases in the Commission dated 24.03.2021. Accordingly, the cases are fixed for today.
2. Respondent, Sh. Sulakhan Singh stated that the sought information has been supplied to the appellant dated 26.06.2021 and she is satisfied with same. An email dated 27.07.2021 from the respondent authority is received by the undersigned bench wherein the aforesaid is mentioned in detail.
3. As the information stands supplied therefore, no cause of action is required in this case. Hence, the instant complaint/appeal case is **disposed & closed**.
4. If, however, the complainant does not feel satisfied/or has any submission pertaining to the information /reply so supplied by the PIO he/she will be at liberty to file a First Appeal to FAA (u/s 19 (1) of RTI Act.).

Chandigarh
Dated: 27.07.2021

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



Sh. Satnam Singh Dhawan, (9501513137)

House no 7, G.K. Vihar, Manakwal,
Ludhiana.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o Sub Divisional Magistrate,
Pathankot.

.....Respondent

Complaint Case No.376 of 2021
(Cisco Webex Proceedings)

RTI application filed on : 18-02-2021

PIO replied on : -

Present: Complainant: Sh. Satnam Singh Dhawan
Respondent: Sh. Parminder Singh (Suptd.)

ORDER:

1. The Appellant/Complainant filed above mentioned appeal/complaint cases in the Commission dated 25.03.2021. Accordingly, the cases are fixed for today.
2. Respondent, Sh. Parminder Singh stated that the sought information has been supplied to the appellant. Complainant, Sh. Satnam Singh Dhawan acknowledge the receiving of the same and has requested to close the case.
3. As the information stands supplied therefore, no cause of action is required in this case. Hence, the instant complaint/appeal case is **disposed & closed**.
4. If, however, the complainant does not feel satisfied/or has any submission pertaining to the information /reply so supplied by the PIO he/she will be at liberty to file a First Appeal to FAA (u/s 19 (1) of RTI Act.).

Chandigarh
Dated: 27.07.2021

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



Smt Kiran Sharma, (7973081420)

W/o Late Sh. Jagdish Sharma,
Street No 42, Preet Nagar, Shimlapuri,
Ludhiana-141003.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o Director General of Police, Punjab,
Chandigarh.

.....Respondent

Complaint Case No.393 of 2021
(Cisco Webex Proceedings)

RTI application filed on : 19-02-2021

PIO replied on : -

Present: Complainant: Sh. Sushil Kumar on behalf of applicant

Respondent: Sh. Ramesh Kumar (ASI)

ORDER:

1. The Appellant/Complainant filed above mentioned appeal/complaint cases in the Commission dated 30.03.2021. 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).

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. In view of the observations noted above, the instant case is remanded to the concerned First Appellate Authority along with a copy of RTI application for their ready reference. The appeal is disposed off accordingly, with the above observations.

Chandigarh
Dated: 27.07.2021

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



Sh. Sohan Singh, S/o Sh. Sucha Singh,
Village Bara PO Pathreri Jatta,
Tehsil & Distt Roopnagar.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer
O/o Tehsildar,
Roopnagar.

.....Respondent

Complaint Case No.396 of 2021
(Cisco Webex Proceedings)

RTI application filed on : 19-02-2021
PIO replied on : -

Present: Complainant: Absent

Respondent: Sh. Kuldeep Singh (Tehsildar), 9872222543

ORDER:

1. The Appellant/Complainant filed above mentioned appeal/complaint cases in the Commission dated 31.03.2021. 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 along with a copy of RTI application for their ready reference. The appeal is disposed off accordingly, with the above observations.

Chandigarh
Dated: 27.07.2021

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



Sh. Darshan Singh, (9888945426)

R/o House No 172, Gurbax Nagar,
Chabal Road, Amritsar.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o Managing Director, Markfed, Punjab,
Sector 35 B, Chandigarh.

.....Respondent

First Appellate Authority

O/o AMD (P), Markfed, Punjab,
Chandigarh.

Appeal Case No.1250 of 2021
(Cisco Webex Proceedings)

RTI application filed on	:	11-09-2020
PIO replied on	:	15-09-2020
First appeal filed on	:	09-12-2020
First Appellate Authority order	:	29-01-2021

Present: Appellant: Absent

Respondent: Ms. Anita Rani (PIO), 9872092520

ORDER:-

4. The Appellant/Complainant filed above mentioned appeal/complaint cases in the Commission dated 10.03.2021. Accordingly, the cases are fixed for today.
5. Respondent, Ms. Anita Rani pleaded that the sought information has been furnished to the appellant and the acknowledged the receiving of the same and has requested to close this case.
6. The commission is in receipt of email from respondent authority, wherein the appellant has expressed her satisfaction with the information supplied by the respondent PIO and has stated that she does not want to pursue the case further. Accordingly the case is disposed of and Closed.

Chandigarh
Dated: 27.07.2021

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

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden, Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864112, Email: - psic23@punjabmail.gov.in
Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Sh. Bhupinder Singh, (9417196448)
S/o Sh. Raghbir Singh,
Village Mallu Duara, PO Khokhar Faujia,
Tehsil Batala, Distt Gurdaspur.

.....Appellant/Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer
O/o Senior Superintendent of Police,
Pathankot.

.....Respondent

First Appellate Authority
O/o DIG, Border Range,
Amritsar.

Appeal Case No.1295 of 2021
(Cisco Webex Proceedings)

RTI application filed on	:	05-03-2020
PIO replied on	:	02-04-2020
First appeal filed on	:	04-06-2020
First Appellate Authority order	:	-

Present: Appellant: Sh. Bhupinder Singh
Respondent: Sh. Sulakhan Singh (ASI), 9417440105

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. Appellant, Sh. Bhupinder Singh stated that no information has been supplied so far.
3. Respondent, Sh. Sulakhan Singh pleaded that the sought information is a third party information which is denied u/s 8(1) J of RTI act 2005. A letter dated 22.07.2021 vide diary no.16158 is received in the Commission vide wherein the aforesaid is mentioned in detail.
4. Keeping in view the facts of the case the commission transpires that "In the present case, there is no tangible public purpose which has been cited by the appellant that would convince the Commission to override the guaranteed exemption under Section 8 to the individual". The **disclosure of such information is not in the public interest as the appellant has asked for the information for promotion of his personal interest.** Therefore, the PIO is justified in denying the information sought, u/s 8(1)(j) of the Act A mere suspicion cannot constitute the basis for a public interest.

The matter is **disposed of** accordingly at Commission's end.

Chandigarh
Dated: 27.07.2021

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