Sh. Sukhjeet Singh, S/o Sh. Darshan Singh R/o VPO Nangal Kalan, Tehsil and Distt. Mansa

.....Appellant

.....Respondent

..Vs

**Public Information Officer,** O/o Director Bureau of Investigation, Punjab Punjab Police Headquarter, Sector 9, Chandigarh First Appellate Authority, O/o Director General of Punjab Sector 9, Chandigarh

AC No. 5275 of 2021

#### Present: (i) None is present on behalf of the appellant (ii) For the respondent : Sh. Karam Singh, Sr. Assistant (9814257967) in the Commission.

#### **ORDER**

The RTI application is dated 07.09.2021 which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter FAA) and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 23.11.2021 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act).

2. Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for 16.02.2022. However, on 16.02.2022 the abovementioned case could not be heard on account of Public Holiday and hence, was postponed to be heard on 28.02.2022, i.e. today.

3. The appellant is absent today.

4. The Respondent states that the required information has already been given to the appellant and has shown the acknowledgment given by the appellant in token of having received the information. The same is taken on record.

5. In view of the foregoing, no cause of action is left, hence the appeal case filed by the appellant is disposed of and closed. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Sd/-

Dated :28.02.2022





Sh. Gagandeep Singh Threeke, (Social RTI Activist), House No 208 Aryan Enclave Main Sua Road, Near Geeta Mandir Chowk, VPO Threeke Ludhiana – 142028 (9780400680)

.....Appellant

Vs

**Public Information Officer,** O/o SSP, Jagraon, Distt. Ludhiana

First Appellate Authority

o/o SSP, Jagraon, Distt. Ludhiana

.....Respondent

# A<u>C.No. 3115 of 2021</u>

Present: (i) None is present on behalf of the appellant (ii) For the respondent : Sh. Nirmal Kumar, ASI (9417849623) through webex

### <u>ORDER</u>

This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 27.10.2021 vide which the appellant was absent and the respondent stated that the information as exists in the record has already been sent to the appellant.

2. Today again the appellant is not present.

3. The respondent states that the information, as exists, in the record has been provided to the appellant.

4. After hearing the respondent and going through the case file it is observed that the appellant is absent on second consecutive hearing without intimation nor he has sought



# AC.No. 3115 of 2021

any adjournment. As per the respondent the information has been sent to the appellant. Hence, it is presumed that he is satisfied with the information provided by the respondent.

5. In view of the foregoing, no cause of action is left, hence the appeal case filed by the appellant is **disposed of and closed**. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Sd/-

Dated : 28.02.2022



Sh. Jaswant Singh, S/o Sh. Gurdev Singh, R/o Village Datarpur Police Station, Morinda, Distt. Roopnagar (9915916318)

.....Complainant

.....Respondent

..Vs

Public Information Officer, O/o SDM, Morinda

### <u>CC No. 1294 of 2021</u>

Present : (i) Sh. Jaswant Singh, the complainant (9915916318) *in the Commission* 

(ii) For the respondent : Sh. Jaspreet Singh, Clerk, (9780366161) in the Commission.

## ORDER

**1.** The RTI application is dated 10.09.2021 \_ whereby the information-seeker has sought information as mentioned in his RTI application. He filed complaint in the Commission on 23.11.2021 under Section 18 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act).

2. Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for 16.02.2022. However, on 16.02.2022 the abovementioned case could not be heard on account of Public Holiday and hence, was postponed to be heard on 28.02.2022, i.e, today.

3. After going through the file, it is observed that this is the complaint case. The attention of the Complainant is drawn to the decision of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India rendered on 12.12.2011 in Civil Appeal Nos. Nos.10787 – 10788 of 2011 (arising out of SLP © No.32768-32769/2010)- Chief Information Commissioner and another Vs. State of Manipur and another, in Para 31 whereof, it has been held that while entertaining a 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).



#### CC No. 1294 of 2021

As such, since 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.

4. 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.

5. The instant matter is now remanded back to the First Appellate Authority. The commission hereby directs the FAA to treat the copy of the complaint (copy enclosed) as the first appeal and decide the matter in accordance with the provisions of the RTI Act after giving all concerned parties an opportunity to be heard. He is directed to give an early date to hear the complainant and decide the matter. In case the complainant is not satisfied with the decision of the First Appellate Authority (FAA), he is at liberty to file second appeal with the Punjab State Information Commission in accordance with the provisions of the RTI Act 2005.

6. 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.

In view of the observations noted above, the instant case is **disposed of.** Copies of this decision be sent to the parties <u>through registered post.</u> Sd/-

Dated : 28.02.2022

(Amrit Partap Singh Sekhon) State Information Commissioner Punjab

First Appellate Authority o/o Deputy Commissioner, Distt. Ropar



Sh.Gagneshwar Walia, Advocate S/o Sh. R.S. Ahluwalia, Advocate (Punjab and Haryana High Court) R/o House No. 359, AOT Complex, Sector 48A, Chandigarh

.....Appellant

Public Information Officer, O/o D.G.P Punjab, Punjab Police Headquarter, Sector 9, Chandigarh

**First Appellate Authority-cum-DIG (Admn)** O/o DGP, Punjab, Sector 9 Chandigarh

.....Respondent

Present: None for the parties.

### <u>ORDER</u>

This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 05.01.2022 and 06.10.2021, vide which the appellant was not present.

AC No.2987 of 2021

3. The respondent is also not present today.

4. The perusal of the file shows that the appellant is absent for third consecutive hearing. During the last hearing, the respondent stated that the information running into 12 pages has been sent to the appellant and the remaining information is lying with the different districts/units.

5. In the aforementioned circumstances, I am of the considered view that no useful purpose would be served by prolonging this matter any further. Whatever information was available with department has been supplied. Remaining information is lying with difference districts/ units. The appellant may take note that each of these authorities has

..Vs

<sup>2.</sup> Today again the appellant is not present.



## AC No.2987 of 2021

also separate PIOs. Under-section 6(1)(a) a person seeking information has to apply to the concerned public authority. It is not the job of the PIO to collect and therefore collate this information from different PIOs of different Public Authorities and thereafter supply the same to the appellant. I find no merit in the appeal and the same is **disposed of and closed**. The appellant may however approach the concerned PIOs with fresh application/s if he wants the information. Copy of the orders be sent to the parties.

Sd/-

Dated :28.02.2022



Sh.Prem Kumar Rattan, House No. 78/8,, Park Road, Navi Mandi, Dhuri, Distt. Sangrur

.....Appellant

..Vs

Public Information Officer, O/o DGP, Punjab Punjab Police Headquarter, Sector 9 Chandigarh

**First Appellate Authority ,** O/o DGP, Punjab Punjab Police Headquarter, Sector 9 Chandigarh

.....Respondent

### AC No. 4519 of 2021

Present: (i) Sh. Prem Kumar Rattan the appellant through CISCO (ii) For the respondent : Sh. Kamaljit Singh, ASI (9803440360) o/o SSP, Barnala *in the Commission* and Smt. Nirlep Kaur, Sr. Assistant , o/o DGP Punjab (9876060574) *through CISCO Webex* 

### <u>ORDER</u>

The RTI application is dated 19.07.2021 which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter FAA) and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 05.10.2021 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act).

2. Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for 16.02.2022. However, on 16.02.2022 the abovementioned case could not be heard on account of Public Holiday and hence, was postponed to be heard on 28.02.2022, i.e, today.

3. The appellant Sh. Prem Kumar Rattan states that no information has been given to him so far.



4. The respondent Sh. Kamaljit Singh , o/o SSP Barnala states that as an enquiry is pending, hence the information cannot be provided to the appellant. He has also filed his written reply in the Commission.

5. After hearing both the parties it is observed that the appellant filed RTI with the PIO, o/o DGP Punjab. PIO, o/o DGP Punjab has transferred the RTI of the appellant to the PIO, o/o SSP, Sangrur. Further PIO, o/o SSP, Sangrur forwarded the RTI of the appellant to the PIO, o/o SSP, Barnala. Sh/ Kamaljit Singh is appearing on behalf of the PIO, o/o SSP Barnala and states that the information cannot be provided to the appellant, as an enquiry is pending. He has also filed his written reply in the Commission.

6. In view of the above mentioned circumstance, no cause of action is left, hence the appeal case filed by the appellant is **disposed of and closed.** Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Sd/-

Dated : 28.02.2022



Sh.Rajesh Kumar, S/o Sh. Kewal Kumar, Flat No. 11A, Sri Deva Ji residency, Kishanpura, Dhakoli, Zirakpur Distt. SAS Nagar (9815148139)

Public Information Officer, O/o SSP, Mohali

First Appellate Authority , O/o SSP, Mohali ..Vs

.....Appellant

.....Respondent

AC No. 4507 of 2021

Present: (i) Sh. Rajesh Kumar the appellant alongwith Dr. Rajinder K Singla *in the Commission* (ii) For the respondent : None is present on behalf of the respondent

### <u>ORDER</u>

The RTI application is dated 05.07.2021 which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter FAA) and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 05.10.2021 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act).

2. Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for 16.02.2022. However, on 16.02.2022 the abovementioned case could not be heard on account of Public Holiday and hence, was postponed to be heard on 28.02.2022, i.e, today.

3. Today, the appellant states that he has received the information. He further states that he has not been provided the information within the time as prescribed under the RTI Act 2005. He has, therefore, suffered mental harassment. For this the appellant demands that the Respondent be penalized and he be compensated for the detriment suffered.

4. The respondent is absent today. He/she has informed on phone that she is unable to attend today's hearing as she is not well today.



### AC No. 4507 of 2021

5. After hearing the appellant and examining the case file, it is observed that the information has been received by the appellant. But he states that he has not received the information within stipulated time. Taking a lenient view, the Respondent PIO is warned to be more careful in future while dealing with the matters pertaining to the RTI Act, 2005 and act swiftly.

6. Since, the appellant has received the information, no further cause of action is left, hence the appeal case filed by the appellant is **disposed of and closed**. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Sd/-

Dated : 28.02.2022