



Smt. Asha Rani,
130, Maharaja Yadwindra Enclave,
Nabha, Patiala.

... Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Treasury Officer,
Nabha, Distt Patiala.

...Respondent

Complaint case No.258 of 2020

Present: None for the Appellant
 Sh.Jatinder Singh, Treasury Officer for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on 26.08.2020. The respondent present pleaded that the information is 3rd party and also the appellant has not deposited the requisite fee. The appellant informed that the fee was not raised within the time prescribed under the RTI Act.

Having gone through the RTI application and hearing both the parties, the Commission was of the view that the PIO had not applied his mind while stating that the information was third party. The appellant had asked for public record of the public authority i.e. receipt of various bills along with the amount received from different departments –payment released – approval of higher authority for release of payment etc.

Since this information clearly does not come under 3rd party, the PIO was directed to provide the information to the complainant.

The PIO claimed that the department had asked the appellant to deposit a fee which he had not deposited. The appellant had denied having received any such letter, and has also claimed that the First Appellate Authority took no notice of his appeal for which there is nothing on record to establish the appellant's claim

Given the two different stances of the PIO, one to deny the information claiming that it is 3rd party and secondly asking for money to release the information, there was clearly miscarriage of the justice. The PIO was directed to provide the information to the appellant within 15 days free of cost.

On the date of last hearing on **06.01.2021**, both the parties were absent. The PIO was directed to comply with the earlier order of the Commission; else the commission will proceed as per the provisions under section 20 of the RTI Act.

Hearing dated 28.04.2021:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Patiala. The respondent present pleaded that in compliance with the order of the Commission, the information has been supplied to the appellant on 01.09.2020 and the complainant is satisfied with the information.

Complaint case No.258 of 2020

The appellant is absent on 2nd consecutive hearing nor has communicated any discrepancies. It is presumed that the appellant has received the information and is satisfied.

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

Chandigarh
Dated 28.04.2021

Sd/-
Khushwant Singh
State Information Commissioner



Sh. Surjit Singh, S/o Sh.Gokul
Singh, VPO Jarg, Tehsil Payal,
Distt. Ludhiana.

... Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o DEO (EE),
Sri Fatehgarh Sahib.

Respondent

Complaint Case No. 499 of 2020

PRESENT: **None for the Complainant**
 Mrs.Ravinder Pal Kaur, Suptd. O/o DPI for the Respondent

Order:

The complainant through RTI application dated 19.06.2020 has sought information regarding copy of letter No.2/Seniority/2020/2087-89 dated 05.05.2020 vide which the seniority was fixed and other information concerning the office of DEO(EE) Sri Fatehgarh Sahib. The complainant was not provided the information after which the complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 03.08.2020.

The case was first heard on 25.11.2020 through video conferencing at DAC Sri Fatehgarh Sahib. Both the parties were absent.

Having gone through the record, the Commission observed that there has been a delay of more than four months in attending to the RTI application. The PIO was directed to explain the reasons for not attending to the RTI application within the time prescribed under the RTI Act and appear before the Commission on the next date of hearing.

On the date of last hearing on **06.01.2021**, the respondent requested for some more time to provide the information, which was granted.

Hearing dated 28.04.2021:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Sri Fatehgarh Sahib. The respondent present informed that the appellant had sought copy of letter No.2/Seniority/2020/2087-89 dated 05.05.2020 vide which the seniority was fixed and the same has already been provided to the complainant on 09.10.2020 and again on 16.04.2021.

The complainant is absent nor has communicated any discrepancies. It is presumed that the complainant has received the information and is satisfied.

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

Chandigarh
Dated:28.04.2021

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh. Dharminder Singh Lamba,
Chamber No-160,
Block-A,
Distt kotak Fatehgarh Sahib.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Civil Surgeon,
Fatehgarh Sahib.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Director,
Health & Family Welfare Department,
Pb, Sector-34, Chandigarh.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 665 of 2021

PRESENT: **None for the Appellant**
 Sh.Varinder Singh, Jr Assistant and Dr.Bhupinder Singh, SMO Nandpur
 Kalor for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 16.03.2020 has sought information regarding details of attendance record of staff from 01.04.2014 to 31.12.2018 – duty time of the staff – field camp/training/meetings being organized by the staff for the said period – cases pending against the staff and other information as enumerated in the RTI application from the office of Civil Surgeon Fatehgarh Sahib. The appellant was not provided the information even after deposit of Rs.3500/- as requisite fee raised by the PIO vide letter dated 08.10.2020 after which the appellant filed first appeal before the first appellate authority on 27.10.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Sri Fatehgarh Sahib. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant by hand on 08.02.2021 and the appellant has acknowledged having received the information.

The appellant is absent nor has not communicated any discrepancies. It is presumed that the appellant has received the information and is satisfied.

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

Chandigarh
Dated:28.04.2021

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh Surjit Singh Aujla,
Village Aujla Dhak,
P.O Lidhar Kalan, Distt Jalandhar.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o XEN,
Water Supply and Sanitation,
Division-2, Jalandhar.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o SE,
Water Supply and Sanitation Circle,
Jalandhar.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 2142 of 2020

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
Sh.Harpreet Singh, SDO for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 16.03.2020 has sought information regarding details of tenders issued for work got done from 01.03.2019 to 15.03.2020 in sub sub-divisions under Jalandhar Division-2 –copy of bills passed for the work done for annual maintenance - copy of cash books – copy of quotation registers – name of SDOs alongwith monthly travelling allowance bills and other information as enumerated in the RTI application from the office of Xen Water Supply and Sanitation Division No.2 Jalandhar. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the first appellate authority on 28.04.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case was first heard on 26.02.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Jalandhar. Both the parties were absent.

The Commission received a letter from the PIO on 19.02.2021 stating that the information has been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 02.02.2021.

The appellant was directed to point out the discrepancies if any in writing to the PIO with a copy to the Commission and the PIO was directed to remove the same.

Hearing dated 28.04.2021:

The case has come up for hearing today through a video conferencing at DAC Jalandhar. The respondent present pleaded that the information has already been provided to the appellant and the appellant has acknowledged having received the information.

The appellant is absent on 2nd consecutive hearing nor has communicated any discrepancies. It is presumed that the appellant has received the information and is satisfied.

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

Chandigarh
Dated: 28.04.2021

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh. Inderjit Singh,
C/o Chamber No-141-A,
New Court, Jalandhar.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o SDO,
Water Supply and Sanitation Circle,
Jalandhar.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o SE,
Water Supply and Sanitation Circle,
Jalandhar.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 2296 of 2020

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
Sh.Harpreet Singh, SDO for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 02.06.2020 has sought information regarding grants approved for water tank in village Santowali Block Adampur – resolution passed by Panchayat alongwith jamabandi and map of the land – guidelines issued by the Govt. – tenders issued and advertisement published – name of contractors participated in bid for tenders – depth of tubewell and other information as enumerated in the RTI application from the office of Xen Water Supply and Sanitation Circle, Jalandhar. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the first appellate authority on 03.07.2020 which took no decision on the appeal. After filing first appeal, the PIO sent a reply to the appellant vide letter dated 13.07.2020 to which the appellant was not satisfied and filed 2nd appeal in the Commission.

The case was first heard on 26.02.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Jalandhar. The Commission received a letter from the PIO on 03.02.2021 stating that the information has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 11.01.2021. As per appellant, the information was incomplete.

Having gone through the RTI application and hearing the appellant, following was concluded:

- | | | |
|----------------|---|--|
| - Point-1 | - | Information stands provided |
| - Point-2 | - | As per appellant, the PIO has not supplied the resolution passed by the Panchayat. The PIO is directed to provide copy of resolution if any available on record. |
| - Point-3 | - | PIO to provide website |
| - Point-4 | - | As per appellant, the information is not certified. The PIO to provide certified copy of the information. |
| - Point-5 | - | Provided |
| - Point-6 | - | Not required |
| - Point-7 | - | Provided |
| - Point-8,9&10 | - | Pertains to point-2 – PIO to provide copy of resolution |

Appeal Case No. 2296 of 2020

The information was to be provided within 15 days of the receipt of the order.

Hearing dated 28.04.2021:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Jalandhar. The respondent present pleaded that as per order of the Commission, the remaining information has been provided to the appellant with a copy to the Commission.

The appellant is absent. Having gone through the RTI application, and the information supplied by the PIO, the Commission observed that the RTI has been sufficiently replied and the information has been supplied to the best possible.

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

Chandigarh
Dated: 28.04.2021

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh. Yogesh Mahajan, S/o Sh. Kuldeep Raj Mahajan,
Opposite Water Tank, Municipal Market,
Mission Road, Pathankot.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o XEN,
Water Supply and Sanitation Division,
Kapurthala.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o SE,
Water Supply and Sanitation Circle,
Jalandhar

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3484 of 2020

PRESENT: **None for the Appellant**
 Sh.Gaurav Batra, JE for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 01.08.2020 has sought information regarding works undertaken/carried out from 01.08.2019 to 01.08.2020 in Sub Division Phagwara – attested copies of work order booked and comparative statements of other work for which no tender called and other information as enumerated in the RTI application from the office of Xen Water Supply & Sanitation Division Kapurthala. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the first appellate authority on 10.09.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Jalandhar. As per respondent, the information has been supplied.

The appellant is absent and vide letter received in the Commission on 31.03.2021 has informed that he has received the information till date.

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

Chandigarh
Dated: 28.04.2021

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in
Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Sh. George Subh, S/o Sh. Rustam Masih,
R/o Begowal, Ward No-12,
Tehsil Bholath, Distt Kapurthala.

... Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Director,
Social Justice Empowerment and Minorities Deptt,
Pb, Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Director,
Social Justice Empowerment and Minorities Deptt,
Pb, Chandigarh

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3518 of 2020

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 04.05.2020 has sought information regarding copy of SC certificate of Tarsem Masih Tehsil Welfare Officer Samual Masih and Sh.harmesh Masih Driver or their service book and other information as enumerated in the RTI application from the office of Director Social Justice Empowerment and Minorities Department Pb Chandigarh. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the first appellate authority on 29.06.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Jalandhar. Both the parties are absent.

The appellant vide email has informed that he has received the information and his appeal case be closed.

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

Chandigarh
Dated: 28.04.2021

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh. George Subh, S/o Sh. Rustam Masih,
R/o Begowal, Ward No-12, Tehsil Bholath,
Distt Kapurthala.

... Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Civil Surgeon,
Kapurthala.

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 960 of 2020

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
Dr.Kuljit Singh, Addl. Distt. Registrar for the Respondent

ORDER:

The complainant through RTI application dated 04.11.2020 has sought information regarding copies of RTI applications filed by Vilium Masih alias Makhanpal Singh Brar along with copies of information provided to him against said RTI applications and other information as enumerated in the RTI application from the office of Civil Surgeon Kapurthala. The complainant was not satisfied with the reply of the PIO dated 01.12.2020 vide which the PIO denied the information stating that the information is 3rd party and the 3rd party has not given its consent to disclose his information after which the complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 15.12.2020.

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Jalandhar. The respondent present pleaded that the information sought by the complainant is 3rd party and the 3rd party has not given its consent to disclose his information and that the reply has already been sent to the complainant on 01.12.2020.

The complainant is absent. I have gone through the facts of the case, and from the facts it is clear that the PIO has responded within the time prescribed under the RTI Act.

Given the above I do not see any reason to hear this case further. However, for the benefit of the appellant the case is remanded back to the First Appellate Authority, which is directed to consider this an appeal case and dispose off the same within a period of 30 days.

With the above order, the case is **disposed off and closed**.

Chandigarh
Dated:28.04.2021

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

CC to First Appellate Authority
O/o Civil Surgeon, Kapurthala.