PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION PS PS PS PS PS PS Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden, Sector 16, Chandigarh. Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100 Email: - psic22@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com Sh. Punjab Singh (8725935291) (Regd. Post) S/o Sh. Satnam Singh

Appellant

VillJiunpura, Tehsil Patran, Distt. Patiala. Versus Public Information Officer (By Name) (Regd. Post) O/o BDPO, Patran

First Appellate Authority

O/o DDPO, Patiala

Appeal Case No.: 630 of 2021 Through CISCO WEBEX

Respondent

None Present. Present:

ORDER:

- 1. This order may be read with reference earlier orders dated: 22.7.2021 vide which both the parties were absent. A show cause notice was issued to the respondent PIO, as he was absent on the previous hearings held on 22.07.2021 and 19.10.2021. The matter was adjourned to 28.4.2022.
- 2. In today's hearing, both the parties are absent despite being aware about the date of hearing.
- 3. A final opportunity is given to the appellant to represent this case on the next date of hearing, failing which case will be decided on merit basis.
- 4. The absence of the PIO is viewed seriously and that also affected hearing and disposal of the case. In pursuance of this, the PIO is directed to file a written submission in response to the Notice of the Commission and Show Cause notice which was issued to him vide orders of the Commission dated 22.07.2021. He is also directed to appear in person at Punjab State Information Commission Office, Chandigarh on the next date of hearing, failing which penal consequences shall follow.
- 5. To come up on 26.05.2022 at 11:00 A.M. through CISCO-Webex (Video Conferencing application). Copy of the order be sent to the parties. (Steps to use CISCO WEBEX: Install CISCO Webex->Click on Join Meeting->Enter Meeting Number 1582933632).

(Anumit Singh Sodhi) State Information Commissioner Punjab

Dated: 28.04.2022

Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Appellant

Sh. Jasbir Singh (9888296107) Guru Nanak Nagar, Village Bolapur,, Jhabewal, PO Ramgarh, Distt. Ludhiana 141123.

Versus

Public Information Officer O/o Secy, Regional Transport Authority, Sangrur

First Appellate Authority

O/o Secy, Regional Transport Authority, Sangrur

Respondent

Appeal Case No.: 1165 of 2021 Through CISCO WEBEX

- **Present:** (i) Sh. Jasbir Singh, the appellant
 - (ii)For the respondent: Sh. Ravinder Sharma (JA).

<u>ORDER</u>

- 1. This order may be read with earlier order dated 19.10.2021 vide which respondent PIO was directed to send the information again to the appellant within two days and appellant was advised to point out deficiency, once he received information. The matter was adjourned to 28.4.2022.
- 2. In today's hearing, appellant pleads that the sought for information as per RTI application has not been provided till date. He further requests that directions may be given to the respondent for supply of information as sufficient time has already gone in vain.
- 3. The respondent states that the information sought vide RTI application is very huge. He requests the court that the appellant may be advised to visit their office for inspection of official record as per RTI application. After the inspection, the identified information shall be provided to the appellant.
- 4. After hearing both the parties and examining the case file, a final opportunity is given to the respondent PIO to supply the point-wise reply/information to the appellant on his visit on 09.5.2022 at 11.00 a.m., on which both the parties agreed.
- 5. Both the parties are advised to represent this case in person on the next date of hearing, failing to which, appropriate order in their absence shall be passed.
- To come up on 14.07.2022 at 11:00 A.M. through CISCO-Webex (Video Conferencing application). Copy of the order be sent to the parties.
 (Steps to use CISCO WEBEX: Install CISCO Webex->Click on Join Meeting->Enter Meeting Number 1582933632).

(Anumit Singh Sodhi) State Information Commissioner Punjab

Dated: 28.4.2022

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden, Sector 16, Chandigarh. Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100 Email: - psic22@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com Informati Sh. Ajay Nand/Ajay Kumar Mehta, (9814646309) Appellant/Complainant (Regd. Post) H.No.C-118, East Mohan Nagar, Chamran Road, Amritsar. Vs. **Public Information Officer.** O/o DGP, Punjab, (Regd. Post) Chandigarh. **First Appellate Authority** O/o DGP, Punjab, Chandigarh. Respondent Appeal case No.1890 of 2020 Through CISCO WEBEX

Present:(i) Appellant: Sh. Ajay Nand(ii) For the respondent: Sh. Parshotam Kumar, ASI

ORDER

- 1. This order may be read with earlier orders dated: 29.9.2021 vide which respondent PIO was absent and matter was adjourned for further hearing to 28.4.2022.
- In today's hearing, respondent, Sh. Purshotam Kumar, ASI states that information relating to RTI application has already been provided to the appellant on 16.3.2020 & 14.12.2020 (13 pages). He states that all the information has been supplied and nothing is left.
- 3. The appellant states that the information provided by the respondent does not have any relevance with the sought information, as respondent PIO provided wrong and misleading information. He further states that the respondent department is wasting the time of the Hon'ble Court and the appellant.
- 4. After hearing both sides, the court directs the respondent PIO to provide an affidavit to the appellant that there is no information left out and nothing more with the DGP office duly signed by the PIO within 10 days under intimation to the Commission.
- To come up on 25.05.2022 at 11:00 A.M. through CISCO-Webex (Video Conferencing application). Copy of the order be sent to the parties.
 (Steps to use CISCO WEBEX: Install CISCO Webex->Click on Join Meeting->Enter Meeting Number 1582933632).

(Anumit Singh Sodhi) State Information Commissioner Punjab

Dated: 28.04.2022

Smt. Kiran Sharma

w/o late Sh. Jagdish Sharma, R/o Street No.42, Preet Nagar, Shimlapuri, Ludhiana

Vs.

(i) Sh. Sushil Kumar on behalf of the complainant.

(ii)Nobody on behalf of the respondent.

Public Information Officer,

O/o Police Commissioner, Ludhiana.

Public Information Officer,

O/o SHO, Thana, Shimlapuri, Ludhiana

Respondent

Complaint case No. 423 of 2020 Through CISCO WEBEX

Present:

ORDER

 This order may be read with earlier order dated: 19.10.2021 vide which respondent, Sh. Jarnail Singh stated that whatever information was available in the official record has already been supplied to the complainant but complainant expresses his dissatisfaction and requests to direct the respondent PIO to supply the information. Being a complaint case, the Commission continuously doing efforts to supply the demanded information to the complainant. Respondent PIO is also continuously supplying reply/information time and again and presenting case on the fixed hearings.

Accordingly, respondent PIO was again advised to bring the original record on 21.10.2021 in connection with RTI applications in the above mentioned cases. Complainant is advised to inspect the record in the PSIC Office on the fixed date. Complainant is also advised to intimate to the undersigned Bench regarding receiving of information.

The attention of the Complainant was 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).

The matter was adjourned to 28.4.2022.

- In today's hearing, representative of the complainant Sh. Sushil Kumar states that the complainant has filed complaint to the Commission not an appeal. He requests the Commission to take an action on the respondent PIO as he failed to supply the information within stipulated time period.
- 3. Respondent, ASI, Sh. Jarnail Singh intimates via telephone that he is unable to attend today's hearing and requested for an adjournment in this case.
- 4. Both the parties are advised to represent this case in person on the next date of hearing, failing to which, appropriate order in their absence shall be passed.
- 5. To come up on **20.07.2022 at 10:30 A.M**. **at Punjab State Information Commission Office, Chandigarh**. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

(Anumit Singh Sodhi) State Information Commissioner Punjab

Dated: 28.04.2022



Appellant/Complainant

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,

Sector 16, Chandigarh. Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100 Email: - <u>psic22@punjabmail.gov.in</u> Visit us: - <u>www.infocommpunjab.com</u>

Sh. Ajay Sharma,(8847545875)

w/o late Sh. Jagdish Sharma, R/o Street No.42, Preet Nagar, Shimlapuri, Ludhiana

Vs.

Public Information Officer,

O/o Police Commissioner, Ludhiana.

Public Information Officer,

O/o SHO, Police Station, Shimlapuri, Ludhiana

Complaint case No. 421 of 2020 Through CISCO WEBEX

Present:

(i) Sh. Sushil Kumar on behalf of the complainant.(ii)Nobody on behalf of the respondent.

ORDER

 This order may be read with earlier order dated: 19.10.2021 vide which respondent, Sh. Jarnail Singh stated that whatever information was available in the official record has already been supplied to the complainant but complainant expresses his dissatisfaction and requests to direct the respondent PIO to supply the information. Being a complaint case, the Commission continuously doing efforts to supply the demanded information to the complainant. Respondent PIO is also continuously supplying reply/information time and again and presenting case on the fixed hearings.

Accordingly, respondent PIO was again advised to bring the original record on 21.10.2021 in connection with RTI applications in the above mentioned cases. Complainant is advised to inspect the record in the PSIC Office on the fixed date. Complainant is also advised to intimate to the undersigned Bench regarding receiving of information.

The attention of the Complainant was 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).

The matter was adjourned to 28.4.2022.

- In today's hearing, representative of the complainant Sh. Sushil Kumar states that the complainant has filed complaint to the Commission not an appeal. He requests the Commission to take an action on the respondent PIO as he failed to supply the information within stipulated time period.
- 3. Respondent, ASI, Sh. Jarnail Singh intimates via telephone that he is unable to attend today's hearing and requested for an adjournment in this case.
- 4. Both the parties are advised to represent this case in person on the next date of hearing, failing to which, appropriate order in their absence shall be passed.
- 5. To come up on **20.07.2022 at 10:30 A.M**. **at Punjab State Information Commission Office, Chandigarh**. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

(Anumit Singh Sodhi) State Information Commissioner Punjab

Dated: 28.04.2022



Appellant/Complainant

Respondent

Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Appellant/Complainant

Smt. Neena Gupta (9855014101)

H.No.1410, Phase-I, Urban Estate, Dugri Road, Ludhiana – 141 013

Vs.

Public Information Officer,

O/o Police Commissioner, Ludhiana.

Public Information Officer/APIO,

O/o SHO, Police Station, Shimlapuri, Ludhiana

Respondent

<u>Complaint case No. 422 of 2020</u> <u>Through CISCO WEBEX</u>

Present: (i) Sh. Sushil Kumar on behalf of the complainant.

(ii)Nobody on behalf of the respondent.

ORDER

 This order may be read with earlier order dated: 19.10.2021 vide which respondent, Sh. Jarnail Singh stated that whatever information was available in the official record has already been supplied to the complainant but complainant expresses his dissatisfaction and requests to direct the respondent PIO to supply the information. Being a complaint case, the Commission continuously doing efforts to supply the demanded information to the complainant. Respondent PIO is also continuously supplying reply/information time and again and presenting case on the fixed hearings.

Accordingly, respondent PIO was again advised to bring the original record on 21.10.2021 in connection with RTI applications in the above mentioned cases. Complainant is advised to inspect the record in the PSIC Office on the fixed date. Complainant is also advised to intimate to the undersigned Bench regarding receiving of information.

The attention of the Complainant was 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).

The matter was adjourned to 28.4.2022.

- 2. In today's hearing, representative of the complainant Sh. Sushil Kumar states that the complainant has filed complaint to the Commission not an appeal. He requests the Commission to take an action on the respondent PIO as he failed to supply the information within stipulated time period.
- 3. Respondent, ASI, Sh. Jarnail Singh intimates via telephone that he is unable to attend today's hearing and requested for an adjournment in this case.
- 4. Both the parties are advised to represent this case in person on the next date of hearing, failing to which, appropriate order in their absence shall be passed.
- 5. To come up on **20.07.2022 at 10:30 A.M**. **at Punjab State Information Commission Office, Chandigarh**. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

(Anumit Singh Sodhi) State Information Commissioner Punjab

Dated: 28.04.2022

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,

Sector 16, Chandigarh. Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100 Email: - <u>psic22@punjabmail.gov.in</u> Visit us: - <u>www.infocommpunjab.com</u>



Appellant/Complainant

Respondent

Sh. Sushil Kumar (9814500575)

H.No.1410, Phase-I, Urban Estate, Dugri Road, Ludhiana – 141 013

Vs.

Public Information Officer,

O/o SHO, Shimlapuri, Ludhiana.

Complaint case No.275 of 2020 Through CISCO WEBEX

(i) Sh. Sushil Kumar, the complainant.

(ii)Nobody on behalf of the respondent.

ORDER

Present:

1. This order may be read with earlier order dated: 19.10.2021 vide which respondent, Sh. Jarnail Singh stated that whatever information was available in the official record has already been supplied to the complainant but complainant expresses his dissatisfaction and requests to direct the respondent PIO to supply the information. Being a complainant case, the Commission continuously doing efforts to supply the demanded information to the complainant. Respondent PIO is also continuously supplying reply/information time and again and presenting case on the fixed hearings.

Accordingly, respondent PIO was again advised to bring the original record on 21.10.2021 in connection with RTI applications in the above mentioned cases. Complainant is advised to inspect the record in the PSIC Office on the fixed date. Complainant is also advised to intimate to the undersigned Bench regarding receiving of information.

The attention of the Complainant was 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).

The matter was adjourned to 28.4.2022.

- 2. In today's hearing, complainant Sh. Sushil Kumar states that he has filed complaint to the Commission not an appeal. He requests the Commission to take an action on the respondent PIO as he failed to supply the information within stipulated time period.
- 3. Respondent, ASI, Sh. Jarnail Singh intimates via telephone that he is unable to attend today's hearing and requested for an adjournment in this case.
- 4. Both the parties are advised to represent this case in person on the next date of hearing, failing to which, appropriate order in their absence shall be passed.
- 5. To come up on **20.07.2022 at 10:30 A.M**. **at Punjab State Information Commission Office, Chandigarh**. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Dated: 28.04.2022



Smt. Kiran Sharma

w/o late ShriJagdish Sharma, R/O Street No.42, Preet Nagar, Shimlapluri Ludhiana.

Appellant/Complainant

Vs.

Public Information Officer,

O/o Police Commissioner, Ludhiana

Public Information Officer

SHO, Thana Shimlapuri, Ludhiana

Respondent

Complaint case No.301 of 2020 Through CISCO WEBEX

Present:

(i) Sh. Sushil Kumar on behalf of the complainant.(ii)Nobody on behalf of the respondent.

ORDER

1. This order may be read with earlier order dated: 19.10.2021 vide which respondent, Sh. Jarnail Singh stated that whatever information was available in the official record has already been supplied to the complainant but complainant expresses his dissatisfaction and requests to direct the respondent PIO to supply the information. Being a complaint case, the Commission continuously doing efforts to supply the demanded information to the complainant. Respondent PIO is also continuously supplying reply/information time and again and presenting case on the fixed hearings.

Accordingly, respondent PIO was again advised to bring the original record on 21.10.2021 in connection with RTI applications in the above mentioned cases. Complainant is advised to inspect the record in the PSIC Office on the fixed date. Complainant is also advised to intimate to the undersigned Bench regarding receiving of information.

The attention of the Complainant was 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). The matter was adjourned to 28.4.2022.

- In today's hearing, representative of the complainant Sh. Sushil Kumar states that he has filed complaint to the Commission not an appeal. He requests the Commission to take an action on the respondent PIO as he failed to supply the information within stipulated time period.
- 3. Respondent, ASI, Sh. Jarnail Singh intimates via telephone that he is unable to attend today's hearing and requested for an adjournment in this case.
- 4. Both the parties are advised to represent this case in person on the next date of hearing, failing to which, appropriate order in their absence shall be passed.

Complaint case No.301 of 2020 Through CISCO WEBEX

5. It is also observed that in the notices and orders earlier passed/sent by the undersigned Bench, respondent parties were mentioned as

Public Information Officer, O/o Police Commissioner, Ludhiana and

First Appellate Authority, O/o SHO, Thana Shimlapuri, Ludhiana

Instead of

Public Information Officer, O/o Police Commissioner, Ludhiana and

Public Information Officer, O/o SHO, Thana Shimlapuri, Ludhiana, which may be read as Public Information Officer, O/o SHO, Thana Shimlapuri, Ludhiana.

6. To come up on **20.07.2022 at 10:30 A.M**. **at Punjab State Information Commission Office, Chandigarh**. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Dated: 28.04.2022



Appellant/Complainant

Respondent

Sh. Sushil Kumar (9814500575)

H.No.1410, Phase-I, Urban Estate, Dugri Road, Ludhiana – 141 013

Vs.

Public Information Officer,

O/o Police Commissioner, Ludhiana.

Complaint case No.285 of 2020 Through CISCO WEBEX

Present:(i) Sh. Sushil Kumar, the complainant.(ii) Nobody on behalf of the respondent.

ORDER

1. This order may be read with earlier order dated: 19.10.2021 vide which respondent, Sh. Jarnail Singh stated that whatever information was available in the official record has already been supplied to the complainant but complainant expresses his dissatisfaction and requests to direct the respondent PIO to supply the information. Being a complainant case, the Commission continuously doing efforts to supply the demanded information to the complainant. Respondent PIO is also continuously supplying reply/information time and again and presenting case on the fixed hearings.

Accordingly, respondent PIO was again advised to bring the original record on 21.10.2021 in connection with RTI applications in the above mentioned cases. Complainant is advised to inspect the record in the PSIC Office on the fixed date. Complainant is also advised to intimate to the undersigned Bench regarding receiving of information.

The attention of the Complainant was 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).

The matter was adjourned to 28.4.2022.

- 2. In today's hearing, complainant Sh. Sushil Kumar states that he has filed complaint to the Commission not an appeal. He requests the Commission to take an action on the respondent PIO as he failed to supply the information within stipulated time period.
- 3. Respondent, ASI, Sh. Jarnail Singh intimates via telephone that he is unable to attend today's hearing and requested for an adjournment in this case.
- 4. Both the parties are advised to represent this case in person on the next date of hearing, failing to which, appropriate order in their absence shall be passed.
- 5. To come up on **20.07.2022 at 10:30 A.M**. **at Punjab State Information Commission Office, Chandigarh**. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Dated: 28.04.2022

Smt. Neena Gupta

H.No.1410, Phase-I, Urban Estate, Dugri Road, Ludhiana – 141 013

Vs.

Public Information Officer,

O/o Police Commissioner, Ludhiana

Public Information Officer

O/o SHO, Shimlapuri, Ludhiana.

Respondent

Complaint case No.289 of 2020 Through CISCO WEBEX

Present:

(i) Sh. Sushil Kumar on behalf of the complainant.(ii)Nobody on behalf of the respondent.

ORDER

 This order may be read with earlier order dated: 19.10.2021 vide which respondent, Sh. Jarnail Singh stated that whatever information was available in the official record has already been supplied to the complainant but complainant expresses his dissatisfaction and requests to direct the respondent PIO to supply the information. Being a complaint case, the Commission continuously doing efforts to supply the demanded information to the complainant. Respondent PIO is also continuously supplying reply/information time and again and presenting case on the fixed hearings.

Accordingly, respondent PIO was again advised to bring the original record on 21.10.2021 in connection with RTI applications in the above mentioned cases. Complainant is advised to inspect the record in the PSIC Office on the fixed date. Complainant is also advised to intimate to the undersigned Bench regarding receiving of information.

The attention of the Complainant was 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).

The matter was adjourned to 28.4.2022.

- 2. In today's hearing, representative of the complainant Sh. Sushil Kumar states that the complainant has filed complaint to the Commission not an appeal. He requests the Commission to take an action on the respondent PIO as he failed to supply the information within stipulated time period.
- 3. Respondent, ASI, Sh. Jarnail Singh intimates via telephone that he is unable to attend today's hearing and requested for an adjournment in this case.
- 4. Both the parties are advised to represent this case in person on the next date of hearing, failing to which, appropriate order in their absence shall be passed.
- 5. To come up on **20.07.2022 at 10:30 A.M**. **at Punjab State Information Commission Office, Chandigarh**. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

(Anumit Singh Sodhi) State Information Commissioner Punjab

Dated: 28.04.2022



Appellant/Complainant



Appellant/Complainant

Sh. Sushil Kumar (9814500575)

H.No.1410, Phase-1, Urban Estate, Dugri Road, Ludhiana.

Vs.

Public Information Officer, O/o Police Commissioner, Ludhiana

Public Information Officer O/o Police Station Shimlapuri, Ludhiana Respondent

Complaint case No.419 of 2020 Through CISCO WEBEX

Present:

(i) Sh. Sushil Kumar, the complainant.(ii)Nobody on behalf of the respondent.

ORDER

1. This order may be read with earlier order dated: 19.10.2021 vide which respondent, Sh. Jarnail Singh stated that whatever information was available in the official record has already been supplied to the complainant but complainant expresses his dissatisfaction and requests to direct the respondent PIO to supply the information. Being a complaint case, the Commission continuously doing efforts to supply the demanded information to the complainant. Respondent PIO is also continuously supplying reply/information time and again and presenting case on the fixed hearings.

Accordingly, respondent PIO was again advised to bring the original record on 21.10.2021 in connection with RTI applications in the above mentioned cases. Complainant is advised to inspect the record in the PSIC Office on the fixed date. Complainant is also advised to intimate to the undersigned Bench regarding receiving of information.

The attention of the Complainant was 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). The matter was adjourned to 28.4.2022.

- 2. In today's hearing, complainant Sh. Sushil Kumar states that he has filed complaint to the Commission not an appeal. He requests the Commission to take an action on the respondent PIO as he failed to supply the information within stipulated time period.
- 3. Respondent, ASI, Sh. Jarnail Singh intimates via telephone that he is unable to attend today's hearing and requested for an adjournment in this case.
- 4. Both the parties are advised to represent this case in person on the next date of hearing, failing to which, appropriate order in their absence shall be passed.

Complaint case No.419 of 2020 Through CISCO WEBEX

5. It is also observed that in the notices and orders earlier passed/sent by the undersigned Bench, respondent parties were mentioned as

Public Information Officer, O/o Police Commissioner, Ludhiana and

First Appellate Authority, O/o Police Station, Shimlapuri, Ludhiana

Instead of

Public Information Officer, O/o Police Commissioner, Ludhiana and Public Information Officer, O/o Police Station, Shimlapuri, Ludhiana, which may be read as Public Information Officer, O/o Police Station, Shimlapuri, Ludhiana.

6. To come up on **20.07.2022 at 10:30 A.M**. **at Punjab State Information Commission Office, Chandigarh**. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Dated: 28.04.2022



Sh. Rajpal Singh, (6239753371)

S/o Sh. Dharmveer Rinwa, VPO Bareka, Tehsil Fazilka

Versus

Show-Cause

	Public Information Officer (By Name)
(Regd. Post)	O/o BDPO, Khuhian, Sarwar at Abohar,
	(Fazilka)

First Appellate Authority

O/o DDPO, Khuhian, Sarwar at Abohar, Distt.Fazilka

Respondent

Appeal Case No.: 1127 of 2021 Through CISCO WEBEX

 Present:
 (i) Sh. Rajpal Singh, the appellant

 (ii)Nobody on behalf of the respondent.

- <u>ORDER</u>
 - This order may be read with earlier order dated: 19.10.2021 vide which respondent PIO was directed to supply the information within seven days. The matter was adjourned for further hearing for 28.4.2022.
 - 2. In today's hearing, appellant is present but respondent PIO is absent without any intimation to the Commission despite being aware about the date of hearing, which shows no regard to the Notice of the Commission. It is to mention here that during the last hearing Sh. Gian Bhatti, BDO(9914400157) was present. Inspite of various calls to Sh. Bhatti, his number was not reachable.
 - 3. The appellant is present in today's hearing. He states that the information sought for vide his RTI application has not been supplied to him till date.
 - 4. In view of the foregoing, respondent PIO, O/o BDPO, Khuhian, Sarwar at Abohar, (Fazilka) is directed to <u>show cause</u> in writing or through affidavit under Section 20(1) of the RTI Act, as to why penalty be not imposed upon him for willful delay/ denial of the information to the RTI applicant and why the compensation be not awarded to the complainant under Section 19 (8)(b) of the Act for detriment suffered.

In addition to his submission, the PIO is also hereby given an opportunity under Section 20(1) proviso, thereto, for a personal hearing before the imposition of such penalty on the next date of hearing. He may note that in case he does not file his submission and does not avail himself of the opportunity of personal hearing on the next date fixed, it will be presumed that he has nothing to say and the Commission shall proceed to take further proceedings against him ex-parte.

Appeal Case No.: 1127 of 2021 Through CISCO WEBEX

- The respondent PIO directed to appear in person on the next date of hearing along with directions to supply the reply/information as per RTI application to the appellant within seven days from the receipt of order.
- 6. The appellant is advised to point out deficiencies, if any, before the next date of hearing positively within seven days after receipt of the information.
- To come up on 26.7.2022 at 11:00 A.M. through CISCO-Webex (Video Conferencing application).
 Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

(Steps to use CISCO WEBEX: Install CISCO Webex->Click on Join Meeting->Enter Meeting Number 1582933632).

Dated: 28.04.2022



Sh. Rajpal Singh, (6239753371)

s/o Sh. Dharamveer Rinwa, Village & PO Bareka, Tehsil Fazilka Distt. Patiala

Show-Cause

Versus

(Regd. Post) Public Information Officer (By Name) O/o BDPO, Khuhina Sarwar at Abohar, (Fazilka)

First Appellate Authority O/o BDPO, Khuhina Sarwar,Abohar,Distt. Fazilka)

Respondent

Appeal Case No.: 1124 of 2021 Through CISCO WEBEX

Present:(i) Sh. Rajpal Singh, the appellant
(ii)Nobody on behalf of the respondent.

<u>ORDER</u>

- This order may be read with earlier order dated: 19.10.2021 vide which respondent PIO was directed to supply the information within seven days. The matter was adjourned for further hearing for 28.4.2022.
- 2. In today's hearing, appellant is present but respondent PIO is absent without any intimation to the Commission despite being aware about the date of hearing, which shows no regard to the Notice of the Commission. It is to mention here that during the last hearing Sh. Gian Bhatti, BDO(9914400157) was present. Inspite of various calls to Sh. Bhatti, his number was not reachable.
- The appellant is present in today's hearing. He states that the information sought for vide his RTI application has not been supplied to him till date.
- 4. In view of the foregoing, respondent PIO, O/o BDPO, Khuhian, Sarwar at Abohar, (Fazilka) is directed to <u>show cause</u> in writing or through affidavit under Section 20(1) of the RTI Act, as to why penalty be not imposed upon him for willful delay/ denial of the information to the RTI applicant and why the compensation be not awarded to the complainant under Section 19 (8)(b) of the Act for detriment suffered.

In addition to his submission, the PIO is also hereby given an opportunity under Section 20(1) proviso, thereto, for a personal hearing before the imposition of such penalty on the next date of hearing. He may note that in case he does not file his submission and does not avail himself of the opportunity of personal hearing on the next date fixed, it will be presumed that he has nothing to say and the Commission shall proceed to take further proceedings against him ex-parte.

Appeal Case No.: 1124 of 2021 Through CISCO WEBEX

- The respondent PIO directed to appear in person on the next date of hearing along with directions to supply the reply/information as per RTI application to the appellant within seven days from the receipt of order.
- 6. The appellant is advised to point out deficiencies, if any, before the next date of hearing positively within seven days after receipt of the information.
- To come up on 26.7.2022 at 11:00 A.M. through CISCO-Webex (Video Conferencing application).
 Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

(Steps to use CISCO WEBEX: Install CISCO Webex->Click on Join Meeting->Enter Meeting Number 1582933632).

Dated: 28.04.2022



Respondent

Sh. Narinder Sharma (9815263774)

3185/25, Kot Mahna Singh,

Tarn Taran Road, Amritsar.

Versus

Public Information Officer O/o Municipal Corporation, Amritsar.

First Appellate Authority

O/o The Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Amritsar.

Appeal case No.: 2369 of 2021

 Through CISCO WEBEX

 Present:
 (i) Sh. Narinder Sharma-the appellant

(i) Nobody on behalf of the respondent.

<u>ORDER</u>

 This order may be read with earlier order passed by the then Ld. SIC, Sh. Hem Inder Singh on 18.11.2021 vide which appellant was advised to point out deficiencies in the supplied information within fifteen days and matter was adjourned for further hearing on 31.01.2022.

The above mentioned case was allocated to the undersigned Bench on 03.01.2022 and matter was not heard on 31.01.2022 and fixed for today.

- 2. In today's hearing, Sh. Narinder Sharma appellant is present but he has not pointed out any deficiency in the supplied information till date.
- 3. Respondent PIO is absent despite being aware about the date of hearing. The absence of the PIO is viewed seriously that affects hearing and disposal of the case.
- 4. Both the parties are advised to comply with the previous order of the Commission as ample time has elapsed but no deficiency has been pointed out by the appellant, which only linger on the decision of this present case. Both the parties are also advised to represent this case in person on the next date of hearing, failing to which, appropriate order in their absence shall be passed.
- 5. To come up on 25.5.2022 at 11:00 A.M. through CISCO-Webex (Video Conferencing application). Copy of the order be sent to the parties.
 (Steps to use CISCO WEBEX: Install CISCO Webex->Click on Join Meeting->Enter Meeting Number 1582933632).

Dated: 28.04.2022

Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Respondent

Sh. Tejinder Singh Advocate (9041004313) Civil Court, Tehsil Complex, Backside Sanjh Kender,

Versus

Public Information Officer O/o State Transport Commissioner, Pb, Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority

Phillaur -144410

O/o State Transport Commissioner, Pb, Chandigarh.

Appeal Case No.: 1591 of 2021 Through CISCO WEBEX

Present: (i) Sh. Tejinder Singh, the appellant.

(ii) For the respondent: Smt. Kulwinder Kaur, PIO

ORDER:

- 1. This order may be read with earlier order dated: 16.3.2022 vide which both the parties were absent and matter was adjourned for 28.4.2022.
- 2. In today's hearing, appellant states that he is not satisfied with the supplied reply as the case relates with embezzled of huge public money.
- 3. After hearing both the parties and examining the case file, respondent PIO is directed to supply an affidavit in original with regard to the sought information as per RTI application of the appellant before the next date of hearing, to the appellant with a copy to the Commission.
- To come up on 17.05.2022 at 11:00 A.M. through CISCO-Webex (Video Conferencing application). Copy of the order be sent to the parties.
 (Steps to use CISCO WEBEX: Install CISCO Webex->Click on Join Meeting->Enter Meeting Number 1582933632).

Dated: 28.04.2022



Respondent

Sh. Jasbir Singh (9888296107) Guru Nanak Nagar, Vill. Bolapur, Jhabewal, PO Ramgarh District Ludhiana 141123.

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/O State Transport Commissioner, Sector 17, Chandigarh

First Appellate Authority O/O State Transport Commissioner, Sector 17, Chandigarh

Appeal Case No.: 1545 of 2021 Through CISCO WEBEX

Present: (i) Sh. Jasbir Singh, the appellant (ii)For the respondent: Ms. Kulwinder Kaur (PIO).

<u>ORDER</u>

- 1. This order may be read with earlier order dated: 16.3.2022 vide which respondent PIO was directed to supply the information within ten days as appellant demanded the final decision on the pending matter. The case was adjourned for 28.4.2022.
- 2. In today's hearing both the parties are present. Respondent, Ms. Kulwinder Kaur states that a reply, which is received from the concerned branch has already been sent to the appellant vide letter no. 7508 dated 28.04.2022 thorugh which he was intimated that ਇਸ ਸੰਬੰਧੀ ਮਾਮਲਾ ਵਿੱਤ ਵਿਭਾਗ ਨਾਲ ਟੇਕਆਪ ਕੀਤਾ ਗਿਆ ਹੈ | She adds that similar matter (appeal case No.1877 of 2021) is pending before the undersigned Bench on 11.05.2022.
- 3. On this, appellant expresses his dissatisfaction and requests the Commission to intervene the matter for supplying the requisite information.
- 4. After hearing both the parties and examining the case file, I am of the considered view that supplied reply is not satisfactory. Respondent PIO is directed to represent this case along with concerned person from the concerned branch to clear the facts of this case.
- 5. To come up on 11.5.2022 at 11:00 A.M. through CISCO-Webex (Video Conferencing application). Copy of the order be sent to the parties.
 (Steps to use CISCO WEBEX: Install CISCO Webex->Click on Join Meeting->Enter Meeting Number 1582933632).

Dated: 28.4.2022