



Sh Nitin Kumar Garg,  
C/o Police Public Dairy,  
15-A, Shastri Nagar, Model Town,  
Ludhiana.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o SMO,  
Batala, Distt Gurdaspur.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
Civil Surgeon,  
Gurdaspur.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 140 of 2021**

**PRESENT: Sh.Nitin Kumar Garg as the Appellant**  
**None for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant through RTI application dated 02.07.2020 has sought information regarding comparative statements approved for the purchase of medicine from 01.04.2019 to 28.02.2020 – list of all types of amounts received from the public in the hospital (daily)– amount utilized for medicine purchase and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of SMO Batala. The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 15.09.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 11.05.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Ludhiana/ Gurdaspur. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information.

The respondent was absent. The Commission received a letter from the PIO-SMO Batala stating that the information has been sent to the appellant vide letter dated 22.06.2020. In the same letter, the PIO also claimed that no letter / RTI application dated 02.07.2020 was received by them.

The Commission observed that the reference of the letter (dated 22.06.2020) vide which the PIO claimed to have sent the information, pre-dates the RTI application (RTI application filed on 02.07.2020). This RTI application was on the file. The PIO was directed to relook at the RTI application (a copy of which was enclosed with the order) and send a point-wise reply along with complete information to the Commission, which will be further sent to the appellant.

On the date of the hearing on **18.08.2021**, both the parties were absent. The case was adjourned.

On the date of the last hearing on **09.02.2022**, the appellant informed that the PIO has not supplied the information. Due to a technical fault in the VC, the respondent could not be heard. The case was adjourned.

On the date of hearing on **17.05.2022**, the respondent present informed that the information has been sent to the appellant via speed post.

The appellant informed that he has not received the information.

The PIO was directed to resend the information with an intimation to the Commission.

**Hearing dated 28.09.2022:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at Ludhiana/Gurdaspur. The appellant stated that he has received the information and has pointed out the discrepancies to the PIO on 07.06.2022 but the same has not yet been sorted out.

The respondent is absent nor is represented.

The PIO is directed to sort out the discrepancies as pointed out by the appellant on 07.06.2022 and provide complete information as per record.

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

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 28.09.2022**

**Sd/-**  
**(Khushwant Singh)**  
**State Information Commissioner**



Sh Nitin Kumar Garg,  
C/o Police Public Dairy, 15-A,  
Shastri Nagar, Model Town,  
Ludhiana.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o SMO, Batala,  
Distt Gurdaspur.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o Civil Surgeon,  
Gurdaspur.

...Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 4445 of 2021**

**PRESENT: Sh.Nitin Kumar Garg as the Appellant**  
**None for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant through an RTI application dated 05.07.2021 has sought information regarding copies of comparative statements duly approved for the purchase of medicines during 01.07.2020 to 01.07.2021 – amount received from the public in hospital – list of medicine purchase and repair in hospital – list of all types of funds/grant received – list of the project received as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of SMO Batala. The appellant was not provided with the information, after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the first appellate authority on 08.08.2021, which did not decide on the appeal.

The case last came up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Gurdaspur. As per the appellant, the PIO had not supplied the information.

The respondent was absent. There has been an enormous delay of more than ten months in attending to the RTI application. The Commission having taken a serious view of this directed the PIO to provide information to the appellant within 15 days of the receipt of the order and appear personally on the next date of hearing alongwith explanation for not attending to the RTI application within the time prescribed under the RTI Act.

**Hearing dated 28.09.2022:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Ludhiana/Gurdaspur. The appellant stated that he has received the information but he will inform the deficiencies if any, after going through the same.

The respondent is absent.

The appellant is directed to point out the discrepancies, if any, in the provided information to the PIO, and the PIO is directed to resolve out the same.

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

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 28.09.2022**

**Sd/-**  
**(Khushwant Singh)**  
**State Information Commissioner**



Sh.Rakesh Parkash s/o Sh.Jagan Nath,  
R/o New Road, Kesar Vakilwali Gali,  
Mansa.

...Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o District Treasury Officer,  
Mansa.

...Respondent

**Complaint case No.473 of 2020**

**PRESENT:   None for the Complainant**  
**Sh.Pardeep Kumar, Suptd. for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The complainant through an RTI application dated 12.05.2020 has sought information regarding copies of Bills dated 26.02.2019, 12.07.2019, 25.04.2019, 22.10.2019, 6.11.2019, 8.05.2019, 21.06.2019, 20.09.2019 alongwith amount released from treasury against these bills –account number in which the amount was deposited, name of account holder– name of official responsible for deposit of amount in the account of account holder - and other information concerning the office of District Treasury Officer, Mansa. The complainant was not satisfied with the reply of the PIO dated 09.06.2020 after which the complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 27.07.2020.

The case was first heard on 02.12.2020. The respondent present informed that since the case is pending with Commissioner Cyber Crime Branch for enquiry, the information cannot be provided and the reply has already been sent to the complainant on 09.06.2020.

The complainant claimed that when the RTI application was filed, the record was available with the District Treasury office.

Having gone through the RTI application, reply of the PIO and hearing both the parties, it was settled that the PIO to provide whatever information is in his custody.

On the date of the hearing on **01.02.2021**, the respondent pleaded that the bills that are being sought through the RTI application, after processing, are sent to the office of AG Punjab for payment, and the asked information is available with the office of AG Punjab.

Given the above, The PIO- AG Punjab was impleaded in the case and directed to look at the RTI application and file a suitable reply. A copy of the RTI application was sent along with the order to the PIO-AG Punjab.

On the date of the hearing on **12.05.2021**, the respondent PIO-District Treasury Officer reiterated his earlier plea that the asked information is in the custody of the office of AG Punjab.

Smt.Bhanumati, DAG o/o AG Punjab was present and pleaded that it was not possible to provide information without voucher numbers of the bills. According to the respondent, the bills received from different departments of Punjab are kept in record with the marking of voucher numbers.

The PIO O/o AG Punjab was directed to file a written reply.

On the date of hearing on **23.08.2021**, both the parties were absent. The case was adjourned.

**Complaint case No.473 of 2020**

On the date of hearing on **15.12.2021**, the respondent was absent. The Commission received a letter from the PIO-DAG Pb Chandigarh stating that it is not possible to provide information without voucher numbers of the bills.

The appellant contended that the vouchers are available with the office of District Treasury Officer since the bills were available with them when the RTI application was filed. The PIO-District Treasury Officer, Mansa was directed to appear personally before the Commission at Chandigarh on the next date of hearing and file an appropriate reply.

**Hearing dated 28.09.2022:**

Sh.Pardeep Kumar, Suptd. present from the office of District Treasury Office Mansa informed that they have sent voucher Number/ bill number to the Commission. The Commission has received a letter dated 22.04.2022 from the Treasury office Mansa, which has been taken on record.

The appellant is absent nor represented.

A copy of the letter received from the Treasury office Mansa is being sent to the appellant, and the appellant is advised to file a fresh RTI application with the concerned AG office for getting the information on the basis of the voucher numbers.

No further interference of the Commission is required. The case is **disposed of and closed**.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated :28.09.2022**

**Sd/-**  
**(Khushwant Singh)**  
**State Information Commissioner**

**CC to: PIO-O/o AG, Punjab,**  
**Sector 17, Chandigarh.**



Sh Rajinder Kumar, S/o Sh. Mehar Chand, Ward  
No-2, Supreme Enclave,  
Near Vishwakarma Bhawan,  
Link Road, Mansa.

...Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o Director, Local Govt,  
Sector-35, Chandigarh.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o Director, Local Govt, Pb  
Sector-35, Chandigarh.

.....Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 2128 of 2020**

**PRESENT: Sh.Rajinder Kumar as the Appellant**  
**Sh.Kuldeep Singh, Suptd.(General Branch) for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant, through RTI application dated 13.05.2020 has sought information regarding the decision taken vide resolution No.365 to 382 of general meeting dated 17.01.2020 of NC Mansa along with noting – resolution no.364 dated 29.11.2019 and other information concerning the office of Director, Local Govt. Punjab, Chandigarh. The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 15.06.2020, which did not decide on the appeal. After filing the first appeal, the PIO sent a reply to the appellant vide letter dated 25.06.2020 stating that the matter is under consideration. On being not satisfied with the reply, the appellant filed 2<sup>nd</sup> appeal in the Commission on 10.08.2020.

The case has already been heard on 02.12.2020, 01.02.2021, 12.05.2021, 23.08.2021 & 15.12.2021.

On the date of hearing on 23.08.2021, the PIO was directed to pay a compensation amount of Rs.2500/- to the appellant for undue harassment suffered by the appellant to get the information.

On the date of the last hearing on **15.12.2021**, the respondent present pleaded that the compensation amount of Rs.2500/- has been paid to the appellant vide demand draft No.001105 dated 23.09.2021 and the appellant has received the same.

However, as per the appellant, the PIO had not provided the affidavit as per the order of the Commission.

The PIO was given one last opportunity to provide an affidavit that the information that has been provided is true, and complete and no other information is available in the record. The affidavit should be on stamp paper duly attested by the competent authority.

**Hearing dated 28.09.2022:**

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Mansa. As per the respondent, the affidavit has been provided to the appellant.

**Appeal Case No. 2128 of 2020**

The appellant has received the affidavit.

Having gone through the reply to the show cause notice received from the PIO on 19.08.2021, the Commission observes that the RTI application was replied to within time (on 29.05.2020), thus the show cause is dropped.

Since the order of the Commission has been complied with to provide information/affidavit and the compensation has been paid to the appellant, no further interference of the commission is required.

The case is **disposed of and closed**.

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 28.09.2022**

**Sd/-**  
**(Khushwant Singh)**  
**State Information Commissioner**



Smt. Gurmeet Kaur Kwatra,  
Res Cum Off, E-457, Ground Floor,  
Greater Kailash-2, New Delhi.

... Appellant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o District Civil Hospital,  
Pathankot.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
O/o Civil Surgeon,  
Pathankot.

.....Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 3563 of 2020**

**PRESENT:     None for the Appellant**  
**None for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant, through an RTI application dated 12.09.2019 has sought information regarding old/existing/new temporary/contractual employees along with ID proofs, salary details and attendance register – appointing authority – list of employees employed in last 7 years - details of safai tender – security guards – funds allocated by State Govt. to de-addiction centre – list of patients admitted – quantity of medicine namely Buprophine that came to the de-addiction centre and other information as enumerated in the RTI application concerning the office of District Civil Hospital, Pathankot. The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 27.11.2019 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case last came up for hearing on 11.08.2021 through video conferencing at DAC Pathankot. The appellant is present on WhatsApp and claimed that the PIO has not provided the information.

The respondent was absent, nor had sent any reply to the RTI application.

During the hearing, the appellant conveyed being interested only in the information relating to points 6,7,8,9 & 10.

The PIO was directed to provide complete information on points 6,7,8,9 & 10 of the RTI application to the appellant and send a compliance report to the Commission.

Also having gone through the facts of the case, the Commission observed that there has been an enormous delay in attending to the RTI application. Having taken a serious view of this the PIO was issued a **show cause notice under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 for not supplying the information within the statutorily prescribed period of time and directed to file reply on an affidavit.**



The PIO was further directed to send details regarding:

- Who was the PIO at the time of filing of RTI application and till what duration?
- Who was the PIO at the time of filing the first appeal?
- Who was the PIO at the time of issue of notice from the Commission?
- Who is the current PIO?

On the date of last hearing on **15.12.2021**, the Commission received a letter dated 24.11.2021 from the PIO (received in the Commission on 06.12.2021) which was taken on the file of the Commission. The appellant was absent. The case was adjourned.

**Hearing dated 28.09.2022:**

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

The Commission has received a reply from the PIO dated 22.04.2022 (received in the Commission on 10.05.2022) which has been taken on record. In the reply, it has been informed that Dr.Bhupinder Singh,SMO and Dr.Rakesh Sarpal, SMO have been the PIO from the date of filing of the RTI application and have since retired. Presently Dr.Sunil Chand is PIO working as officiating SMO. The PIO has further mentioned in the reply that since the de-addiction center is being run by DMC Pathankot, the information be got from DMC office.

Since both the PIOs responsible for the delay in attending to the RTI application stand retired, no penalty can be imposed on the retired person. The show cause is hereby dropped.

The appellant is absent for 2<sup>nd</sup> consecutive hearing.

A copy of the reply is being sent to the appellant alongwith the order.

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

Chandigarh  
Dated: 28.09.2022

Sd/-  
(Khushwant Singh)  
State Information Commissioner

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSIONER**

**Red Cross Building, Near  
Rose Garden, Sector 16,  
Chandigarh.**

**Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: -  
psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: -  
[www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)**



Smt.Rupinder Kaur, W/o Late Sh.Joginder  
Singh,  
# C-27, Civil Lines, Bathinda.

Complainant

Versus

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o Commissioner, MC,  
Bathinda.

Respondent

**Complaint Case No. 155 of 2020**

**PRESENT:   None for the Complainant  
                  None for the Respondent**

**ORDER:**

That the complainant through the RTI application dated 04.10.2019 has sought information regarding details of property No.C-28 MC No.MCB Z-2-09103 Civil Line Bhatinda – map approved for the purpose of residential/commercial/school and other information concerning the office of Commissioner, MC Bhatinda. The complainant was not provided with the information after which the complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 05.02.2020.

The case has already been heard on 30.09.2020, 03.11.2020, 05.01.2021, 11.08.2021 & 15.12.2021.

Due to non-supply of information and non-compliance of order of the Commission, a penalty of Rs.5000/- was imposed on the PIO-Inderjit Singh O/o MC Bathinda on 15.12.2021 and a compensation of Rs.2500/- was awarded on 5.01.2021 to be paid to the complainant by way of demand draft.

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

The Commission has received a copy of challan dated 25.02.2022 from the PIO as proof of having deposited the penalty amount in the Govt treasury and a copy of demand draft dated 17.03.2022 alongwith receipt of the complainant as proof of having paid the compensation to the complainant.

Since the penalty has been deposited and compensation has been paid, no further course of action is required. The case is **disposed of and closed**.

**Chandigarh  
Dated: 28.09.2022**

**Sd/-  
(Khushwant Singh)  
State Information Commissioner**



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

Appellant

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o XEN, Water Supply and  
Sanitation, Division No-3,  
Bathinda.

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

Respondent

**Appeal Case No. 1278 of 2020**

**PRESENT: None for the Appellant**  
**Sh.Thakur Singh and Ms.Nirmal Kaur, Jr.Assistant for the**  
**Respondent**

**ORDER:**

The appellant through RTI application dated 06.01.2020 has sought information regarding grants received/utilized in the division from 07.01.2019 to 06.01.2020 –copies of comparative statements approved by competent authority for works by e-tendering/online – work by tender/offline undertaken – sanction letter issued for work of CSR to all SDE from the office of Executive Engineer, W/S & Sanitation Division No.3, Bathinda. The appellant was not provided with the information after which the appellant filed the first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 05.02.2020 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case first came up for hearing on 28.09.2020 through video conferencing at DAC Bathinda. The respondent present pleaded that some of the information has been provided to the appellant and the remaining will be sent within a week.

The appellant was absent and vide email informed that the PIO has not provided the information. The PIO was directed to provide complete information to the appellant within a week and send a compliance report to the Commission.

On the date of the next hearing on 03.11.2020, the appellant vide email has informed that the PIO has not provided the complete information. The respondent was absent.

The PIO was directed to comply with the earlier order of the Commission and provide the information to the appellant within a week with a copy to the Commission and explain the reasons for the delay in providing the information.

On the date of hearing on 05.01.2021, both the parties were absent. The case was adjourned.

On the date of last hearing on 11.08.2021, the appellant informed that the PIO has not provided the information despite the order of the Commission.

The respondent was absent on the 2<sup>nd</sup> consecutive hearing had complied with the order of the Commission. The PIO was given one last opportunity to comply with the order of the Commission and appear before the Commission on the next date of hearing along with the explanation for not complying with the order of the Commission.

On the date of last hearing on **15.12.2021**, the appellant was absent and vide email informed that the PIO has not provided the information. The appellant was directed to appear on the next date of hearing to pursue his case.

The PIO was also absent on 4<sup>th</sup> consecutive hearing. The PIO was given one last opportunity to appear personally on the next date of hearing alongwith the explanation for not providing the information within the time prescribed under the RTI Act otherwise the Commission will be constrained to take action under section 20 of the RTI Act.

**Hearing dated 28.09.2022:**

The case has come up for hearing today through the video conferencing at DAC Bathinda/ Pathankot. As per the respondent, the information has been provided.

The appellant is absent and vide email has informed that he has received the information from the PIO.

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

**Chandigarh**  
**Dated: 28.09.2022**

**Sd/-**  
**(Khushwant Singh)**  
**State Information Commissioner**