

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden, Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - psic30@punjabmail.gov.in
Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Sh.Devan Munjal,
Ward No-19, Street NO-4, Roop Nagar,
Gidderbaha, Distt Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Tehsildar, Gidderbaha,
Distt. Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o SDM, Gidderbaha,
Distt. Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1227 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Devan Munjal as the Appellant
Sh.Rajinder Pal Singh for the Respondent

ORDER: The case was last heard on 31.07.2019. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent was absent. The commission received an email from the PIO stating that the appellant has been asked to get copies of NOCs regarding point-1 from the Sewa Kendra by depositing requisite fee and the information regarding point-2 has been sent to the appellant.

Having gone through the reply, the Commission observed that information is incomplete since the appellant in point-2 has asked for RTI applications which were replied within the prescribed time of 30 days. The PIO had also not replied regarding points-3 & 4. The appellant was directed to inspect the record regarding point-1 by visiting the office of PIO by fixing a mutually convenient date and time and get the relevant information. The PIO was directed to allow inspection of record and provide the information regarding point-1, in the form it exists.

Due to an enormous delay of 10 months in attending to the RTI application, the PIO was issued a **show cause notice Section 20 of the RTI Act and directed to** file reply on an affidavit. The PIO was again directed to provide the information to the appellant within 10 days.

Hearing dated 28.11.2019:

The respondent present pleaded that the information has been supplied to the appellant vide letter dated 02.09.2019. The appellant claims that despite order of the Commission as well as direction of the First Appellate Authority, the PIO has not allowed the inspection of record pertaining to the information regarding point-1. The PIO has also sent wrong and misleading information regarding points-2, 3 & 4.

Hearing both the parties, the Commission directs the PIO to relook at the RTI application and provide complete information on points 2,3& 4. Regarding point-1, the PIO to bring original record to the Commission at the next date of hearing. The PIO is also directed to appear personally and file detailed reply to the show cause notice otherwise the Commission will be constrained to take action against the PIO under section 20 of the RTI Act.

To come up for further hearing on **25.02.2020 at 11.00 AM.**

Sd/-

Chandigarh
Dated:28.11.2019

(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



through registered post.

Sh. Harjit Singh, S/o ShTarsem Singh,
R/o Rose Avenue Chamari Road,
Ajnala, Distt Amritsar.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Addl, SE, Operational,
PSPCL, Division, Ajnala,
Distt Amritsar.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Chief Engineer,
Border Zone, Amritsar.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 909 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Harjit Singh as the Appellant
Sh.RajeshKumar for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was last heard on 18.06.2019. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant was not satisfied and stated that regarding point-1, he has sought copies of MCO and SCO issued for the said electric connections. The respondent pleaded that the record stands destroyed being more than 20 years old. The PIO was directed to enquire into the matter and submit a complete enquiry report which establishes that the record is missing or destroyed as per the procedure.

The information regarding point-2 & 6 stands provided. Regarding information on point-3, the PIO was directed to get it from the Computer Cell and provide to the appellant. The PIO was also directed to provide information on point-4 and sort out the anomaly regarding point-5.

Hearing dated 28.11.2019:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conference facility available in the office of **Deputy Commissioner, Amritsar**. The appellant claims that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent pleaded that the information has not been received from the computer cell.

The earlier order stands. The PIO is given one more opportunity to comply with the earlier order of the Commission and provide the information to the appellant. The PIO to provide the information within 10 days and send a compliance report to the Commission otherwise the Commission will be constrained to issue a show cause notice under section 20 of the RTI Act.

To come up for further hearing **on 27.01.2020 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Amritsar. Copies of the order be sent to the parties ***through registered post.***

Chandigarh
Dated 28.11.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh.Rajinder Kumar,
Q No-35-L, I.T.I Staff Colony,
Talwara

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
SDO, PSPCL,
Sub Division, Haryana,
Distt.Hoshiarpur.

First Appellate Authority,
SDO, PSPCL,
Sub Division, Haryana,
Distt.Hoshiarpur.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3594 of 2018

Present: Sh.Rajinder Kumar as Appellant
Sh.Jagdeep Kumar for the Respondent

Order:

The case was first heard on **04.02.2019**. The respondent present pleaded that since the information is 3rd party, it cannot be provided. Having gone through the RTI application, the Commission directed the PIO to provide information regarding points 2. Rest of the points to be adjudicated at the next date of hearing.

The case was again heard on **27.02.2019**. The respondent informed that the information regarding point-2 has been provided. Regarding information on point-1, the respondent denied the information stating that the information is 3rd party and it cannot be provided.

To provide an opportunity to the 3rd party under section 19(4) of the RTI Act, Sh.Baljinder Singh was impleaded as a party to the case and directed to appear before the Commission on the next date of hearing if he wanted to plead the case. The PIO was also directed to provide information regarding point-4 to the appellant.

The case was again heard on **06.05.2019**. The respondent pleaded that 3rd party has not given his consent to part with the information. Sh.Baljinder Singh was absent. Sh.Baljinder Singh was given one more opportunity to appear before the Commission on the next date of hearing and plead his case otherwise the Commission will decide the case ex-parte.

The case was last heard on **02.07.2019**. Both the parties were absent. The case was adjourned.

Hearing dated 28.11.2019:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conference facility available in the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Hoshiarpur. The 3rd party, Sh.Baljinder Singh is absent on 3rd consecutive hearing. There appears to be some personal family dispute between the appellant and Sh.Baljinder Singh and the appellant wants documentation to settle personal property matters and hence requires the information.

Despite giving sufficient opportunities, the 3rd party has failed to appear and plead its case that why the information should be not disclosed.

The PIO is directed to provide the information to the appellant within 15 days of the receipt of this order and send a compliance report to the Commission.

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

Chandigarh
Dated: 28.11.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

CC to Sh.Baljinder Singh S/o Sh.Hari Singh Saini,
Village BassiMudda, P.O.Baghpur,
District Hoshiarpur (M-81462-23964)



through registered post.

Sh. Sharvan Kumar,
VPO Kular, Tehsil Abohar,
Distt.Fazilka.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o DC,
Fazilka.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o DC,
Fazilka.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 742 of 2019

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was last heard on 18.06.2019. The respondent present pleaded that since the complaint of the appellant was not found in their record, the appellant was asked vide letter dated 29.04.2019 to appear and clarify the information but he did not turn up. The appellant was again called telephonically on 13.06.2019 when he appeared and informed that in his complaint, inadvertently, he had mentioned the date as 25.09.2015 instead of 25.09.2018 and sought action taken report on the complaint. The respondent further pleaded that they have sent the complaint to the BDPO Fazilka for investigation and the BDPO was asked vide letter dated 13.06.2019 to complete the report within two days. The information to be provided to the appellant on receipt of investigation report.

The appellant was absent and vide email has requested for hearing through video conference facility available in the office of DC Fazilka. The case was adjourned.

Hearing dated 28.11.2019:

The case has come up for further hearing today through video conference facility available in the office of **Deputy Commissioner, Fazilka**. Both the parties are absent. The earlier order stands.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **27.01.2020 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of **Deputy Commissioner, Fazilka**. The order be sent to both the parties through registered post.

Chandigarh
Dated 28.11.2019

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



through registered post.

Sh. Lakhwinder Singh, S/o ShGurjant Singh,
VPO PatiiSadiq, Tehsil Abohar,
DisttFazilka.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o DC,
Fazilka.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o DC,
Fazilka.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1349 of 2019

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
Sh.Amarjit Singh for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was last heard on 27.08.2019. The respondent present has pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant and the appellant has received the same.

The appellant was absent and vide email sought adjournment. In the same email, the appellant informed that the PIO has not provided the requisite information and requested for next hearing through video conferencing at District Administrative Complex, Fazilka. The case was adjourned.

Hearing dated 28.11.2019:

The case has come up for further hearing today through video conference facility available in the office of **Deputy Commissioner, Fazilka**. The respondent present pleaded that the enquiry is pending with TehsildarAbohar and after receipt of complete enquiry report, the information will be provided to the appellant.

The appellant is absent. The PIO is directed to send complete status report on the enquiry to the appellant within 10 days.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **27.01.2020 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of **Deputy Commissioner, Fazilka** Copy of order be sent to both the parties **through registered post**.

Chandigarh
Dated:28.11.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden, Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - sicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in
Visit us: - www.infocompunjab.com



Sh.Simranjit Singh, S/o ShJagdish Singh,
93/2,Adarsh Nagar, Jalandhar

Versus

...Appellant.

Public Information Officer,
O/o Jalandhar Development Authority,
Jalandhar.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Jalandhar Development Authority,
Jalandhar.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3673 of 2018

Present: None for the Appellant
Sh.Rajinder Kumar Bali O/o JDA for the Respondent

Order:

The case was first heard on **04.20.2019**.The respondent present pleaded that the information regarding point 1 has been provided and since the information sought regarding other points is not clear, it cannot be provided.

Having gone through the RTI application and the reply of the PIO, the Commission directed the appellant to clarify for which vehicle the information is being sought as well as to specify the period from which day and year, the information is being sought.

The case was again heard on **27.02.2019**. The appellant informed that he has specified the vehicle and period from which the information is being sought. The respondent pleaded that the appellant has provided the date today only. The PIO was directed to provide the information within 5 days and send a compliance report to the Commission.

On the date of next hearing which was held on **06.05.2019**, both the parties were absent. The case was adjourned.

The case was last heard on **02.07.2019**.The appellant claimed that no information has been provided. The respondent denied the information stating that the information sought by the appellant is in personal interest and not in the public interest. The appellant said that he has sought the information regarding vehicles authorized for official use.

Having gone through the entire case, taking attention to section 4(2) of the RTI Act and under the powers vested under section 19(8)(a) of the RTI Act, the Commission directed the PIO to upload the information regarding vehicles, log book, fuel expenses as well as kilometers covered and provide the information to the appellant as per earlier order which still stands.

Appeal Case No. 3673 of 2018

Hearing dated 28.11.2019:

The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 16.08.2019. The appellant is absent nor has pointed out any discrepancy in the information provided. It is presumed that the appellant has received the information and is satisfied.

Regarding uploading of the information on website of the department relating to vehicles, log book, fuel expenses as well as kilometers covered, the respondent pleaded that the action is being taken by the Chief Administrator, JDA Jalandhar. The Chief Administrator, JDA Jalandhar is directed to comply with the order of the Commission and send a compliance report of the order under section 4 of the RTI Act to the Commission.

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

Chandigarh
Dated:28.11.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



through registered post.

Sh. Simranjit Singh, S/o ShJagdisth Singh,
93/2, Adarsh Nagar, Jalandhar.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Jalandhar Development Authority,
Jalandhar.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Jalandhar Development Authority,
Jalandhar.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 653 of 2019

PRESENT: None the Appellant
Sh.Sanjeev O/o JDA for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on 13.05.2019. The respondent was absent. The Commission received a letter diary No.8586 on 25.04.2019 from the PIO stating that since the information sought by the appellant was not specific and that the appellant was asked vide letter dated 10.01.2019 to clarify for which area/site the information is required, but the appellant has not responded to their query.

Having gone through the RTI application, the appellant was asked to make this RTI application more specific to enable the PIO to send desired reply. The PIO was directed to look at this clarification once submitted and provide the information.

The case was last heard on **02.07.2019**. The respondent present pleaded that the appellant has not clarified the information sought. The appellant was directed to specify the information and the PIO was directed to provide the information as per earlier order which still stands.

Hearing dated 28.11.2019:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Jalandhar. The respondent present informed that the appellant has not specified the information. The appellant is absent without any intimation. The appellant is neither present at the last hearing.

Since the orders have already been passed at the previous hearing that the information be provided once the appellant specifies the information, no further course of action is left in the case.

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

Chandigarh
Dated 28.11.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



through registered post.

Sh. Naresh Kumar,
H No-2795, Street No-3,
Jammu colony, Ludhiana.

Appellant.

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o Deputy Chief engineer,
Operational Urban (West) Division,
PSPCL, Ludhiana.

First Appellate Authority,

O/o Chief Engineer, Central Zone,
PSPCL, Ludhiana.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3249 of 2018

Present: Sh.Naresh Kumar as Appellant
Sh.Brij Mohal Mittal, AAO(Revenue) O/o Sr Executive Engineer, City
Central Div/Op.(Spl) PSPCL Ludhiana for the Respondent

Order:

The case was first heard on 28.01.2019. The respondent present pleaded that the handover/takeover report is not available in their record. The respondent claimed that the concerned Police Division No.4 Ludhiana was asked vide letter dated 21.06.2018 to provide the handover/takeover list. The respondent further pleaded that as per report of the Police Division No.4, the Police Division No.4 has been changed to Police Station Daresi and they have requested the concerned SHO Police Station Daresi vide letter dated 30.07.2018 and again on 30.11.2018 to provide the information but their response is awaited.

The Commission directed the PIO to respond to the RTI application as per facts on an affidavit. The PIO, Police Station, Daresi Ludhiana was also directed to send response.

The case was again heard on **19.03.2019**. The respondent present submitted an affidavit stating that handover/takeover report is not available in their record and the appellant has already been informed vide letter dated 25.05.2018. The respondent further pleaded that the SHO Police Station Daresi has not sent any reply.

The SHO Police Station Daresi Ludhiana was directed to look into the matter and send response as per facts of the case. The PIO Police Station Daresi Ludhiana was also impleaded as a party in the case and directed to appear before the Commission regarding this particular case on the next date of hearing.

On the next date of hearing which was held on **15.05.2019**, the appellant claimed that he has not received the information. The respondent present pleaded that hand-over/take-over report was not available in their record. The SHO Thana Daresi Ludhiana was absent. The SHO Police Station, Daresi, Ludhiana was again directed to provide hand-over/take-over list and be present on the next date of hearing otherwise the Commission will take action as per the RTI Act. The PIO-PSPCL was also directed to send a certified copy of the affidavit to the appellant.

The case was last heard on **17.07.2019**. The appellant informed that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent present informed that the SHO Police Station Daresi has not sent any reply. The SHO Police Station, Daresi, Ludhiana was given one last opportunity and directed to provide hand-over/take-over list and be present on the next date of hearing otherwise the Commission will take action as per the RTI Act.

A copy of the order was also sent to the SSP Ludhiana to get the order served to the concerned PIO and to ensure compliance of this order, as well as ensure that the concerned PIO to provide the information and appears personally at the next date of hearing.

Hearing dated 28.11.2019:

The PIO-SHO Police Station Daresi-Ludhiana is absent. The direction of the Commission has not been followed. The Commission has taken a serious view of this. The SSP Ludhiana is again directed to ensure the presence of the PIO-SHO Police Station Daresi otherwise the Commission will be constrained to issue warrants under section 18 of the RTI Act.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **27.01.2020 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of **Deputy Commissioner, Ludhiana**. Copies of the order be sent to both the parties **through registered post**.

Chandigarh
Dated: 28.11.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

CC to :1. PIO-SHO, Police Station,
Daresi, Ludhiana.

2. Senior Superintendent of Police
Ludhiana.



through registered post.

Sh.Jagmohan Singh,
334, G.T Road, Salem Tabri,
Ludhiana.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Sub Registrar (East),
Transport Nagar, Ludhiana.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o SDM,
Ludhiana (East).

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 660 of 2019

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard by Sh.S.S.Channay, Chief Information Commissioner on 27.03.2019. Both the parties were absent. The appellant vide letter dated 27.03.2019 informed that the PIO has not provided the information and the Sub-Registrar is pressurizing him to withdraw the RTI application. The PIO was directed to supply the information to the appellant before the next date of hearing otherwise the Commission will take action under the provisions of the RTI Act.

The case was last heard on 22.08.2019 by this bench. Both the parties were absent. The case was adjourned. The PIO was directed to comply with the earlier order which still stands and be present on the next date of hearing alongwith the explanation for not attending to the RTI application.

Hearing dated 28.11.2019:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Ludhiana. Both the parties are absent. The earlier order stands. The case is adjourned.

To come up for further hearing on **27.01.2020 at 11.00AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Ludhiana. The order be sent to both the parties **through registered post**.

Chandigarh
Dated: 28.11.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Regd Post

Sh.NareshDevgan Sharma,
Advocate, Chamber NO-702/2,
District Courts, Ludhiana.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Commissioner of Police,
Ludhiana.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Commissioner of Police,
Ludhiana.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3877 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Naresh Devgan for the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard by Sh.S.S.Channay, Chief Information Commissioner on 28.11.2018. The respondent present from the office of Police Station Division No.5 Ludhiana sought some more time to collect the information from police station Division No.5 Ludhiana and from the office of Commissioner of Police Ludhiana which was granted and the case was adjourned. On the next date of hearing on 15.01.2019, the appellant informed that the information provided is incomplete. The respondent was directed to allow the appellant to inspect the record and identify the specific documents required by him and supply the same to the appellant. On the next date of hearing on 12.02.2019, the appellant informed that after inspecting the record, he received information pertaining to his 5 complaints out of 8 complaints sent to the Commissioner of Police Ludhiana. The respondents were directed to provide the information on remaining three complaints.

On the last hearing on 26.03.2019, the appellant was absent. The respondent submitted a letter dated 13.03.2019 from incharge, Police Post Kochar Market, Police Station Division No.5 Ludhiana stating that the remaining information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant was given last opportunity to send his observations, if any, to the PIO with a copy to the Commission.

The case was last heard by this bench on 22.08.2019. The appellant was absent and vide email informed that the PIO has not provided the complete information. Having gone through the RTI application I found that the appellant in his RTI application has not mentioned that what does he need specifically, and that the application is vague. The appellant was asked to specify the information so that the information can be provided to the best possible extent.

Hearing dated 28.11.2019:

The appellant is present and has now specified the information. The PIO is given one last opportunity to look at the RTI application and provide complete information before the next date of hearing otherwise the Commission will be constrained to issue show cause notice under section 20 of the RTI Act. The PIO is also directed to be present on the next date of hearing.

To come up for further hearing on **19.12.2019 at 11.00 AM**

Chandigarh
Dated: 28.11.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Regd Post

Sh. Naresh Devgan Sharma,
Advocate, Chamber NO-702/2,
Distt Courts, Ludhiana.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Commissioner of Police,
Ludhiana.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Commissioner of Police,
Ludhiana.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3878 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Naresh Devgan as the Appellant
None for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard by Sh.S.S.Channay, Chief Information Commissioner on 28.11.2018. The respondent present from the office of Police Station Division No.5 Ludhiana sought some more time to collect the information from concerned police stations which was granted and the case was adjourned. On the next date of hearing on 15.01.2019, the appellant informed that the information provided is incomplete. The respondent was directed to allow the appellant to inspect the record and identify the specific documents required by him and supply the same to the appellant. On the next date of hearing on 12.02.2019, the appellant informed that after inspecting the record, he received information pertaining to his 3 complaints out of 12 complaints sent to the Commissioner of Police Ludhiana. The respondents were directed to provide the information on remaining nine complaints.

On the next date of hearing on 26.03.2019, the appellant was absent. The respondent submitted a letter dated 13.03.2019 from incharge, Police Post Kochar Market, Police Station Division No.5 Ludhiana stating that the remaining information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant was given last opportunity to send his observations, if any, to the PIO with a copy to the Commission.

The case was last heard by this bench on 22.08.2019. The appellant was absent and vide email informed that the PIO has not provided the complete information. Having gone through the RTI application I found that the appellant in his RTI application has not mentioned that what does he need specifically, and that the application is vague. The appellant was asked to specify the information so that the information can be provided to the best possible extent.

Hearing dated 28.11.2019:

The appellant is present and has now specified the information. The PIO is given one last opportunity to look at the RTI application and provide complete information before the next date of hearing otherwise the Commission will be constrained to issue show cause notice under section 20 of the RTI Act. The PIO is also directed to be present on the next date of hearing.

To come up for further hearing on **19.12.2019 at 11.00 AM**

Chandigarh
Dated: 28.11.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh. Sadhu Singh, S/o ShSajjan Singh,
Village Rurka, P.ODEhlon,
Dist Ludhiana

... Appellant

Versus

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

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Police Commissioner,
Ludhiana.

...Respondent

Appeal No.693 of 2019

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
Sh.Ranjit Singh, Head Constable for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard by Sh.S.S.Channay, Chief Information Commissioner on 09.04.2019. Sh.Naresh Kumar HC appeared on behalf of the respondent informed that a compromise has been arrived at between the parties. The appellant expressed dis-satisfaction and stated that he wants action taken report on his complaint. After hearing both the parties, the appellant was directed to send a copy of his complaint to the respondent PIO and the PIO was directed to furnish action taken report before the next date of hearing.

The case was last heard by this bench on 21.08.2019. The respondent present pleaded that the appellant has not provided the reference number/copy of complaint as per order of the Commission. The appellant was absent and vide email has sought exemption.

The appellant was directed to send reference number of the complaint or a copy of his complaint to the respondent and the PIO was directed to comply with the earlier order of the Commission which still stands.

Hearing dated 28.11.2019:

The respondent says that the appellant has not specified the complaint number. The appellant is absent on two occasions.

If the appellant still needs the information, he is directed to specify the reference number of complaint or a copy of the complaint to the respondent and the PIO is directed to provide the information.

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

Chandigarh
Dated:28.11.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner