



Sh.Ashok Kumar,
H No-214, Pine Homes,
Dhakoli, Zirakpur.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Chief Administrator,
GMADA, PUDA Bhawan,
Sector-62, Mohali..

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Chief Administrator,
GMADA, Sector-62,
Mohali.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 95 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Ashok Kumar as the Appellant
Sh.Gulshan Kumar, PIO GMADA for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was last heard on **08.04.2019**. The respondent present pleaded that they have already sent the information to the appellant vide letter dated 06.11.2018. The appellant was absent and vide letter received in the Commission on 04.04.2019 informed that he has not received the information as per the RTI application.

Since the appellant was absent and no discrepancy could be discussed at the hearing, the case was adjourned.

Hearing dated 29.05.2019:

The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant is not satisfied and stated that he has sought calculation sheet vide which the allotment price of land was finalized alongwith allotment letter for the land allotted to Reimagining Higher Education Foundation. The respondent pleaded that the information is relates to 3rd party and the 3rd party has not given its consent to part with the information.

I have gone through the RTI application and the reply of the PIO and hereby direct the PIO to provide information regarding point-1 within a week. Regarding information on point-3, the 3rd party M/s Reimagining Higher Education Foundation is hereby impleaded in the case and directed to appear before the Commission on the next date of hearing to plead its case, should it have something to say in the matter.

To come up for further hearing on **05.08.2019 at 11.00AM.**

Sd/-

Chandigarh
Dated 29.05.2019

(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

CC to M/s Reimagining Higher Education Foundation,
SCO-99-100, 3rd Floor, Sector 17-B,
Chandigarh. M-98723-78623



Sh. Ashok Kumar,
H No-214, Pine Homes,
Dhakoli, Zirakpur.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Chief Administrator,
GMADA, PUDA Bhawan,
Sector-62, Mohali..

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Chief Administrator,
GMADA, Sector-62,
Mohali.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 96 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Ashok Kumar as the Appellant
Sh.Gulshan Kumar, PIO-GMADA for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was last heard on **08.04.2019**. The respondent present pleaded that they have already sent the information to the appellant vide letter dated 09.10.2018 and again on 26.03.2019. The appellant was absent and vide letter received in the Commission on 04.04.2019 informed that he has not received the information as per the RTI application.

Since the appellant was absent and no discrepancy could be discussed at the hearing, the case was adjourned.

Hearing dated 29.05.2019:

The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant is not satisfied and stated that the PIO has not provided the information on point-3. The PIO is directed to provide the information on point-3 within a week.

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

Sd/-

Chandigarh
Dated 29.05.2019

(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh.Raghubir Singh, S/o Sh Daljit Singh,
VPO Mauli Baidwan, Sector-80,
Tehsil & Distt SAS Nagar.

...Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/oEstate Officer,
GMADA, Mohali.

First Appellate Authority,
O/oGMADA, Mohali.

...Respondent

Appellant Case No. 108 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Raghubir Singh as the Appellant
Sh.Gulshan Kumar PIO, GMADA Mohali for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was last heard on **08.04.2019**. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 14.08.2018. The appellant claimed that he had received the information regarding points a & b but was not satisfied with the information regarding points c, d & e.

Having gone through the RTI application and the reply of the PIO, the Commission was of the view that the information on points a & b stands provided and directed the PIO to provide the information on points-c & d. The PIO was also directed to clarify point-e.

Hearing dated **29.05.2019**:

The respondent has brought the information on point-c and handed over to the appellant. Regarding points-d & e, the respondent pleaded that the record has to be obtained from the concerned bank and as soon as the information is received from the bank, the same will be supplied to the appellant.

The PIO is directed to check the record from the bank and provide the information to the appellant before the next date of hearing.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **06.08.2019 at 11.00 AM**.

Sd/-

Chandigarh
Dated 29.05.2019

(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh.Rohit Sabharwal,
Kundan Bhawan 126, Model Gram,
Ludhiana.

.....Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Municipal Corporation, Zone-A,
Ludhiana.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Municipal Corporation,
Ludhiana.

...Respondent

Appellant Case No. 111 of 2019

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
Dr.Vipal Malhotra PIO-cum-Health Officer for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was last heard on **08.04.2019**. The respondent present pleaded that the information regarding points 1, 2 & 3 has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 19.11.2018 and since the information regarding points 4,5&6 was related to the PIO-Account Branch, MC Ludhiana, they have transferred the RTI application to their account branch on 26.11.2018.

Having gone through the reply, the Commission observed that the RTI application for information on points 4,5 & 6 was transferred on 26.11.2018 but with an enormous delay since it was to be transferred within 5 days. The PIO had also not adequately responded points 7 & 8.

The appellant was absent and no particular discrepancy was pointed out. It was presumed that the information on points 1,2& 3 had been provided to the best possible extent. However, since there was delay in transferring the RTI application regarding points 4, 5 &6, the PIO was directed to explain the reasons for delay in transferring the RTI application.

The PIO-Accounts Department, MC Ludhiana was impleaded in the case with the directions to provide the information on points 4 5 &6 as per the RTI application and explain the reasons for not attending to the RTI application within the time prescribed under the RTI Act.

Hearing dated 29.05.2019:

The respondent present pleaded that the remaining information has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 25.04.2019. The advocate for the appellant vide email has informed that the appellant has received the information and is satisfied.

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

Chandigarh
Dated 29.05.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

CC to PIO-Accounts Department, MC Ludhiana

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden, Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864114, Email: - Psicsic30@punjabmail.gov.in
Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Sh. Rohit Sabharwal,
Kundan Bhawan 126, Model Gram,
Ludhiana.

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Municipal Corporation, Zone-A,
Ludhiana.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Municipal Corporation,
Ludhiana.

...Respondent

Appellant Case No. 112 of 2019

PRESENT: None for the Appellant
Dr.Vipal Malhotra PIO-cum-Health Officer for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was last heard on **08.04.2019**. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant on 06.04.2019 and produced a document stating that the appellant has received the information. However, since the Commission received an email from the advocate of the appellant stating that the information has not been provided, the case was adjourned for adjudication on the next date of hearing.

Hearing dated 29.05.2019.

The respondent present pleaded that the remaining information has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 06.04.2019. The advocate for the appellant vide email has informed that the appellant has received the information and is satisfied.

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

Sd/-

Chandigarh
Dated 29.05.2019

(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commission



Sh. Lalit Mohan, S/o Sh Satpal Gargi,
13813-A, Street No-7, Ganesha Basti,
Bathinda.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Secretary, Regional Transport Officer,
Faridkot.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o State Transport Commission,
Pb, Chandigarh.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 152 of 2019

Present: **None for the Appellant**
Sh.Chander Mohan, Data Entry Operator O/o RTA Faridkot for the
Respondent

ORDER: The case was last heard on **10.04.2019**: The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant on 01.04.2019. The appellant had received the information and was satisfied. The appellant however, pleaded that the information has been provided with a delay of one year.

The Commission observed that there has been an enormous delay of one year in attending to the RTI application, and issued a **show cause notice under section 20 of the RTI Act and** directed the PIO to file reply on an affidavit. If there are other persons responsible for the delay in providing the information, the PIO was directed to inform such persons of the show cause and direct them to appear before the Commission alongwith the written replies. The appellant was exempted.

Hearing dated 29.05.2019:

The information stands provided. Regarding reply to the show cause notice, the respondent has submitted an affidavit which is taken on the file of the Commission. The PIO in the reply has stated that the appellant had filed RTI application with the office of SDM Faridkot which was transferred by them to this office. The PIO has further stated that since the record was with Vigilance Department which was not handed over by them to this office in time, the information has been delayed.

The Commission has gone through the affidavit and directs the PIO to elaborate point-6 of the affidavit and specify through documentary evidence, so that the Commission can ascertain the exact time when the record was returned by the Vigilance Department, to arrive at a conclusion whether the plea of the PIO is bonafide or not.

To come up for further hearing on **05.08.2019 at 11.00 AM.**

Sd/-

Chandigarh
Dated 29.05.2019

(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

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



Sh.Arun Garg, S/o Sh Sham Lal,
40-41, Central Town, Village Dad,
P.O LaltonKalan, Distt Ludhiana.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
Deputy Chief Engineer, DS City West Circle,
PSPCL, Ludhiana.

First Appellate Authority,
Chief Engineer, DS Central,
PSPCL, Ludhiana

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 2615 of 2018

Present: None for the Appellant
Sh.M.P.Singh Addl. SE, O/o Dy. Chief Engineer, PSPCL Ludhiana for the
Respondent

ORDER: The case was first heard on **30.10.2018**. The respondent present pleaded that the complete information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant was absent and vide email informed that the information which has been provided by the PIO after 9 months of his RTI application is incomplete and incorrect. The PIO was directed to submit explanation with solid reasons for delay in tending to the RTI application on an affidavit. The appellant was directed to point out discrepancy if any and be present on the next date of hearing.

The case was again heard on **04.12.2018**. The respondent present pleaded that the information has already been provided to the appellant. The appellant was absent and vide email pointed out discrepancies in the information provided and a copy of the same was handed over to the respondent to look at it and sort out the discrepancies and provide the information to the best possible extent within 10 days.

The respondent also submitted an affidavit explaining the reasons for delay in attending to the RTI application which was taken on the file of the Commission.

The case again came for hearing on **23.01.2019**. The respondent present informed that the available information has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 11.12.2018 and a copy of the same submitted to the Commission. The appellant was absent and vide email informed that the information was incomplete and misleading. The PIO was directed to send the information once again to the appellant with an affidavit stating that the information provided as per record, is true and correct.

The case was again heard on **27.02.2019**. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant on 11.12.2018. The appellant stated that the information provided was incomplete since he had sought date-wise action taken on new domestic electric connection application and also the information was provided after filing first appeal. The respondent further informed that in compliance with the order of the Commission, the appellant has also been provided with an affidavit. Having gone through the reply, the Commission directed the PIO to provide complete file of the case from the time of application to the filing of RTI application within 3 days.

The Commission further observed that there had been enormous delay of 9 months in handling the RTI application. Also the deponent's plea of combining the RTI application and the appellant's complaint for not installation of election connection together was not in order, nor was the PIO's stand of treating a reply to the complaint as a RTI reply. The RTI application was to be dealt with separately and the information was to be provided within 30 days.

Given the above circumstances, the PIO was issued a **show cause notice Under Section 20 of the RTI Act** and directed to file reply on an affidavit. The PIO was also directed to provide information to the appellant within 3 days of the receipt of order.

The PIO in the affidavit also stated that the appellant had preferred second appeal without filing first appeal. The appellant even though claimed that he had filed first appeal, the appellant was asked to submit proof of filing first appeal.

The case was last heard on **01.04.2019**. The respondent present pleaded that in compliance with the order of the Commission, a copy of the complete file of the case has been sent to the appellant. The respondent also brought the relevant file. Having gone through the file, I found that the information has been provided to be best possible extent.

Regarding reply to the show cause notice issued to the PIO at the last hearing, the respondent filed an affidavit. The case was adjourned for adjudication on the next date of hearing.

Hearing dated 29.05.2019:

In the last hearing, it was observed that the information stands provided to the best possible extent. The respondent filed reply to the show cause notice which was taken on the file of the Commission and the case was adjourned for adjudication.

I have gone through the entire facts of the contention of the PIO. In this case, the information stands provided. However, there is a delay of nine months. During the course of hearing, the respondent pleaded that the appellant has come to the Commission without going to the First Appellate Authority, after which the Commission had directed the appellant to produce evidence that he had gone to the First Appellate Authority before coming to the Commission. The appellate had not produced any evidence to that. The Commission observes that the appellate came directly to the Commission without going to the First Appellate Authority and has desired to not answer the query raised by the Commission.

I have gone through the merits of the case and find that the information stands provided. I accept the plea of the Respondent and close the case.

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

Sd/-

Chandigarh
Dated: 29.05.2019

(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.infocompunjab.com



Sh.Vikram Vaid,
1527, Gali No-2,
Bagh Ramanand, Amritsar.

....Appellant

Versus

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

First Appellate Authority,
Commissioner of Police,
Ludhiana.

...Respondent

Appellant Case No. 3338 of 2018

Present: Sh.Vikram Vaid as Appellant
Sh.Pawandev Singh, SI (RTI Branch) O/o Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana
for the Respondent

Order: The case was first heard on **07.01.2019**. The respondent present informed that they have sent all the information to the appellant on 16.08.2018 except the information on points 3 & 4 which they will send before the next date of hearing. The appellant is absent and has asked for hearing through video conferencing in the office of DC Amritsar. The request is accepted and the case is adjourned.

The case was last heard on **11.02.2019** through video conference facility available in the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Amritsar. Sh.Pawandev Singh, SI from the office of Commissioner of Police Ludhiana was present at Chandigarh. The respondent pleaded that in compliance with the order of the Commission, the information has been sent to the appellant point-wise.

As per information from the office of DC Amritsar, the appellant was present. However, since some other department was holding a video conference, the case was adjourned.

Hearing dated 29.05.2019:

The respondent present pleaded that in compliance with the order of the Commission, the remaining information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant has received the information and is satisfied.

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

Chandigarh
Dated: 29.05.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

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.Vikram Vaid,
1527, Gali No-2,
Bagh Ramanand, Amritsar.

.....Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Deputy Commissioner of Police,
Amritsar

First Appellate Authority,
Commissioner of Police,
Amritsar.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3340 of 2018

Present: Sh.Vikram Vaid as Appellant
Sh.Hira Singh, ASI Office of DC Amritsar for the Respondent

Order:

The case was first heard on **07.01.2019**. The respondent present pleaded that the information has already been provided to the appellant. The respondent submitted a letter of the PIO dated 05.01.2019 stating that they received the RTI application on 01.06.2018 through the office of Asstt .Inspector General of Police, Chandigarh-cum-PIO (Admn) and after collecting report from the concerned Police Officer, the reply was sent to the appellant vide letter dated 07.07.2018. The appellant was informed that the information sought is not available in their record.

The PIO further stated in the letter that after the receipt of notice of the Commission, the information was again called from the concerned police officer, Police Kotwali, Amritsar and the following reply was sent to the appellant:

1. The information regarding points 1,2,3,5,6,7,11 &12 is not available in their record;
2. The information regarding points 4, 15 & 16 is available on the public domain;
3. The information regarding points 9 & 10 are in question form;
4. The information regarding point No.13 does not relate to them.

The respondent further informed that the appellant has filed two more appeal cases No.1675 and 1678/2018 seeking similar information which are fixed for hearing before Sh.S.S.Channi, CIC.

The appellant was absent and has asked for hearing through video conferencing in the office of DC Amritsar The request was accepted and the case was adjourned.

The case was last heard on **11.02.2019** through video conference facility available in the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Amritsar. Sh.Hira Singh, ASI from the office of Deputy Commissioner, Amritsar was present at Chandigarh. The respondent pleaded that the reply has already been sent to the appellant.

As per information from the office of DC Amritsar, the appellant was present. However, since some other department was holding a video conference, the case was adjourned.

Hearing dated 29.05.2019:

The case has come up for hearing today. As per the facts of the case, the PIO in its reply to the appellant had informed that no information is available for points 1,2,3,5,6,7,11 &12 while the information on points 4,15 & 16 is available on the public domain.

Regarding point-1, the appellant has produced a copy of his statement which he had clicked on his mobile when his statement was recorded. The PIO has declined the information stating that it is not available. The PIO is directed to look at this and provide the information, otherwise the Commission is within its power to investigate the matter through the means available to it.

Regarding point-2, the appellant has produced a document that the hospital has already sent the X-ray film/scan etc. to concerned police station. The PIO-SHO Police Kotwali, Amritsar is hereby impleaded in the case and directed to look at the RTI application and provide the information, since there is ample evidence towards the fact that the X-rays were handed over to the PIO-SHO Police Kotwali, Amritsar.

Regarding point-3, the respondent informed that there is no system to mark attendance of employees of police. The PIO is directed to clarify how the attendance is marked. The PIO is also directed to clarify on which public domain the information on points-4,15& 16 is available. Regarding point-11, the PIO to relook and provide the information. Regarding point-13, the PIO is directed to give in writing.

The PIO-Commissioner of Police, Amritsar is also impleaded in the case and directed to investigate the matter as it appears to be a case of stonewalling the information, and direct the concerned PIO to provide the information to the appellant and file a reply in the matter.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **26.08.2019 at 11.00AM.**

Chandigarh
Dated: 29.05.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

CC to PIO-SHO, Police Kotwali, Amritsar

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



Sh.Vijay Hans,
H No-3, Satya Niwas, Silver City,
Zirakpur

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Superintendent of Personnel (IAS Branch),
Govt of Punjab, Chandigarh.

First Appellate Authority,
Under Secretary,
Department of Personnel (IAS Branch),
Govt of Punjab, Chandigarh.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3287 of 2018

Present: Sh.Vijay Hans as the Appellant
Sh.Saneev Sachdeva, Sr.Assistant, (IAS Branch) O/o Superintendent of
Personnel for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on **18.12.2018**. It was observed that the appellant had filed RTI application with the Department of Personnel & Training, Government of India which vide letter dated 28.04.2018, informed the appellant that the information regarding point No.1 i.e. the procedure adopted for selection from Non-SCS cadre to IAS cadre is in accordance with the IAS(Appointment by Selection) Regulations, 1997, a copy of which available on the website of DoP&T. For the information regarding points 2 to 4, they forwarded the application to the UPSC and the Chief Secretary, Government of Punjab, Chandigarh.

The appellant informed that he has received the information regarding point No.4 from the UPSC. Regarding information relating to points 2 & 3, the PIO, Department of Personnel, Punjab has rejected the information on the basis of the section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act and that there is no larger public interest involved. The appellant also stated that if the UPSC could provide the information, then there was no harm in providing him the information on points 2 & 3. The case was adjourned for adjudication on points 2&3.

The case was again heard on **12.02.2019**. The respondent present reiterated the PIO's earlier stand on the basis of which the information was rejected. The appellant was absent and the case was adjourned.

The case was last heard on **01.04.2019**. The appellant was absent. The respondent had denied the information under section 8(1)(j) as well as stating that there was no larger public interest. The appellant in his application, made various allegations against the person about whom he has sought information and stated that the sought information has larger public interest. The appellant was given one last opportunity to appear before the Commission and produce credible evidence to substantiate his allegations and to establish that the disclosure of information has larger public interest.

Appeal Case No. 3287 of 2018

Hearing dated 29.05.2019:

In the last hearing, the appellant had made various allegations against the person about whom the information was sought and stated that the sought information has larger public interest. The appellant was directed to produce credible evidence to substantiate his allegation and to establish that the disclosure of information has larger public interest. The appellant has not brought any documentary evidence to establish that the disclosure of information has larger public interest.

Having gone through the file, the Commission directs the PIO to provide information on point-3. The point-2 will be adjudicated on the next date of hearing.

The case is adjourned. To come up on **06.08.2019 at 11.00 AM** for further hearing.

Sd/-

Chandigarh
Dated: 29.05.2019

(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

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



Sh Ravinder Singh,
H no-16, Shaheed Nagar, Chhehartta,
Amritsar.

... Appellant

Versus

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

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Chief Administrator,
Amritsar Development Authority,
Amritsar.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3697 of 2018

Present: None for the Appellant
Sh.Ravinder Singh Paul, ADO O/o Amritsar Development Authority and
Sh.Gagandeep ,APIO O/o CTP for the Respondent

Order:

The case was first heard on 06.02.2019. Since both the parties were absent, the case was adjourned.

The case was last heard on **25.03.2019**. The respondent present pleaded that the information concerning them has been provided to the appellant vide letter dated 30.11.2018 and remaining information relates to the office of CTP Punjab, Chandigarh. The appellant is not satisfied and claims that the respondent has not transferred the RTI application to the concerned department.

Having gone through the RTI application, the Commission was of the view that the information stands provided on points 1,3 &5 and for the remaining information, the PIO-ADA was directed to transfer the RTI application to the Chief Town Planner, Punjab, Chandigarh. The PIO-CTP Punjab, Chandigarh was impleaded as a party of the case and directed to provide the information regarding points 2,,4, 6,7 and 9 to 14. The PIO-ADA was also directed to explain the reasons for delay in providing the information and for not transferring the RTI application to the concerned department within the time prescribed under the RTI Act.

Hearing dated 29.05.2019:

The respondent present from the office of ADA Amritsar informed that the information concerning them has been provided and for remaining information, they have already transferred the RTI application to CTP, Punjab. The respondent present from the office of CTC pleaded that they received the RTI application on 05.04.2019 and they asked the appellant vide letter dated 11.04.2019 to deposit requisite fee of Rs.3250/- and get the information. The appellant has not deposited the requisite fee.

Appeal Case No. 3697 of 2018

Having gone through the RTI application again, the Commission directs the PIO-CTP to relook at the RTI application and provide point-wise information to the appellant. If the appellant needs maps, the appellant to pay requisite fee and get the maps of the building. The appellant be allowed to inspect the record by fixing a mutually convenient date and time.

To come up for further hearing on **06.08.2019 at 11.00 AM** for further hearing.

Chandigarh
Dated: 29.05.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

CC to PIO, Chief Town Planners, Punjab, Chandigarh.



Sh.Kamalpreet Singh,
134, Basant City, Th4reekay,
P.O Daad, Pakhowal Road,
Ludhiana.

...Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/oAddl, Chief Administrator,
Amritsar Development Authority,
Amritsar.

First Appellate Authority,
O/oChief Administrator,
Amritsar Development Authority,
Amritsar.

...Respondent

Appellant Case No. 4291 of 2018

Present: None for the Appellant
Sh.Ravinder Singh Paul, ADO O/o Amritsar Development for the
Respondent

ORDER:

The case was last heard on **18.03.2019**. The respondent present submitted a reply vide letter dated 20.02.2019. In the letter, the PIO mentioned that the reply to the RTI application was sent to the appellant vide letter dated 28.09.2018 and again on 15.02.2019. The PIO has further mentioned in the letter that the RTI application was filed by the appellant in the DC office after which it was transferred to them on 15.05.2019. As per the respondent, the reply was sent by the PIO to the appellant on 28.09.2018 whereby the PIO had denied the information stating that the information was voluminous in nature. The PIO had asked the appellant to file a fresh RTI and be specific with the information sought. On being denied the information, the appellant filed first appeal on 17.07.2018 with the First Appellate Authority which disposed off the appeal upholding the PIOs decision.

The appellant was absent. The PIO's reply was taken on the file of the Commission.

Hearing dated 29.05.2019:

In the last hearing, the PIO had submitted his reply stating that the information is voluminous in nature and will divert the resources available with the public authority. The PIO has further mentioned in the reply that since the information is basically related with the revenue department, the appellant was asked to file a fresh RTI and be specific with the information sought. The First Appellate Authority also disposed off the appeal upholding the PIO's decision.

The appellant is absent to plead his case on 2nd consecutive hearing. Having gone through the RTI application and the reply of the PIO, I find no merit in the appeal. I uphold the decision of the First Appellate Authority, and close the case.

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

Chandigarh
Dated: 29.05.2019.

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner