

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864115, Email: - psic25@punjabmail.gov.in
Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Sh. Rajinder Singh (9781203437)

S/o Sh. Major Singh
R/o Barwala, Post Office-Hira,
Tehsil & District Ludhiana

Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer/APIO

O/o SSP, Khanna
District Ludhiana

Respondent

Compliant Case No.: 144 of 2020
Heard through CISCO WEBEX

Present: Nobody on behalf of the appellant.
For the respondent: ASI, Roor Singh (7980001280)

ORDER

1. This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 19.08.2020 vide which respondent, ASI Roor Singh intimated the Commission that reply was sent to the complainant dated 04.02.2020. Complainant was absent and another opportunity was given to him to represent this case on the next date of hearing, failing to which case will be decided on merit basis. Matter was adjourned for further hearing on 29.09.2020 i.e. today.

2. In today's hearing, neither the complainant is present for today's hearing nor did he file reply in this regard. He was also absent on the previous hearing held on 19.08.2020. Notice of hearing and copy of previous order dated 19.08.2020 were sent to the complainant through registered post but he failed to represent this case. **Complainant, Sh. Rajinder Singh demanded the following information in his RTI application dated 29.11.2019:-**

ਜੇ ਦਰਖਾਸਤ ਕਰਮਜੀਤ ਸਿੰਘ ਵਾਸੀ ਪਿੰਡ ਉਟਾਲਾਂ, ਤਹਿਸੀਲ ਸਮਰਾਲਾ, ਜਿਲਾ ਲੁਧਿਆਣਾ ਵਲੋਂ ਭਵਨਜੀਤ ਸਿੰਘ ਪੁੱਤਰ ਬਚਨ ਸਿੰਘ ਵਾਸੀ ਪਿੰਡ ਸਾਹਾਬਾਣਾ, ਤਹਿਸੀਲ ਵਾ ਜਿਲਾ ਲੁਧਿਆਣਾ ਖਿਲਾਫ ਦਰਖਾਸਤ ਮਿਤੀ 14.05.2019 ਨੂੰ ਮਾਨਯੋਗ ਐੱਸ ਐਚ ਓ ਸਾਹਿਬ ਸਮਰਾਲਾ ਦੇ ਦਫਤਰ ਵਿੱਚ ਦਰਜ ਕਰਵਾਇ ਸੀ, ਦੀ ਤਸਦੀਕ ਸੂਦਾ ਨਕਲ ਅਤੇ ਉਸ ਦਰਖਾਸਤ ਪਾਰ ਅੱਜ ਤਕ ਜੇ ਵੀ ਕਾਰਵਾਈ ਕੀਤੀ ਗਈ ਤਸਦੀਕ ਸੂਦਾ ਅਧੀਨ ਜਾਰੀ ਕੀਤੀ ਜਾਵੇ |

3. On this, respondent, ASI, Roor Singh intimated the Commission that requisite information could not be supplied to the complainant as it is under investigation. He added that reply has already been sent to the complainant dated 04.02.2020 and same has also been sent to the Commission through an email.

4. After hearing the respondent and examining the documents placed on record, It is observed that an email dated 19.08.2020 from email ID surinder.singh.gaddu09@gmail.com was received by the undersigned bench comprising copies of two letters (letter no. 848 dated 18.08.2020 and letter no. 240 dated 04.02.2020), which are taken on record. As per letter no. 420 dated 04.02.2020 which is addressed to the complainant stating the reply of the respondent which is as follows:

ਨੰਬਰ 240 ਆਰ.ਟੀ.ਆਈ. ਮਿਤੀ 4-2-2020
ਵਿਸ਼ਾ ਸੂਚਨਾ ਅਧਿਕਾਰ ਐਕਟ-2005 ਤਹਿਤ ਮੰਗੀ ਗਈ ਸੂਚਨਾ।

ਯਾਦ ਪੱਤਰ

ਉਪਰੋਕਤ ਵਿਸ਼ਾ ਦੇ ਸਬੰਧ ਵਿੱਚ ਆਪ ਨੂੰ ਲਿਖਿਆ ਜਾਂਦਾ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਆਪ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਸੂਚਨਾ ਅਧਿਕਾਰ ਐਕਟ-2005 ਤਹਿਤ ਸੂਚਨਾ ਹਾਸਲ ਕਰਨ ਲਈ ਜੋ ਦਰਖਾਸਤ ਇਸ ਦਫਤਰ ਨੂੰ ਡਾਕ ਰਾਹੀਂ ਮਿਤੀ 02.12.2019 ਨੂੰ ਭੇਜੀ ਹੈ। ਆਪ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਮੰਗ ਪੱਤਰ ਵਿੱਚ ਮਿਤੀ 14.05.2019 ਨੂੰ ਥਾਣਾ ਸਮਰਾਲਾ ਵਿਖੇ ਕਰਮਜੀਤ ਸਿੰਘ ਵਾਸੀ ਪਿੰਡ ਉਟਾਲਾ ਤਹਿਸੀਲ ਸਮਰਾਲਾ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਦਿੱਤੀ ਦਰਖਾਸਤ ਸਬੰਧੀ ਸੂਚਨਾ ਦੀ ਮੰਗ ਕੀਤੀ ਗਈ ਕੀਤੀ ਹੈ। ਜਿਸ ਸਬੰਧੀ ਮੁੱਖ ਅਫਸਰ ਥਾਣਾ ਸਮਰਾਲਾ ਨੂੰ ਪੱਤਰ ਨੰਬਰ 1647/ਆਰ.ਟੀ.ਆਈ. ਮਿਤੀ 02.12.2019 ਨਾਲ ਆਪ ਦੇ ਮੰਗ ਪੱਤਰ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਸੂਚਨਾ ਦੀ ਮੰਗ ਕੀਤੀ ਗਈ ਸੀ। ਮੁੱਖ ਅਫਸਰ ਥਾਣਾ ਸਮਰਾਲਾ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਆਈ ਸੂਚਨਾ ਦੀ ਆਪ ਜੀ ਦੇ ਘਰ ਦੇ ਪਤੇ ਪਰ ਇਸ ਪੱਤਰ ਨਾਲ ਨੱਥੀ ਕਰਕੇ ਭੇਜੀ ਜਾਂਦੀ ਹੈ ਜੀ। ਜਿਸ ਸਬੰਧੀ ਮੁੱਖ ਅਫਸਰ ਥਾਣਾ ਸਮਰਾਲਾ ਦੀ ਰਿਪੋਰਟ ਮੁਤਾਬਕ ਕਰਮਜੀਤ ਸਿੰਘ ਵਾਸੀ ਉਟਾਲਾ ਤਹਿਸੀਲ ਸਮਰਾਲਾ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਦਿੱਤੀ ਦਰਖਾਸਤ ਪੜਤਾਲ ਅਧੀਨ ਹੈ। ਇਸ ਲਈ ਆਪ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਮੰਗੀ ਗਈ ਸੂਚਨਾ ਪੜਤਾਲ ਅਧੀਨ ਹੋਣ ਕਰਕੇ ਆਰ.ਟੀ.ਆਈ ਐਕਟ 2005 ਦੀ ਧਾਰਾ 8.1 (ਐਚ) ਤਹਿਤ ਮੁਹੱਈਆ ਨਹੀਂ ਕਰਵਾਈ ਜਾ ਸਕਦੀ। ਆਪ ਨੂੰ ਲਿਖਿਆ ਜਾਂਦਾ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਦਰਖਾਸਤ ਦੀ ਪੜਤਾਲ ਮੁਕੰਮਲ ਹੋਣ ਉਪਰੰਤ ਦੋਬਾਰਾ ਆਰ.ਟੀ.ਆਈ ਐਕਟ ਦਾ ਫਾਰਮ ਭਰ ਕੇ ਇਸ ਦਫਤਰ ਪਾਸੇ ਸੂਚਨਾ ਹਾਸਲ ਕਰ ਸਕਦੇ ਹੋ।

5. **In view of above, it is transpired that when investigations are in progress, documents cannot be disclosed as per Section 8(1)(g) and 8(1)(h) of the RTI Act 2005.** The replies of respondent are upheld. Therefore, no cause of action is required. Hence, this instant complaint case is **disposed of & closed accordingly at Commission's end.**

6. Announced in the Court. Copy of the order to be sent to the parties.

Chandigarh
29.09.2020

(Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864115, Email: - psic25@punjabmail.gov.in
Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Sh. Jagshir Singh (8195800345)

S/o Sh. Gian Singh
House No. 9/20, Mandi Mullanpur,
Ludhiana-141101

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer/APIO

O/o DCP, Ludhiana.

First Appellate Authority

O/o Police Commissioner, Ludhiana

Respondent

Appeal Case No.: 783 of 2020
Heard through CISCO WEBEX

Present: Nobody on behalf of the appellant.

For the respondent:

ASI, Ramesh Kumar (9915603000)

ASi Harmesh Lal (9877072935)

ORDER

1. This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 17.08.2020 vide which it was observed that requisite information is vague in nature and appellant was advised to specify the requisite information relates with him. Respondent PIO was directed to supply the information, once he had received the letter regarding specific information from the appellant. Matter was adjourned for further hearing on 29.09.2020 i.e. today.

2. In today's hearing, neither the appellant is present for today's hearing nor did he file reply in this regard. **Appellant, Sh. Jagshir Singh demanded the following information in his RTI**

application dated 29.11.2019:-

- 1) ਥਾਣਾ ਬਸਤੀ ਜੇਏਵਾਲ ਲੁਧਿਆਣਾ ਵਿਚ ਦਰਜ ਮੁਕਦਮਿਆਂ ਦੇ ਵੇਰਵੇ, ਕਿੰਨੇ ਮੁਕਦਮਿਆਂ ਦੇ ਚਲਾਨ ਪੇਸ਼ ਨਹੀਂ ਕੀਤੇ ਗਏ |
- 2) ਜੇ ਮੁਕੱਦਮੇ ਆਦਮ ਪਤਾ ਅਤੇ ਅਖਰਾਜ ਰਿਪੋਰਟਾਂ ਕੀਤੀਆਂ ਦੇ ਵੇਰਵੇ ਦੀਆਂ ਤਸਦੀਕ ਸ਼ੁਦਾ ਕਾਪੀਆਂ |
- 3) ਜੇ ਮੁਕੱਦਮੇ ਆਦਮ ਪਤਾ ਅਤੇ ਅਖਰਾਜ ਰਿਪੋਰਟਾਂ ਬਣੀਆਂ ਕਿੰਨੇ ਦੀ ਮੰਜੂਰੀ ਮਿਲੀ |
- 4) ਜੇ ਮੁਕੱਦਮੇ ਦਾ ਚਲਾਨ ਪੇਸ਼ ਅਦਾਲਤ ਨਹੀਂ ਕੀਤਾ ਗਿਆ ਮੁਕੱਦਮੇ ਦੀ ਲੜੀਵਾਰ ਲਿਖਤੀ ਰੂਪ ਵਿੱਚ ਵੇਰਵੇ
- 5) ਜੇ ਮੁਕੱਦਮੇ ਤਫਤੀਸ਼ੀ ਅਫਸਰ ਵਲੋਂ ਅਜੇ ਤਕ ਜਾਣ ਬੁੱਝ ਕੇ ਲੰਬਿਤ ਰਾਖੇ ਗਏ ਹਨ ਉਹਨਾਂ ਖਿਲਾਫ ਕੀਤੀ ਕਾਰਵਾਈ ਦੀ ਰਿਪੋਰਟ ਦੀ ਕਾਪੀ |
- 6) ਹੀਨੀਅਸ ਕ੍ਰਾਈਮ ਦੇ ਮੁਕਦਮਿਆਂ ਵਿੱਚ ਅੱਜ ਤਕ ਥਾਣਾ ਮੁਖੀ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਦੇਸ਼ੀ ਗਿਰਫਤਾਰ ਨਹੀਂ ਕੀਤੇ ਗਏ ਉਹਨਾਂ ਦੇ ਵੇਰਵੇ |

7) ਜੇਕਰ ਮੰਗੀ ਸੂਚਨਾ ਆਪ ਜੀ ਨਾਲ ਸੰਬੰਧਤ ਨਹੀਂ ਹੈ ਤਾਂ ਆਰ ਟੀ ਆਈ ਦੀ ਧਾਰਾ ਅਧੀਨ ਸੰਬੰਧਤ ਸੂਚਨਾ ਅਫਸਰ ਨੂੰ

ਭੇਜੀ ਜਾਵੇ |

8) ਅਸਲ ਰਿਕਾਰਡ ਨਿਰੀਖਣ ਕਰਨ ਦੀ ਇਜਾਜ਼ਤ ਦਿਤੀ ਜਾਵੇ |

3. **Respondent ASI, Harmesh Lal states that no letter has been received from the appellant regarding specific required information.** He added that he had visited the clinic of the appellant on 28.09.2020 along with Constable, Ranjit Singh but appellant intimated him that he is going Barnala and he will visit the respondent's office today evening at 05:00PM. He added that when appellant was again contacted by the respondent, he informed that he will visit today early morning i.e. 29.09.2020 at the respondent's place between 8am to 9am but no response from the appellant.

4. After hearing the respondent and examining the documents placed on record, **it is observed that appellant has not comply with the previous order of the Commission dated 17.08.2020 regarding to specify the required information.** In view of all, no further cause of action is required. Hence, this instant appeal case is **disposed of & closed.**

5. Announced in the Court. Copy of the order to be sent to the parties.

Chandigarh
29.09.2020

(Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)
State Information Commissioner

Note: After the hearing was over, appellant intimated the undersigned bench through telephonic message that he was reached at the DC Office, Ludhiana to attend hearing mistakenly. He was apprised with the proceedings of this hearing

When he was asked that he sent letter to the respondent PIO regarding specific required information as per the previous order of the Commission dated 17.08.2020 or not, he replied yes but when undersigned bench asked him to send a copy of the same to the Commission (as it was mentioned in the previous order of the Commission dated 17.08.2020) then he immediately responded and replied, he is okay with the decision of this case.

It was already observed on the previous hearing on 17.08.2020 that RTI application is vague in nature, appellant was given an opportunity to specify the required information but he failed to avail this opportunity.

Chandigarh
29.09.2020

(Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864115, Email: - psic25@punjabmail.gov.in
Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Sh. Arun Garg (7888459837)

S/o Sh. Sham Lal
House No. 40-41, Central Town,
Village Dad, PO-Lalton Kalan,
District Ludhiana-142022

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer/APIO

O/o DCP, Ludhiana.

First Appellate Authority

O/o Commissioner of Police,
Ludhiana

Respondent

Appeal Case No.: 804 of 2020
Heard through CISCO WEBEX

Present: Sh. Arun Garg, the appellant in person.
For the respondent: ASI, Ramesh Kumar (9915603000).

ORDER

1. This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 17.08.2020 vide which respondent, ASI, Ramesh Kumar stated that information relates helpline number 112, which relates with Head Office, Phase-7, Mohali. He added that reply was sent to the appellant twice (letter no. 1153 dated 02.05.2019 and letter no. 125/FA/RTI dated 08.06.2020) in this regard stating that appellant can collect requisite information from the concerned office. He also mentioned that reply was sent to the appellant third time through registered post on 14.08.2020.

Appellant, Sh. Arun Garg stated that he is not satisfied with the earlier supplied replies and requested for an adjournment to go through the sent reply dated 14.08.2020, which has not been received by him till 17.08.2020.

Appellant was advised to go through the reply, once he had received through registry sent by the respondent PIO. Matter was adjourned for further hearing on 29.09.2020 i.e. today.

2. In today's hearing, respondent, ASI, Ramesh Kumar states that reply has already been sent to the appellant by post and also supplied by hand to the appellant.

3. Appellant, Sh. Arun Garg states that he is not satisfied with the supplied reply and he has sent an email in this regard to the Commission.

Appellant Sh. Arun Garg demanded the following information from the respondent PIO in RTI application dated 01.04.2019 regarding call/complaint of loudspeakers made by applicant from Mobile No. 78884-59837 to Police Control Room No. 112 (ref. no. 3891) on the morning of 01.04.2019 at 4.54 AM-

01) Attested copies of complainant/docket Form/other document along with all annexure.

02) Name/No. & designation of call taker.

03) Action taken by police on call/complaint as per record.

04) Name/No. & designation of RCR/Local/Area Police official(s) to whom the complaint was forwarded for necessary action.

- 05) Name/No. & designation of RCR/Local/Area Police official(s) who were responsible to take necessary action at the complaint at the relevant time of complaint.
 - 06) Name/No. & designation of RCR/Local/Area Police official(s) who were sent/reached on spot/took action on complaint as per record.
 - 07) Name/No. & designation of Incharge-ACP-ADCP-Nodal Officer(s) & all other concerned officials of Police Control Room as well as Local/Area Police.
 - 08) Attested copies of F.I.R./D.D.R registered on complaint by police, if any, otherwise provide information in writing about non-registration of F.I.R./D.D.R.
 - 09) Concerned law providing attested copy of thereof for action taken on call/complaint.
 - 10) Particulars and attested copies of concerned documents of all other calls/complaints made by all other persons of loudspeaker/music/noise at day/night of 31.03.2019 & 01.04.2019 along with action taken on each such call/complaint.
 - 11) Concerned law providing attested copy thereof, in case the information is denied on any ground or any record is claimed not maintained or not available.
 - 12) Names & designation with full official address, mobile, e-mail of PIO/APIO & FAA along with attested copy of concerned office order/notification/other document.
 - 13) Availability of complete/any part of sought information on internet through official web-site and its access to public along with addresses of concerned web-pages.
4. Appellant, Sh. Arun Garg started using unacceptable language and baseless allegations during discussion of the present case with both the parties, which could not be tolerated by the Commission.
5. After examining the case file, it is also observed that an email of the appellant was received by the undersigned bench dated 23.09.2020 through which, it is observed that wording written by the appellant in an email in relation to the Commission/Commissioners, it is clarified that the Commission is a constitutional body. It is disgraceful to write without a solid basis/document. Appellant has made some un-charitable comments against the bench alleging it to be vindictive and inimical while deciding appeals this bench and bench is bound by an oath of allegiance to the Constitution of India to discharge its duties without fear or favor. The Commission is duty bound morally and ethically to take decisions without bias or ill-will against anyone. The Commission considers it appropriate to underline here that no litigant should be allowed to seek a decision in his favor or to choose one of his choice.

6. In the view of above and on perusal of the relevant documents on file, the Commission found no reason to disagree with the replies of the respondents. The replies of respondents (letter no. 347 dated 14.08.2020) upheld. In the present case, there is no tangible public purpose which has been cited by the appellant.

7. In wake of above, no further cause of action is required. Hence, **matter is disposed of & closed accordingly at Commission's end.**

8. Announced in the Court. Copy of the order to be sent to the parties.

Chandigarh
29.09.2020

(Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.

Ph: 0172-2864115, Email: - psic25@punjabmail.gov.in
Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Sh. Arun Garg (7888459837)

S/o Sh. Sham Lal
House No. 40-41, Central Town,
Village Dad, PO-Lalton Kalan,
District Ludhiana-142022

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer/APIO

O/o DCP, Ludhiana.

First Appellate Authority

O/o Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana

Respondent

Appeal Case No.: 805 of 2020
Heard through CISCO WEBEX

Present: Sh. Arun Garg, the appellant in person.
For the respondent: ASI, Ramesh Kumar (9915603000).

ORDER

1. This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 17.08.2020 vide which respondent, ASI, Ramesh Kumar stated that information relates helpline number 112, which relates with Head Office, Phase-7, Mohali. He added that reply was sent to the appellant twice (letter no. 1154 dated 02.05.2019 and letter no. 126/FA/RTI dated 08.06.2020) in this regard stating that appellant can collect requisite information from the concerned office. He also mentioned that reply was sent to the appellant third time through registered post on 14.08.2020.

Appellant, Sh. Arun Garg stated that he is not satisfied with the earlier supplied replies and requested for an adjournment to go through the sent reply dated 14.08.2020, which has not been received by him till 17.08.2020.

Appellant was advised to go through the reply, once he had received through registry sent by the respondent PIO. Matter was adjourned for further hearing on 29.09.2020 i.e. today.

2. In today's hearing, respondent, ASI, Ramesh Kumar states that reply has already been sent to the appellant by post and also supplied by hand to the appellant.

3. Appellant, Sh. Arun Garg states that he is not satisfied with the supplied reply and he has sent an email in this regard to the Commission.

Appellant Sh. Arun Garg demanded the following information from the respondent PIO in RTI application dated 01.04.2019 regarding call/complaint of loudspeakers made by applicant from Mobile No. 78884-59837 to Police Control Room No. 112 (ref. no. 3861) on the morning of 31.03.2019 at 10.05 PM-

- 01) Attested copies of complainant/docket Form/other document along with all annexure.
- 02) Name/No. & designation of call taker.
- 03) Action taken by police on call/complaint as per record.
- 04) Name/No. & designation of RCR/Local/Area Police official(s) to whom the complaint was forwarded for necessary action.

- 05) Name/No. & designation of RCR/Local/Area Police official(s) who were responsible to take necessary action at the complaint at the relevant time of complaint.
 - 06) Name/No. & designation of RCR/Local/Area Police official(s) who were sent/reached on spot/took action on complaint as per record.
 - 07) Name/No. & designation of Incharge-ACP-ADCP-Nodal Officer(s) & all other concerned officials of Police Control Room as well as Local/Area Police.
 - 08) Attested copies of F.I.R./D.D.R registered on complaint by police, if any, otherwise provide information in writing about non-registration of F.I.R./D.D.R.
 - 09) Concerned law providing attested copy of thereof for action taken on call/complaint.
 - 10) Particulars and attested copies of concerned documents of all other calls/complaints made by all other persons of loudspeaker/music/noise at day/night of 31.03.2019 & 01.04.2019 along with action taken on each such call/complaint.
 - 11) Concerned law providing attested copy thereof, in case the information is denied on any ground or any record is claimed not maintained or not available.
 - 12) Names & designation with full official address, mobile, e-mail of PIO/APIO & FAA along with attested copy of concerned office order/notification/other document.
 - 13) Availability of complete/any part of sought information on internet through official web-site and its access to public along with addresses of concerned web-pages.
4. Appellant, Sh. Arun Garg started using unacceptable language and baseless allegations during discussion of the present case with both the parties, which could not be tolerated by the Commission. Appellant, Sh. Arun Garg left the meeting in between, which seems he has no regard to the Commission as well as of the RTI Act, 2005, which is mainly to promote transparency and accountability in the working of every public authority.

After examining the case file, it is also observed that an email of the appellant was received by the undersigned bench dated 23.09.2020 through which, it is observed that wording written by the appellant in an email in relation to the Commission/Commissioners, it is clarified that the Commission is a constitutional body. It is disgraceful to write without a solid basis/document. Appellant has made some un-charitable comments against the bench alleging it to be vindictive and inimical while deciding appeals this bench and bench is bound by an oath of allegiance to the Constitution of India to discharge its duties without fear or favor. The Commission is duty bound morally and ethically to take decisions without bias or ill-will against anyone. The Commission considers it appropriate to underline here that no litigant should be allowed to seek a decision in his favor or to choose one of his choice.

5. In the view of above and on perusal of the relevant documents on file, the Commission found no reason to disagree with the replies of the respondents. The replies of respondents (letter no. 350 dated 14.08.2020) upheld. In the present case, there is no tangible public purpose which has been cited by the appellant.

6. In wake of above, no further cause of action is required. Hence, **matter is disposed of & closed accordingly at Commission's end.**

7. Announced in the Court. Copy of the order to be sent to the parties.

Chandigarh
29.09.2020

(Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864115, Email: - psic25@punjabmail.gov.in
Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Sh. Arun Garg (7888459837)

S/o Sh. Sham Lal
House No. 40-41, Central Town,
Village Dad, PO-Lalton Kalan,
District Ludhiana-142022

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer/APIO

O/o SHO,
Police Station Sadar, Ludhiana.

First Appellate Authority

O/o Commissioner of Police,
Ludhiana

Respondent

Appeal Case No.: 808 of 2020
Heard through CISCO WEBEX

Present: Nobody on behalf of the appellant.
For the respondent: ASI, Kulwant Singh (9876244427).

ORDER

1. This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 17.08.2020 vide which respondent, Head Constable, Rajinder Singh stated that requisite information has already been supplied to the appellant dated 22.11.2019. Appellant, Sh. Arun Garg stated that he has not received the information till date.

Respondent PIO was advised to send the requisite information to the appellant once again through registered post and appellant was advised to go through the information, once he had received through registry and point out deficiency, if any. Both the parties were advised to represent this case on the next date of hearing. Matter was adjourned for further hearing on 29.09.2020 i.e. today.

2. In today's hearing, respondent, ASI, Kulwant Singh states that information was sent to the appellant through registered post on 17.08.2020 as per the previous order of the Commission dated 17.08.2020.

3. Appellant, Sh. Arun Garg left the meeting in between during the hearing of another appeal case 805 of 2020 of the appellant.

Appellant Sh. Arun Garg demanded the following information from the respondent PIO in RTI application dated 27.09.2019 regarding Notice dated 10.05.2019 issued & sent to applicant by Police Station Sadar Ludhiana (PTO)-

01) Concerned law regarding issue of the notice attested copies thereof.

02) Name & designation of the police officer/official who issued/signed the said notice.

03) Attested copies of all 18 complaints mentioned in the said notice.

04) Attested copies of all documents pertaining to action taken on all said complaints with all statements, inquiry/other reports, office order/correspondence/file noting etc.

- 05) Name with designations of all officials of police who took action or whose signature appear on any document pertaining to the said notice, complaints and email-letter.
 - 06) Attested copy of FIR/DDR registered on each complaint separately, if any, otherwise provide information in writing about non-registration of FIR/DDR.
 - 07) Concerned law for non-registration of FIR/DDR with attested
 - 08) Concerned law providing attested copy thereof for action taken on each complaint.
 - 09) Concerned law providing attested copy thereof, in case the information is denied on any ground or any record is claimed not maintained or not available.
 - 10) Names & designations with full official address, mobile, e-mail of PIO/APIO & FAA along with attested copy of concerned office order/notification/other document.
 - 11) Availability of complete/any part of sought information on internet through official web-site and its access to public along with addresses of concerned web-pages.
4. After hearing the respondent and examining the documents placed on record,
 5. Appellant, Sh. Arun Garg started using unacceptable language and baseless allegations during discussion of the present case with both the parties, which could not be tolerated by the Commission. Appellant, Sh. Arun Garg left the meeting in between, which seems he has no regard to the Commission as well as of the RTI Act, 2005, which is mainly to promote transparency and accountability in the working of every public authority.

After examining the case file, it is also observed that an email of the appellant was received by the undersigned bench dated 23.09.2020 through which, it is observed that wording written by the appellant in an email in relation to the Commission/Commissioners, it is clarified that the Commission is a constitutional body. It is disgraceful to write without a solid basis/document. Appellant has made some un-charitable comments against the bench alleging it to be vindictive and inimical while deciding appeals this bench and bench is bound by an oath of allegiance to the Constitution of India to discharge its duties without fear or favor. The Commission is duty bound morally and ethically to take decisions without bias or ill-will against anyone. The Commission considers it appropriate to underline here that no litigant should be allowed to seek a decision in his favor or to choose one of his choice.

6. In the view of above and on perusal of the relevant documents on file, the Commission found no reason to disagree with the replies of the respondents. The replies of respondents (letter dated 14.08.2020 along with annexure which has been received in the Commission vide diary no. 12575 dated 22.09.2020) upheld. In the present case, there is no tangible public purpose which has been cited by the appellant.

7. In wake of above, no further cause of action is required. Hence, **matter is disposed of & closed accordingly at Commission's end.**

8. Announced in the Court. Copy of the order to be sent to the parties.

Chandigarh
29.09.2020

(Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.

Ph: 0172-2864115, Email: - psic25@punjabmail.gov.in
Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Sh. Kulwant Singh (9878973610)

S/o Sh. Pritam Singh
VPO: Pohir, Block Dehlon (Ludhiana)
Punjab-141204

Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer/APIO

O/o Police Commissioner,
Ludhiana

Respondent

Compliant Case No.: 189 of 2020
Heard through CISCO WEBEX

Present: Nobody on behalf of the appellant.
For the respondent: ASI, Ramesh Kumar (9915603000)

ORDER

1. This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 17.08.2020 vide which respondent PIO intimated the Commission that requisite information could not be supplied because darkhast is pending. He also sent an email dated 15.08.2020 along with remarks of the complainant that respondent informed him regarding the pending status of the investigation and will supply when it will be completed. One opportunity was given to the complainant to represent this case and matter was adjourned for further hearing on 21.09.2020 i.e. today.

2. In today's hearing, respondent, ASI Ramesh Kumar intimated the Commission that still under investigation and it will be supplied to the complainant after completion of the investigation.

3. Neither the complainant, Sh. Kulwant Singh is present for today's hearing nor did he file reply in this regard. He was also not present on the previous hearing held on 17.08.2020.

4. After hearing the respondent and examining the documents placed on record, it is observed that requisite information is under investigation, which could not be supplied to the appellant, as per reply filed by the respondent vide letter no. 340-D dated 13.08.2020.

I am of the view that matter under investigation could not be supplied as per Section 8 (1) (g) and 8 (1) (h) per RTI Act 2005. Therefore, no further cause of action is required in this case.

5. In wake of above, this instant complaint case is **disposed of & closed accordingly at the Commission's end** along with directions to the respondent PIO to supply the requisite information once the investigation will be completed.

6. Announced in the Court, copy of the order to be sent to the parties.

Chandigarh
29.09.2020

(Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)
State Information Commissioner

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864115, Email: - psic25@punjabmail.gov.in
Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com



Sh. Jagshir Singh (8195800345)
S/o Sh. Gian Singh
House No. 9/20, Mandi Mullanpur,
Ludhiana-141101

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer/APIO
O/o DCP, Ludhiana.

First Appellate Authority
O/o Police Commissioner, Ludhiana

Respondent

Appeal Case No.: 1102 of 2020
Heard through CISCO WEBEX

Present: Nobody on behalf of the appellant.
For the respondent: ASI, Ramesh Kumar (9915603000)

ORDER

1. This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 17.08.2020 vide which respondent, ASI, Ramesh Kumar states that requisite information could not be supplied as it relates with confidential information of Police Department. Appellant was advised to file a reply to the Commission, failing to which case will be decided on merit basis. A copy of previous order dated 17.08.2020 along with 02 pages (copies of letter numbers 1102/2020 dated 14.08.2020 and 28/FA dated 14.02.2020) were sent to the appellant through registered post. Matter was adjourned for further hearing on 29.09.2020 i.e. today.
2. In today's hearing, respondent, ASI Ramesh Kumar states that reply has already been sent to the appellant.
3. Neither the complainant, Sh. Kulwant Singh is present for today's hearing nor did he file reply in this regard.
4. After hearing the respondent and examining the documents placed on record, it is observed that reply has already been supplied to the appellant but appellant has not filed reply as he was directed by the Commission vide order dated 17.08.2020.
5. In wake of above, no further cause of action is required. Hence, this instant appeal case is **disposed of & closed.**
6. Announced in the Court. Copy of the order to be sent to the parties.

Chandigarh
29.09.2020

(Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)
State Information Commissioner

Note: After the hearing was over, appellant intimated the undersigned bench through telephonic message that he was reached at the DC Office, Ludhiana to attend hearing mistakenly. He was apprised with the proceedings of this hearing He replied, he is okay with decision of this case.

Chandigarh
29.09.2020

(Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla)
State Information Commissioner