



Sh. Lakshmi Narain, S/o Sh Girdhari Lal,
R/o H No-994-B, Street No-3, Parwana Nagar,
Moga.

... Complainant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o SSP, Civil Secretariat,
Police Head Quarter,
Moga.

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 573 of 2019

PRESENT: None for the Complainant
Sh.Charanjit Singh, ASI for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on 04.11.2019. The respondent present had brought the information. The complainant was absent to point out the discrepancies, if any. The respondent was directed to send the information to the complainant through registered post.

The case was last heard on **14.01.2020**. The complainant was absent. The complainant had communicated discrepancies vide letter received in the Commission on 19.12.2019. Regarding point-1, the respondent present informed that the vehicle was impounded at the Police naka as there were no documents, and after showing the driving license and receipt of payment of due penalty by the violator to the concerned authority, the vehicle was released but no driving license was confiscated. The PIO was directed to give this in writing to the complainant.

Regarding points 3 & 4, the respondent informed that the information has been supplied to the complainant and a copy of the same submitted to the Commission. Having gone through the information, the Commission found that the information on points 3 & 4 had been provided to the best possible extent.

Hearing dated 30.06.2020:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Moga. The respondent present pleaded that in compliance with the order of the Commission, the information has been provided to the complainant.

The complainant is absent on 3rd consecutive hearing and vide email has sought exemption. Since the complainant is not appearing to plead his case, the Commission cannot keep adjourning the case. Hence, hearing the respondent and having gone through the reply, the Commission has taken a view that the RTI application has been sufficiently replied and no further course of action is required.

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

Chandigarh
Dated 30.06.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh Dinesh Kumar S/o Sh Daulat Ram,
R/o Village Ratewal (Neleware),
Tehil Balachaur, Distt SBS Nagar.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o DC,
Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o DC,
Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3683 of 2019

**PRESENT: Sh.Dinesh Kumar as the Appellant on W/s
Sh.Mrs.Adarsh Pal Kaur, PIO for the Respondent**

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 13.05.2019 has sought information regarding name of the officer who issued the voter card to Ms.Usha w/o Prem Chand EPIC No.JWY1249319 and date of issue and other information concerning the office of DC Sri Mukatsar Sahib. The appellant was not provided the information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 26.06.2019 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case was last heard on 28.01.2020. The respondent present pleaded that the information being 3rd party and not in public interest, it cannot be provided.

Having gone through the RTI application, the Commission directed the PIO to provide the name of the officer and date of issue of voter card. The document regarding personal information may not be provided. The information be supplied within 10 days.

Hearing dated 30.06.2020:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Sri Mukatsar Sahib. The appellant claims that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent present pleaded that the information is 3rd party, it cannot be provided.

In the last hearing, directions were issued to the PIO to provide the name of the officer and date of issue of voter card. The document regarding personal information may not be provided. However, the PIO has not complied the order of the Commission.

The PIO is given one last opportunity to comply with the earlier order of the Commission which still stands and provide the information to the appellant within 10 days, otherwise the Commission will be constrained to take action under section 20 of the RTI Act against the PIO.

To come up for compliance on **19.08.2020 at 11.00 AM** through video conference facility available in the office of Deputy Commissioner, **Sri Mukatsar Sahib.**

Chandigarh
Dated 30.06.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh Balbir Singh, S/o Sh Ajmer Singh,
Near Bus Stand, Sandhwa,
Faridkot.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Asst XEN,
AEE, TLSC, Sub Division,
132 KV Sub Station Colony, Kotakpur Road,
Sri Mukatsar Sahib, Distt Sri Mukatsar Sahib

...Respondent

Complaint Case No. 769 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Balbir Singh as the Complainant
Sh.Pushpinder Kansal, AEE O/o TLSC Sub Division,PSPTCL Sri Mukatsar
Sahib for the Respondent

ORDER:

The complainant through RTI application dated 29.12.2018 has sought information regarding weight and price of wire fencing around the tower in the area of village Sandhwan Distt.Faridkot and other information concerning the office of Asstt.Xen PSTCL Sri Mukatsar Sahib. The complainant was not satisfied with the reply of the PIO dated 16.01.2019 after which the complainant filed a complaint in the Commission on 27.08.2019.

The case was last heard on 24.12.2029. The respondent present pleaded that the information relates to the office of General Manager, Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd and they have already transferred the RTI application to them vide letter dated 05.01.2019 and the reply has been sent to the appellant.

The appellant was absent. The General Manager, Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd., Moga was impleaded in the case and directed to provide the information to the appellant. A copy of the RTI application was enclosed with the order for the PIO-General Manager, Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd. Moga.

Hearing dated 30.06.2020:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Sri Mukatsar Sahib.

The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the complainant. The complainant is present and informed that he 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 30.06.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh Kawal Nain Singh,
62, Model Town,
Ambala City.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o GMADA,
Mohali.

First Appellate Authority,
O/o EO, GMADA,
Mohali.

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 3956 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Kawal Nain Singh as the Appellant
Sh.Gagandeep Singh, Clerk-RTI Branch O/o GMADA Mohali for the
Respondent

ORDER:

The appellant through RTI application dated 09.07.2019 has sought information regarding allotment of religious sites to religious bodies – allotment of sites to Dera Radha Swami Satsang Beas in SAS Nagar Mohali alongwith a copy of map of sector 76 to 80 as on 21.02.2000 and other information concerning the office of GMADA Mohali. The appellant was not satisfied with the reply of the PIO dated 02.08.2019 whereby the PIO informed the appellant that since the information is voluminous, the appellant to inspect the record on any working day and get the relevant information after which the appellant filed first appeal before the First Appellate Authority on 05.09.2019 which took no decision on the appeal.

The case was last heard on 19.02.2020. The respondent present pleaded that the information is voluminous and the PIO is on leave due to illness and has sought adjournment.

The PIO was directed to relook at the RTI application and provide point-wise information to the appellant with a copy to the Commission. The First Appellate Authority was also directed to ensure that the information is provided on all points.

Hearing dated 30.06.2020:

The respondent present pleaded that since the information is voluminous and no PIO is posted, the appellant be asked to inspect the record and get the relevant information.

Hearing both the parties, the Commission directs the respondent to bring entire case file to the Commission at the next date of hearing for the appellant to inspect the record.

To come up for further hearing on **15.07.2020 at 11.00 AM.**

Chandigarh
Dated 30.06.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh. Arvinder Singh Bedi,
H No-593, Phas3B-1, Mohali.

...Appellant

Vs

Public Information Officer,
O/o PUDA,
Mohali.

First Appellate Authority
O/o PUDA,
Mohali.

...Respondent

Appeal Case .No. 4253 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Arinder Singh as the Appellant
Sh.Gagandeep Singh, Clerk for the Respondent

ORDER: The case was last heard on 11.03.2020. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent present informed that the information relates to the PIO-GMADA. The Commission observed that the GMADA was not being represented for a couple of months. The respondent informed that due to ill-health, the PIO-GMADA is not in a position to attend the hearing.

The respondent further informed that on the appeal of the appellant, the First Appellate Authority verbally ordered PUDA to provide the information within a week. The respondent had brought some information on behalf of the PIO-GMADA. However, the appellant was not satisfied with this information.

The Commission found the information to be wishy washy and not as per RTI application. The Commission directed the First Appellate Authority, GMADA to appoint a fresh PIO who can represent the organization on various hearings. A copy of the order was sent to the First Appellate Authority with the direction to ensure that this order is being complied with and the information is provided to the appellant as per RTI application.

Hearing dated 30.06.2020:

The appellant claims that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent present pleaded that the information is ready but the signing authority is on leave. The respondent further informed that the earlier PIO has been transferred and no fresh PIO has been posted. The respondent has however, assured to provide the information within a week.

The respondent is directed to comply with the earlier order of the Commission which still stands and provide the information to the appellant within a week.

To come up for further hearing on **15.07.2020 at 01.00 PM.**

Chandigarh
Dated 30.06.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

CC to: 1. PIO-GMADA, Mohali

2. First Appellate Authority,
GMADA, Mohali.



ShJatinder Singh, S/o ShBakhsish Singh,
R/o 5777-B, Sector-38 (West),
Chandigarh.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o GMADA, Sector-62,
Mohali.

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

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1504 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Jatinder Singh as the Appellant
Sh.Gagandeep Singh, Clerk-RTI Branch O/o GMADA Mohali for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on 09.07.2019. The respondent present pleaded that this case came to his knowledge a day before the hearing only and asked for a copy of the RTI application. The respondent further assured to supply the information within 15 days. A copy of the RTI application was provided to the respondent. The PIO was directed to look at the RTI application and provide the information within 15 days.

The case was again heard on **11.09.2019**. The appellant informed that the PIO has not provided the complete information. The respondent was absent. The PIO was given one more opportunity to relook at the RTI application and provide the complete information as per the RTI application and explain the reasons for not complying with the order of the Commission.

The case was last heard on **10.12.2019**. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information. The appellant was interested to inspect the record.

The respondent was absent. The appellant was directed to visit the office of PIO on **23.12.2019 at 11.00 AM** to inspect the record and get the relevant information. The PIO was directed to allow inspection of the record to the appellant on the given date and time and provide the relevant information as per the RTI application.

The Commission however, observed that there has been an enormous delay of one year in providing the information. The PIO was issued a **show cause notice under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 for not providing the information within the time as prescribed under the RTI Act and directed to file reply on an affidavit.**

Hearing dated 30.06.2020:

The appellant informed that the PIO has not provided the information and neither did the PIO cooperate when he had gone to inspect the record on 23.12.2019 and 14.01.2020 as per the Commission's order dated 10.12.2019.

The PIO is absent nor has sent any reply to the show cause notice. The respondent present pleaded that the information is ready but the signing authority is on leave. The respondent further informed that since the earlier PIO has been transferred and no fresh PIO has been posted. The respondent has however, assured to provide the information within a week.

The respondent is directed to comply with the earlier order of the Commission which still stands and provide the information to the appellant within a week.

It may be noted that Sh.Gulshan Kumar was the PIO during the duration of these cases and he is directed to respond to the show cause.

To come up for further hearing on **15.07.2020 at 11.00 AM.**

Chandigarh
Dated:30.06.2019

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh Jatinder Singh, S/o Sh Bakhsish Singh,
R/o 5777-B, Sector-38 (West),
Chandigarh.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o GMADA, Sector-62,
Mohali.

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

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1505 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Jatinder Singh as the Appellant
Sh.Gagandeep Singh, Clerk-RTI Branch O/o GMADA Mohali for the
Respondent

ORDER: The case was first heard on 11.09.2019. The appellant claimed that the PIO has given misleading and incorrect information. The respondent was absent.

The PIO was directed to relook at the RTI application and provide whatever the document is available as per RTI application. If there is any file that exists, the PIO was directed to bring the entire record at the next date of hearing.

The case was last heard on **10.12.2019**. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the complete information. The respondent was absent. The appellant was interested to inspect the record. The appellant was directed to visit the office of PIO on **23.12.2019 at 11.00 AM** to inspect the record and get the relevant information. The PIO was directed to allow inspection of the record to the appellant and provide the information as per the RTI application.

The Commission however, observed that there has been an enormous delay of one year in providing the information. 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.**

Hearing dated 30.06.2020:

The PIO is absent nor has sent any reply to the show cause notice. The respondent present has brought the information and handed over to the appellant. The appellant is not satisfied with the information on point 4 & point-7.

The respondent informed that the information regarding point-7 relates to CTP department. The respondent is directed to procure the information regarding point-7 from CTP and provide to the appellant. The respondent is also directed to provide information on point-4.

Regarding the show cause, it may be noted that Sh.Gulshan Kumar was the PIO during the duration of these cases and he is directed to respond to the show cause.

To come up for further hearing on **15.07.2020 at 11.00 AM.**

Chandigarh
Dated:30.06.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh Jatinder Singh, S/o Sh Bakhsish Singh,
R/o 5777-B, Sector-38 (West),
Chandigarh.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o GMADA, Sector-62,
Mohali.

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

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1506 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Jatinder Singh as the Appellant
Sh.Gagandeep Singh, Clerk-RTI Branch O/o GMADA Mohali for the
Respondent

ORDER: The case was first heard on **11.09.2019**. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent was absent.

The PIO was directed to provide the information and explain the reasons for not attending to the RTI application within the time prescribed under the RTI Act. The PIO was also directed to bring entire record at the next date of hearing to the Commission.

The case was last heard on **10.12.2019**. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent was absent. The appellant was interested to inspect the record. The appellant was directed to visit the office of PIO on **23.12.2019 at 11.00 AM** to inspect the record and get the relevant information. The PIO was directed to allow inspection of the record to the appellant and provide the information as per the RTI application.

The Commission however, observes that there has been an enormous delay of one year in providing the information. The PIO was issued a **show cause notice under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 and directed to file reply on an affidavit.**

Hearing dated 30.06.2020:

The PIO is absent nor has sent any reply to the show cause notice. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant informed that the PIO has not provided the information on point-2. The respondent is directed to provide information on point-2 within a week.

Regarding the show cause, it may be noted that Sh.Gulshan Kumar was the PIO during the duration of these cases and he is directed to respond to the show cause.

To come up for further hearing on **15.07.2020 at 11.00 AM.**

Chandigarh
Dated:30.06.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh Jatinder Singh, S/o Sh Bakhsish Singh,
R/o 5777-B, Sector-38 (West),
Chandigarh.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o GMADA, Sector-62,
Mohali.

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

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1507 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Jatinder Singh as the Appellant
Sh.Gagandeep Singh, Clerk-RTI Branch O/o GMADA Mohali for the
Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on **11.09.2019**. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information. The respondent was absent.

The PIO was directed to provide the information and explain the reasons for not attending to the RTI application within the time prescribed under the RTI Act. The PIO was also directed to bring entire record at the next date of hearing to the Commission.

The case was last heard on **10.12.2019**. The appellant informed that the PIO has provided the partial information. The respondent was absent. The appellant was interested to inspect the record. The appellant was directed to visit the office of PIO on **23.12.2019 at 11.00 AM** to inspect the record and get the relevant information. The PIO was directed to allow inspection of the record to the appellant and provide the information as per the RTI application.

The Commission however, observed that there has been an enormous delay of one year in providing the information. The PIO was issued a **show cause notice under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 and directed to file reply on an affidavit.**

Hearing dated 30.06.2020:

The appellant pleaded that despite visiting the office of PIO on 23.12.2019 and again on 14.01.2020, the PIO has not provided the information.

The PIO is absent nor has sent any reply to the show cause notice. The respondent present pleaded that the appellant has not specified the information. The respondent further informed that the earlier PIO has been transferred and no fresh PIO has been posted and that the file is in the custody of Sh.Balbir Singh.

The respondent is directed to be present alongwith Sh.Balbir Singh and entire record at the next date of hearing.

Appeal Case No. 1507 of 2019

The appellant in the case is 73 years old and has informed the Commission that he had visited twice for inspection on 23.12.2019 and 14.01.2020, but the respondent did not cooperate. The Commission feels that in the given pandemic situation, it is not prudent for the appellant to go to the public authority, and hence directs the respondent to bring the record to the Commission at the next date of hearing.

The Commission also observes that the appellant has had to suffer undue inconvenience to get the information, it is a fit case for awarding compensation to the appellant u/s 19(8)(b) of the RTI Act.

The PIO is directed to pay an amount of **Rs.5000/-** via demand draft drawn through Govt. Treasury as compensation to the appellant for the loss and detriment suffered by him of having to file the appeals and not getting information in time. The PIO is directed to duly inform the Commission of the compliance of the order and submit proof of having compensated the appellant.

To come up for further hearing on **15.07.2020 at 11.00 AM.**

Chandigarh
Dated:30.06.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh Jatinder Singh, S/o Sh Bakhsish Singh,
R/o 5777-B, Sector-38 (West),
Chandigarh.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o GMADA, Sector-62,
Mohali.

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

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1508 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Jatinder Singh as the Appellant
Sh.Gagandeep Singh, RTI Clerk for the Respondent

ORDER: The case was first heard on 11.09.2019. The appellant claimed that the PIO has not provided the information. The appellant further informed that the PIO sought consent of 3rd party and the 3rd party has already given its consent for disclosure of information, but the PIO had not supplied the information.

The respondent was absent. The PIO was directed to provide the information and explain the reasons for not providing the information within the time prescribed as per the RTI Act. The PIO was also directed to bring entire record at the next date of hearing to the Commission.

The case was last heard on **10.12.2019**. The appellant informed that the PIO has provided the partial information. The respondent was absent. The appellant was interested to inspect the record. The appellant was directed to visit the office of PIO on **23.12.2019 at 11.00 AM** to inspect the record and get the relevant information. The PIO was directed to allow inspection of the record to the appellant and provide the information as per the RTI application.

The Commission however, observed that there has been an enormous delay of one year in providing the information. The PIO was issued a **show cause notice under Section 20 of the RTI Act 2005 and directed to file reply on an affidavit.**

Hearing dated 30.06.2020:

The appellant informed that the PIO has not provided the information and neither did the PIO cooperate when he had gone to inspect the record on 23.12.2019 and 14.01.2020 as per the Commission's order dated 10.12.2019.

The PIO is absent nor has sent any reply to the show cause notice. The respondent present pleaded that the appellant has not specified the information. The respondent further informed that the earlier PIO has been transferred and no fresh PIO has been posted and that the file is in the custody of Sh.Balbir Singh.

The respondent is directed to be present alongwith Sh.Balbir Singh and entire record at the next date of hearing.

Regarding the show cause, it may be noted that Sh.Gulshan Kumar was the PIO during the duration of these cases and he is directed to respond to the show cause.

To come up for further hearing on **15.07.2020 at 11.00 AM.**

Chandigarh
Dated:30.06.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner



Sh.Gurmukh Singh, S/o Sh.Natha Singh,
VPO Hohsiarpur, Tehsil Kharar,
Distt. Mohali.

... Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Land Acquisition Collector,
GMADA, Mohali

First Appellate Authority,
O/o EO, GMADA,
Mohali

...Respondent

Appeal Case No. 1085 of 2019

PRESENT: Sh.Gurmukh Singh as the Appellant
Sh.Tarlochan Singh, O/o Deptt of Horticulture and Sh.Harpal Singh, O/o
LAC GMADA for the Respondent

ORDER:

The case was first heard on 27.06.2019. The respondent present pleaded that the information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant was not satisfied and stated that the PIO has not provided the assessment report of the trees standing on particular khasra numbers for which he had sought the information.

Having gone through the record, the Commission instructed the department of Forest, Punjab and the department of Horticulture to complete the assessment within 45 days and once the assessment is completed and sent to the Land acquisition department, the information be provided to the appellant.

The case was again heard on **16.10.2019**. The respondent present from the office of GMADA informed that they have already written to the department of Forests for supply of information but the information has not been provided. The respondent present from Forest Department pleaded that since the information sought by the appellant relates to the assessment of fruit trees, the same had to be conducted by the Horticulture department and the information was to be provided by them. The PIO-Department of Horticulture, Punjab, was again directed to look at the RTI application and provide the information. The PIO-Department of Forest was exempted.

The case was again heard on **23.12.2019**. The respondent present from the office of GMADA informed that they have already written to the Forest Department for supply of information. The respondent present from the Forest Department informed that GMADA has not identified the khasra no. and has not deposited requisite fee for assessment of trees.

The Commission observed that it is an inter-department issue and directed the PIO-GMADA to coordinate with Forest Department and complete the requisite formalities to prepare the assessment report and to provide the complete information to the appellant.

The respondent from Horticulture department was absent. The Commission has received a letter from PIO-Horticulture department stating they are only to do assessment of fruits of fruit trees and the assessment of non-fruit trees is to be done by the Forest Department. The appellant was asking for copy of assessment of Jaman trees standing on land bearing khasra No.10//25-3. The PIO-Horticulture department was directed to relook the RTI and provide the complete information.

Hearing dated 30.06.2020:

The case has come up for hearing today through video conferencing at DAC Mohali.

The respondent present from the office of Horticulture department informed that the information has been provided to the appellant. The appellant is not satisfied and stated that the information that has been provided, was not sought by him. The respondent informed that since no trees were found, no assessment was done. The PIO-Horticulture Department is directed to give this in writing on an affidavit that no trees were found and no assessment was done.

The respondent present from the office of LAC GMADA pleaded that the assessment was to be done by the Forest Department. The Forest Department has not given the reply.

The PIO-GMADA is directed to pursue with the Forest Department regarding assessment of trees standing on Khasra No.20/48 and provide the information to the appellant.

The case is adjourned. To come up for further hearing on **15.07.2020 at 11.00 AM.**

Chandigarh
Dated 30.06.2020

Sd/-
(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner

CC to: 1. PIO-Department of Forests, Punjab, Mohali

**2. PIO-Directorate of Horticulture, Punjab,
Kheti Bhawan, 3rd Floor, Near Dara Studio,
Sector 56-A, Mohali.**