**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**RED CORSS BUILDING, SECTOR-16, MADHYA MARG, CHANDIGARH**

**Tele No. 0172-2864112, FAX No. 0172-2864125, Visit us @** [**www.infocommpunjab.com**](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)

Sh. Davinder Singh,

House No. H. No. 8718, Street No. 3,

Kot Baba Deep Singh, Amritsar. Appellant

 Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o Punjab State Information Commission,

Sector 16, Chandigarh

First Appellate Authority,

O/o Secretary,

Punjab State Information Commission,

Sector 16, Chandigarh Respondents

 **Appeal Case No.1078/2018**

Date of RTI application: 20.11.2017

Date of First Appeal : Nil

Date of Order of FAA : Nil

Date of 2nd Appeal/complaint 17.03.2018

**Present: Sh. Davinder Singh - Appellant.**

1. **Sh. Sudhir Kumar, PIO, PSIC,**
2. **Sh. Sadhu Ram, PS.Secy,PSIC - for Respondents.**

**ORDER**

It shall be appropriate to reproduce a couple of interim orders passed by this forum on 05.07.2018 and 09.08. 2018 as under:

 **Order dated 05.07.2018**

 *“Sh. Sudhir Kumar, PIO says that the appellant was asked to deposit an amount of Rs.96/- as a cost of information. Having failed, the information could not been supplied to the appellant. The appellant, on the other hand, says that he had sent across a postal order worth Rs.100/- which was not accepted by the respondents. The appellant reiterates that the same was not received by him.*

 *The Commission does not intend to go into this controversy and directs the respondents to transmit the information to the appellant by post within ten days from today positively.”*

 *“The respondents say that in compliance with the order of the Commission the Contd….page….2*
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*requisite information has been supplied to the appellant. The appellant communicated certain discrepancies which have been endorsed to the respondents as well. The respondents deny its receipt. A copy has been handed over to them. They should look into it and endeavour to provide the information as per availability in the record.”*

**Order dated 09.08.2018**

 *“The respondents submit that the appellant is seeking explanations as well as answers to his various complicated queries which the office of the Ld. SIC (A) is looking into as the application has been forwarded to it under Section 5(4) of the RTI Act. The respondents are desired to file a suitable reply besides supplying the material information that is available with them.”*

 The Commission finds that the appellant is aggrieved with the disciplinary action taken against him by his disciplinary authority. Reportedly he has been provided with the record available with the respondents. However, he is getting into hair splitting in seeking explanation in inconsequential issues from the Commission. RTI is not a vehicle to achieve redressal against the orders passed by the superior officers in disciplinary proceedings in an organization. He should exploit the internal mechanism which should be in place in the organization to find the reprieve rather than taking the route of RTI. The information available with the respondents has been duly provided to him and no further intervention of the Commission is called for.

  **Disposed.**

 **Sd/-**

**30.08.2018** **(Yashvir Mahajan)**

 **State Information Commissioner**