

Sh. Rajinder Kumar (9872771117)

s/o Sh. Hari Ram, Quarter No.35-L, Govt. ITI Staff Colony, PO Talwara Township, Tehsil Mukerian, Distt. Hoshiarpur-144216

Versus

Public Information Officer O/o Principal, ITI, Talwara Twonship, Distt. Hoshiarpur

First Appellate Authority

O/o Principal, ITI, Talwara Twonship, Distt. Hoshiarpur

Respondent

Appeal Case No.: 2236 of 2021 Through CISCO WEBEX

Present: (i) Appellant – Absent

(ii) Respondent: Absent.

Order:

- 1. The above mentioned case was earlier heard on 28.10.2021 dated 21.10.2021 vide which respondent Sh. Sushil stated that requisite information has already been supplied to the appellant. Appellant was absent and one opportunity was awarded to him to represent this case on the next date of hearing and case was adjourned to 31.3.2022.
- 2. In today's hearing, both the parties are absent. An email dated 30.03.2022 is received from the appellant regarding exemption from today's hearing but nothing is mentioned about his absence on the previous hearing held on 28.10.2021 or regarding information. It is observed that appellant has not pointed out any deficiency in spite of sufficient time has passed.
- 4. In view of the observations noted above, no further cause of action is required. Therefore, the instant case is **disposed of**. Copies of this decision be sent to the parties.

Date: 31.03.2022



Sh. Gurpreet Singh (7814044919) H.No.163, Sector-45-A, Chandigarh.

Versus

Public Information Officer O/o Deptt. Of Technical Education & Industrial Training(Indl. Training Wing), Pb, Sector 36, Chandigarh

First Appellate Authority

O/o Deptt. Of Technical Education & Industrial Training(Indl. Training Wing), Pb, Sector 36, Chandigarh Appeal Case No.: 1063 of 2021

Respondent

Present:

(i) Sh. Gurpreet Singh, the appellant in person. (ii) For the respondent: Sh. Rupinder (Deputy Director-cum-PIO) (9872826538)

Through CISCO WEBEX

<u>Order</u>

- This order may be read with earlier order dated 21.10.2021 vide which respondent stated that partial information comprising 194 pages had been provided to the appellant on 19.10.2021 and rest of the information relates with Vigilance Department. The Commission advised the appellant to point out deficiency, if any, to the respondent under intimation to the Commission. The case was adjourned to 31.3.2022.
- 2. In today's hearing both the parties are present. Respondent, Sh. Rupinder states that Vigilance department denied supplying the information. A reply vide letter no. 115 dated 17.03.2022 is received from the Vigilance Department. He adds that a reply in this regard has also been sent to the undersigned Bench on 30.03.2022 along with supporting documents, which are received and taken on record.
- 3. The appellant pleads the court to intervene in the matter for supply of pending information.
- 4. After hearing both the parties and examining the case file, I am of the considered view that sufficient reply and information has already been supplied to the appellant, which is satisfactory. Therefore, no further cause of action is required. Hence, the instant case is **disposed of**. Copies of this decision be sent to the parties.

Dated: 31.03.2022

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden, Sector 16, Chandigarh. Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100 Email: - psic22@punjabmail.gov.in

Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com

HIT HIT ARAND

Sh. Tarlochan Singh (9815813800) S/o Sh. Bakhtaur Singh Village Manakwal, PO-Gill, District Ludhiana

Versus

Public Information Officer O/o BDPO, Block-I, Ludhiana

First Appellate Authority O/o DDPO, Ludhiana

Appeal Case No.: 330 of 2021 Through CISCO WEBEX

Respondent

Appellant

Present:

(i) Sh. Tarlochan Singh, the appellant.

(ii) For the respondent: Sh. Sarabjeet Singh (Superintendent-BPO-Ludhiana-1) (9417452665).

<u>ORDER</u>

- 1. This order may be read with earlier order dated 21.10.2021 vide which respondent stated that the information had been provided to the appellant after inspection of record but the appellant was not satisfied with the supplied information. The Commission directed the appellant for inspection of record for 28.10.2021 and supplied the identified pages. The court advised the appellant to point out deficiency, if any, to the respondent under intimation to the Commission. The case was adjourned to 31.3.2022.
- 2. In today's hearing both the parties are present. Respondent, Sh. Sarabjeet Singh states that earlier 315 pages were supplied to the appellant and appellant raise objection on the plea that pages are missing in the supplied information. On the appellant's visit official record had already been inspected by the appellant and it is made clear to him nothing is concealed to be supplied as per RTI application. Appellant expresses his satisfaction on the same. He adds that reply (vide letter no. 966 dated 30.03.2022) in this regard has also been sent to the Commission via an email today i.e. 31.03.2022, which is received and taken on record.
- 3. Appellant states that he has no objection to close this case.
- 4. After hearing both the parties and examining the case file, it is observed that sufficient reply has already been supplied to the appellant. Therefore, the court does not see any further course of action required in the present and the case stands **disposed of**. Copies of this decision be sent to the parties.

Dated: 31.3.2022



Sh. Suraj Partap Singh (9356820416-7900260416) s/o Sh. Surendra Prasad, TCR, IL Tech Fit, 4 Wing, Air Force Station, Agra (UP)-282008

Versus

Public Information Officer O/o I.K.Gujral Pb. Technical University, Jalandhar

First Appellate Authority

O/o I.K.Gujral Pb. Technical University, Jalandhar

Respondent

Appeal Case No.: 2184 of 2021

Present: (i) Appellant – absent.

(ii) Sh. Hardeep Singh, Asstt. Registrar (Examination)(9478098036).

<u>ORDER</u>

- This order may be read with earlier order dated 21.10.2021 vide which appellant intimated the Commission that the information had not been provided to him. Respondent was absent. The Commission granted another opportunity to the respondent PIO to represent his case and the case was adjourned to 31.3.2022.
- 2. In today's hearing the appellant is not present.
- 3. Respondent, Sh. Hardeep Singh states that appellant is satisfied with the supplied information and requests to close this case via email dated 28.03.2022. He adds that he will send an email in this regard to the Commission after the hearing will be over.
- 4. Respondent PIO is directed to send an email of acknowledging receipt of the information by the appellant as per para 4 of this order.
- 5. In view of the observations noted above, no further cause of action is required. Therefore, the instant case is **disposed of**. Copies of this decision be sent to the parties.

Dated: 31.3.2022

(Anumit Singh Sodhi) State Information Commissioner Punjab

Note: After the hearing was over, an email dated 31.03.2022 is received from the respondent PIO comprising acknowledgment of the appellant regarding received information. In that email appellant mentioned that he has received the demanded information and requested to close this case. This email is taken on record.

Dated: 31.3.2022

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden, Sector 16, Chandigarh. Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100 Email: - psic22@punjabmail.gov.in

Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com

Vs.



Sh. Ramrashpal Singh (9465133828) s/o Sh. Fauja Singh,

VillageAjit Nagar, PO Beas, Tehsil Baba Bakala, District Amritsar

Complainant

Respondent

Public Information Officer O/o IGP (Crime), Punjab,

Chandigarh.

Public Information Officer

O/o SSP, Amritsar (Rural)

Complaint case No.343 of 2020 Through CISCO WEBEX

Present:

(i) Sh. Ramrashpal Singh, the complainant in person.(ii) For the respondent: Ms Navneet Kaur (SI) (9779294115) (O/o SSP, Rural)

Order:

- 1. This order may be read with earlier order dated 21.10.2021 vide which respondent, Sh. Davinder Singh requested for an adjournment in this case. He was directed to solve the matter at the earliest. The case was adjourned for 31.3.2022.
- 2. In today's hearing, respondent, Ms. Navneet Kaur states that matter is already solved. She adds that department received an email from SSP, Majitha stating therein that the complainant had lent the money to the borrower, which the borrower committed to return but on the later stage he backed out. They further state in the email that they cannot do much in this case. The appellant may knock at the door of the court. She also mentions that a reply in this regard is also sent to the undersigned Bench on 30.03.2022 comprising 03 pages.
- 3. Complainant is present for today's hearing.
- 4. After hearing both the parties and examining the case file, it is observed that sufficient reply has already been supplied to the appellant. Therefore, the court does not see any further course of action required in the present and the case stands **disposed of**. Copies of this decision be sent to the parties.

Dated: 31.3.2022

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

Ph: 0172-2864113, Helpline No. 0172-2864100 Email: - psic22@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: - www.infocommpunjab.com

Sh. Sandeep Kumar Maluja, (9646546613) S/o Sh. Om Parkash, R/o Street No.2, Near ShaniMandir, Patel Nagar, Malout.

Vs

Public Information Officer O/o Commissioner Sales Tax, Patiala

First Appellate Authority O/o Commissioner Sales Tax, Patiala

Appeal Case No.: 745 of 2021 Through CISCO WEBEX

(i) Sh. Sandeep Kumar Maluja, the appellant

Present: (ii)For the respondent: Ms Paramjit Kaur, PIO(98149336350).

ORDER

- 1. This order may be read with earlier order dated 21.10.2021 vide which respondent PIO was directed to collect the information from 10 PIOs and supply the information to the appellant within 15 days. The case was adjourned for 31.3.2022.
- 2. In today's hearing, appellant intimates that he is satisfied with the supplied information and he has no objection to close this case.
- 3. Respondent, Ms Paramiit Kaur states that information was sent to the appellant on 26.10.2021
- 4. In view of the observations noted above, no further cause of action is required. Therefore, the instant case is **disposed of**. Copies of this decision be sent to the parties.

Date: 31.03.2022

(Anumit Singh Sodhi) **State Information Commissioner** Puniab



Appellant



Sh. Dinesh Goyal (9815288544)

House No. 2545, Sector-50 C, BSNL Society, Chandigarh-160047

Versus

Appellant

Public Information Officer O/o Registrar Firms & Societies,

Punjab, Chandigarh

Sh. Jaswant Rai (APIO) O/o Registrar Firms & Societies, Punjab, Chandigarh

First Appellate Authority O/o Registrar Firms & Societies, Punjab, Chandigarh

Appeal Case No.: 366 of 2021 Through CISCO WEBEX

Present:

(i) Appellant: Sh. Dinesh Goyal.(ii) Respondent: Sh. Jaswant Rai (APIO).

<u>Order</u>

- This order may be read with earlier order dated 28.10.2021 vide which respondent PIO is directed either to supply the information to the appellant within one week or file an affidavit in original duly attested by the competent authority regarding unavailability of the concerned record in connection with 'Masters' Games Federation-Regd. No. 179/2017'. The case was adjourned for 31.3.2022.
- 2. In today's hearing, appellant intimates the Commission that affidavit is received from the respondent PIO regarding 'Masters' Games Federation-Regd. No. 179/2017' with regard to the demanded information. He has no objection to close this case.
- Respondent, Sh. Jaswant Rai states that reply vide letter no. 7003 dated 12.01.2022 along with an affidavit is also sent to the Commission, which is received in the Commission vide diary no. 801 dated 13.01.2022 and taken on record.
- 4. In view of the observations noted above, no further cause of action is required. Therefore, the instant case is **disposed of**. Copies of this decision be sent to the parties.

Date: 31.03.2022

(Anumit Singh Sodhi) State Information Commissioner Punjab



Sh. Kuldip Singh (0417520628) S/o Sh. Major Singh Vill. Jasiya, Block Ludhiana-1

Public Information Officer O/o BDPO Ludhiana-1.

First Appellate Authority O/o DDPO, Ludhiana

Appeal Case No.: 637 of 2021 Through CISCO WEBEX

Versus

Respondent

Present:

(i) Appellant – Absent.(ii) Respondent: Sh. Sarabjit Singh (Superintendent).

<u>ORDER</u>

- 1. The above mentioned case was earlier heard on 28.10.2021 vide which respondent, Sh. Jagroop Singh was directed to supply the requisite information within one week. Appellant was advised to point out deficiency in the supplied information as per his RTI application in writing to the PIO under intimation to the Commission within ten days, once he received the information. The case was adjourned to 31.03.2022.
- In today's hearing, appellant is not present despite being aware about the date of hearing. Respondent, Sh. Sarabjit Singh states that as per directions of the court dated 28.10.2021, the appellant did not point out any deficiency in the supplied information till date.
- 3. In view of the observations noted above, no further cause of action is required. Therefore, the instant case is **disposed of**. Copies of this decision be sent to the parties.

Dated: 31.3.2022



Sh. SatnamSingh (9307900008)

s/o Sh. Mangal Singh, Vill. Masal Mohan Ke, PO Pindi, Tehsil Guruharsai, Distt. Ferozepur 152022.

Versus

Public Information Officer

O/o Principal, Multitechnical College, Guru Teg Bahadurgarh, Distt. Moga.

First Appellate Authority

O/o Principal, Multitechnical College, Guru Teg Bahadurgarh, Distt. Moga.

Appeal Case No.: 2339 of 2021 Heard through CISCO WEBEX

Present:

(i) Appellant: Absent.(ii) Sh. Narinder Singh, Lecturer-cum-PIO on behalf of the respondent.

<u>ORDER</u>

- 1. This order may be read with the previous order dated 28.10.2021 vide which respondent PIO was directed to supply attested copies of the information within 10 days. The case was adjourned to 31.3.2022.
- In today's hearing the appellant is not present but he intimates the Commission through telephonic message that he has received the required information and requests to close this case.
- 3. Respondent, Sh. Narinder Singh, Lecturer-cum-PIO is present for today's hearing.
- 4. In view of the observations noted above, no further cause of action is required. Therefore, the instant case is **disposed of**. Copies of this decision be sent to the parties.

Dated: 31.3.2022

(Anumit Singh Sodhi) State Information Commissioner Punjab



Appellant

Sh. Brish Bhan Bujarak (987101698) S/o Sh. Saroop Chand, R/O H.No.33, Kahangarh Road, Patran, Distt. Patiala

Versus

Appeal Case No.: 1216 of 2021

Public Information Officer (By Name)(Regd. Post)O/o MC, Budhlada, Distt. Mansa

First Appellate Authority O/o MC, Budhlada, Distt. Mansa

Respondent

(i) Appellant: Absent.

Present: (i) Appellant: Absent. (ii) Respondent: Absent.

<u>ORDER</u>

1. This order may be read with the reference of previous order dated 28.10.2021 vide which respondent, Sh. Parminder Singh stated that he had joined the respondent's office two months ago and concerned staff intimated that requisite information had already been sent to the appellant on 07.12.2020 but appellant denied of receiving any information and requested the Commission to direct the concerned respondent PIO to supply the demanded information.

Both the parties were advised to represent this case in person on the next date of hearing, failing to which, appropriate order in their absence shall be passed. Matter was adjourned for further hearing on 31.03.2022.

- In today's hearing, both the parties are absent without any intimation to the Commission despite being aware about the date of hearing. Calls were made to respondent, Sh. Vijay Jindal (EO) on his mobile number: 9646350081 but no response from him, which shows his causal approach towards the orders of the Commission.
- **3.** Appellant is absent despite being aware about the date of hearing, which means he has nothing to say in this regard and no communication is received from the appellant by the Commission after the previous hearing held on 28.10.2021.
- 4. In view of the observations noted above, no further cause of action is required. Therefore, the instant case is **disposed of**. Copies of this decision be sent to the parties.

Date: 31.03.2022



Sh. Gurdial Singh (8437294858) s/o Sh. Teja Singh Vill. Gurdittpura, Tehsil Rajpura, Distt. Patiala

Versus

Public Information Officer O/o BDPO, Distt. Patiala

Complaint Case No.: 193 of 2021 Through CISCO Webex

Present: (i) Complainant: Absent.

(ii) For the respondent: Sh. Harinder (Clerk) (9814491863)

ORDER

1. This order may be read with the reference to the previous order dated 28.10.2021 vide which

complainant expressed his dissatisfaction with the supplied information.

It was observed that this instant case is a Complaint Case. The attention of the Complainant is drawn to the decision of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India rendered on 12.12.2011 in Civil Appeal Nos. Nos.10787 – 10788 of 2011 (arising out of SLP © No.32768-32769/2010)-Chief Information Commissioner and another Vs. State of Manipur and another, in Para 31 whereof, it has been held that while entertaining a complaint case under Section 18 of the RTI Act, 2005, the Commissioners have no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for an access to the information which is as under:-

(31. We uphold the said contention and do not find any error in the impugned judgment of the High Court whereby it has been held that the Commissioner while entertaining a complaint under Section 18 of the said Act has no jurisdiction to pass an order providing for access to the information).

Despite of being a complaint case, the Commission advised to the respondent PIO to send copy of requisite information to the complainant through an email by today under intimation to the Commission.

Complainant

Complaint Case No.: 193 of 2021 Through CISCO Webex

Complainant was also advised to point out specific deficiency as per RTI application, in writing to the respondent PIO with a copy to the Commission within ten days, once he receives information from the respondent PIO, failing which case will be closed.

Both the parties are advised to represent this case in person on the next date of hearing, failing to which, appropriate order in their absence shall be passed. Matter was adjourned for further hearing on 31.03.2022.

- 2. In today's hearing, respondent, Sh. Harinder states that requisite information was again sent to the appellant on 08.11.2021, as per the directions of the Commission on the previous hearing held on 28.10.2021. He adds that no deficiency has been pointed out by the appellant till date.
- 3. Complainant is absent despite being aware about the date of hearing, which means he has nothing to say in this regard and no communication is received from the complainant by the Commission after the previous hearing held on 28.10.2021.
- 4. In view of the observations noted above, no further cause of action is required. Therefore, the instant case is **disposed of**. Copies of this decision be sent to the parties.

Date: 31.03.2022



Sh. Amarjit Singh Dhamotia(9888490031)

Whistle Blower Social Workers, Distt. President-Ludhiana NCAG, H.No.60-35-P-376-1, Street No.8, Maha Singh Nagar, PO Dhandari Kalan, Ludhiana 141014.

Versus

Public Information Officer O/o Secy., Regional Transport Authority, Ludhiana

First Appellate Authority

O/o Secy., Regional Transport Authority, Ludhiana

Appeal Case No.: 2139 of 2021 Through CISCO WEBEX

Present: (i) Sh. Gurmel Singh on behalf of the appellant.

(ii) Nobody on behalf of the respondent.

Order:

1. The above mentioned case was earlier heard on 21.10.2022 vide which representative of the appellant presented the case and stated that requisite information is still pending from the respondent PIO.

Respondent PIO was not present for hearing but an email dated 05.10.2021 was received by the undersigned Bench comprising a letter no. 5394 dated 01.10.2021 stating that requisite information has already been sent to the appellant on 16.07.2021 and till date no objections have been raised by the appellant. This email was taken on record. Matter was adjourned for further hearing on 31.03.2022.

- 2. In today's hearing, representative of the appellant is present but respondent PIO is absent without intimation to the Commission. It is also observed that appellant has not pointed out deficiency till date in the supplied information even after the ample time has elapsed.
- 3. In wake of above, no further cause of action is required. Therefore, this instant case is **disposed of**.

Copies of this decision be sent to the parties.

Dated: 31.03.2022

(Anumit Singh Sodhi) State Information Commissioner Punjab