# 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. Sandeep Singh, (7626094125)

S/o Sh Kulwainder Singh, R/o No 162, Near Khakh Patti Gurdwra, Gobindgarh, PO Jugiana, Distt Ludhiana

Versus

Appellant

hformation

**Public Information Officer** O/o Police Post Incharge, PB Police, On Ludhiana – Chandigarh Road, Ludhiana.

# First Appellate Authority

O/o Police Commissioner, Mini Seretariate, Ferozepur Road Ludhiana

### Appeal Case No.: 3385 of 2019 Heard through CISCO WEBEX

Respondent

Present: None on behalf of the appellant. For the respondent: ASI, Ramesh Kumar (9915603000) along with Ms. Kuljeet Kaur (9811508878)

### <u>ORDER</u>

1. This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 22.07.2020 vide which respondent, Sh. Ramesh Kumar stated that requisite information has already been sent to the appellant but representative of the appellant informed the Commission that no information had been received from the respondent PIO. Show Cause notice was issued to the respondent PIO, Sh. Akhil Chaudhary Commission and matter was adjourned for further hearing today i.e. 31.08.2020.

2. In today's hearing, ASI, Ramesh Kumar states that requisite information has already been supplied to the appellant dated 24.08.2020 and appellant is satisfied with the supplied information.

3. Neither the appellant is present for today's hearing nor did he file reply in this regard.

4. After hearing the respondent and examining the case file, it is observed that no correspondence has been sent by the appellant for today's hearing. On the assurance of the respondent, no further cause of action is required in this case. Hence, the instant appeal case is **disposed of & closed.** 

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

Chandigarh Dated: 31.08.2020 (Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla) State Information Commissioner

### Shri Ramandeep Kansal,

S/o Shri Himmat Rai Kansal, # 1022, Ward No 6, Street No 2, Back side new Bus Stand, Preet Colony, Bhawanigarh, Distt Sangrur-148026.

Public Information Officer

O/o Women Cell, Mohali.

**First Appellate Authority** O/o SSP, Mohali.

### Appeal Case No.: 479 of 2020 Heard through CISCO WEBEX

Versus

Present:

Advocate, Varun Bansal on behalf of the appellant. For the respondent: Ms. Purnima Bhardwaj (Social Worker at Women Cell) (8076028770)

**ORDER** 1. This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 22.07.2020 vide which respondent PIO was directed to go through the official record once again and supply the reply/information as per RTI application to the appellant before the next date of hearing. Matter was adjourned for further hearing today i.e. 31.08.2020.

2. In today's hearing, representative of the appellant, Advocate Varun Bansal states that requisite information is still pending from the respondent PIO.

3. On this, respondent, Ms. Purnima Bhardwaj states that reply of RTI application was sent to the appellant dated 18.11.2019 stating that requisite information could not be supplied as per section 8 of the RTI Act, 2005 so that proceedings of the case would not be effected.

4. Representative of the appellant, Advocate Varun Bansal states that complaint was disposed of by the department which was filed by the girl so there is no issue to be supplied. He added that conciliation was done between both the parties in the respondent's office.

5. Respondent, Ms. Purnima Bhardwaj states that no reconciliation had taken place between both the parties and states that matter is pending as follow ups are going on, so requisite information could not be supplied to the appellant.

6. After hearing both the parties and examining the case file, I am of the view that requisite information could not be supplied to the appellant. Sufficient reply has already been supplied to by the respondent. Therefore, no further cause of action is required in this case. Hence, the instant appeal case is **disposed of & closed**.

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

Chandigarh Dated: 31.08.2020 (Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla) State Information Commissioner



Respondent

Appellant



# Sh. Harminder Singh (9478167407)

S/o Sh. Avtar Singh, #23540, Street No 2, Harbans Nagar, Bhatinda.

Versus

**Public Information Officer/APIO** O/o Director, General School Education, PB, Mohali.

### **First Appellate Authority**

O/o Director, General School Education, PB, Mohali.

#### Appeal Case No.: 245 of 2020 Heard through CISCO WEBEX

Present: Sh. Harminder Singh, appellant. None on behalf of the respondent.

<u>ORDER</u>

1. This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 24.02.2020 vide which respondent, Ms. Mini Khurana was directed to supply the joining date of 28 candidates to the appellant before the next date of hearing and matter was adjourned for 31.08.2020 i.e. today.

2. In today's hearing, appellant, Sh. Harminder Singh states that information has been received from the respondent PIO and requested to close this case.

3. Respondent PIO is not present for today's hearing.

4. As the information stands supplied and on the request of the appellant, no cause of

action is left. 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 Dated: 31.08.2020 (Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla) State Information Commissioner

Respondent

Appellant

Sh. Rajinder Singh (Naib Subedar),(8728076247) VPO Chhapar, Distt Ludhiana.

**Public Information Officer** O/o SSP, Jagraon, Distt Ludhiana (Rural)

**First Appellate Authority** O/o SSP, Jagraon, Distt Ludhiana (Rural)

### Appeal Case No.: 620 of 2020 Heard through CISCO WEBEX

Present: Sh. Rajinder Singh, the appellant. For the respondent: ASI, Harpreet Singh (9779900815)

ORDER

This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 21.07.2020 vide which 1. respondent PIO was directed to supply the information relates with point no. 1 to 3 to the appellant

already been supplied to the appellant through registered post on 06.07.2020, nothing is left to be

Appellant, Sh. Rajinder Singh states that he is satisfied with the supplied information and 3. does not want to pursue this case further.

4. As the information stands supplied and on the request of the appellant, no cause of action is left. 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 Dated: 31.08.2020

# (Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla) **State Information Commissioner**

Versus



Respondent

and matter was adjourned for further hearing on 31.08.2020 i.e. today.

2. In today's hearing, respondent, ASI, Harpreet Singh states that requisite information has

supplied.

Appellant



**Dr. K K Jindal,** House No 05883/14089, Near Round About, Ganesha Basti, Bathinda.

Versus

Appellant

Respondent

### **Public Information Officer**

O/o District Transport Officer, Mansa.

**Ms. Sankuntala** O/o Sub District Magistrate, Mansa.

**First Appellate Authority** O/o Sub District Magistrate, Mansa.

### Appeal Case No.: 320 of 2019 Heard through CISCO WEBEX

**Present:** None on behalf of the appellant. For the respondent: Sh. Gurkirat Singh (JA-8437300494).

ORDER 1. This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 27.07.2020, both the parties were absent and last and final opportunity was given to both the parties to represent this case on the next date of hearing and matter was adjourned for further hearing on 31.08.2020 i.e. today.

2. In today's hearing, respondent, Sh. Gurkirat Singh states that record was not received in SDM office from the DTO, Mansa office so it could not be supplied to the appellant. He added that reply dated 01.07.2019 has already been sent to the appellant.

3. Neither the appellant, Dr. K.K. Jindal is present nor did he file reply in this regard.

4. After hearing the respondent and examining the case file, it is observed that copy of letter no. 01.07.2019 is not available in the case file, accordingly respondent PIO is directed to send copy of letter dated 01.07.2019 through an email of the undersigned bench on email ID <a href="mailto:psic25@punjabmail.gov.in">psic25@punjabmail.gov.in</a> so that it will be on record.

I am of the view that supplied reply is sufficient by the respondent PIO, no further cause of action is required because appellant has not availed the provided opportunities to represent this case because he was only seeking orders in his favor but the Commission is bound with the law.

5. In view of above, the instant appeal case is **disposed of & closed**.

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

Chandigarh Dated: 31.08.2020 (Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla) State Information Commissioner



### Sh.Sukhchain Singh Sran, (9815235256)

S/o Sh. Kulwant Singh, # 39, Barnala Road, Balaji Enclave, Rampura Phul, Distt Bhathinda.

Versus

**Public Information Officer,** O/o SSP, Mohali.

#### **First Appellant Authority,** O/o SSP, Mohali

### Appeal Case No.: 908 of 2020 Heard through CISCO WEBEX

Respondents

Appellant

Present: None on behalf of the appellant.

For the respondent: Head Constable, Karamjeet Kaur (9779003132).

## <u>ORDER</u>

1. This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 08.06.2020 vide which appellant, Sh. Sukhchain Singh states that requisite information is still pending but respondent, Ms. Gagndeep Kaur stated that requisite information has already been supplied to the appellant dated 16.10.2019 and 31.12.2019. Respondent PIO was directed to send the requisite information to the appellant through registered post before the next date of hearing and matter was adjourned for further hearing on 31.08.2020 i.e. today.

2. In today's hearing, Head Constable, Karamjeet Kaur states that requisite information has already been sent o the appellant through registered post as per the previous order of the Commission dated 08.06.2020.

3. Appellant, Sh. Sukhchain Singh is not present for today's hearing but he intimated the undersigned bench through telephonically that he has received the requisite information and does not want to pursue this case further.

4. After hearing the respondent and as appellant does not want to pursue this case, therefore no further cause of action is required in this case. Hence, the instant appeal case is **disposed** 

# of & closed.

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

Chandigarh Dated: 31.08.2020 (Dr. Pawan Kumar Singla) State Information Commissioner



**Sh Lakha Singh (**9463570178**)** S/O sh Mangal Singh Fauji, VPO Raiya (Khurd), Ward No. 3, Tehsil Baba Bakla, Distt Amritsar.

Versus

Appellant

Respondents

Public Information Officer

O/o EO, Nagar Panchayat, Rayya, Distt. Amritsar

**First Appellate Authority** O/O Deputy Director, Local Govt. Dept. Amritsar.

#### Appeal Case No.: 4388 of 2019 Heard through CISCO WEBEX

Present:

Sh. Lakha Singh, the appellant in person. For the respondent: Sh. Balwinder Singh (Clerk) (8427120005)

<u>ORDER</u>

1. This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 30.07.2020 vide which respondent stated that documentation fee amounting Rs. 2,700/- was demanded from the appellant but till date it has not been deposited by the appellant. Appellant requested the Commission to allow him to inspect the official record and he will collect the information after depositing the documentation fee of identified pages.

2. In today's hearing, appellant, Sh. Lakha Singh states that he has collected the requisite information by hand from the respondent's office today morning.

3. On this, respondent, Sh. Balwinder Singh states that appellant inspected the official record on 18.08.2020 as per the order of the Commission dated 30.07.2020. He added that appellant identified 30 pages and said that he will collect it on 26.08.2020. A call was made to him to collect but appellant informed he will collect it on 27.08.2020 and then he again informed on call he will collect it on 31.08.2020. He further states that today morning appellant collected 30 pages of identified pages without depositing the documentation fee of 30 pages.

4. After hearing both the parties and examining the case file, it is observed that conduct and behavior of the respondent is satisfactory in this case. It is also observed that appellant from the day one denied that requisite information has not been received by him but he mislead the Commission by not informing that respondent PIO sent a reply regarding documentation fee amounting Rs. 2,700/-.

Appellant, Sh. Lakha Singh time and again changing his versions and not cooperating. I am of the view that appellant already inspected the official record and received identified pages by him. Therefore, no further cause of action is required in this case. Hence, the instant appeal case is **disposed of & closed.** 

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