

# PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,  
Madhya Marg, Sector 16, Chandigarh.

Ph: 0172-2864111, Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com),  
Email: [psic21@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic21@punjabmail.gov.in)



## FINAL ORDER

**Amrik Singh,**  
S/o Sh. Boota Singh,  
VPO-Vada Ghar,  
District Moga.

Versus

**Public Information officer,**  
o/o Punjab State Warehousing Corporation,  
SCO-74-75, Bank Square,  
Sector-17 B, Chandigarh.

**First Appellate Authority,**  
o/o Punjab State Warehousing Corporation,  
SCO-74-75, Bank Square,  
Sector-17 B, Chandigarh.

### Appeal Case No. 2961 of 2021 (Video Conference Proceedings)

PRESENT:

(Appellant) Absent

Jagdev Kaur, APIO-cum-Superintendent Grade-2 (for the Respondent)

ORDER:

1. The RTI application is dated **10.8.2020** vide which the appellant has sought information **regarding Chargesheet No. PWC/ADMN/E-10/PF-33/2180/05 dated 15.4.2005, against Jaswinder Singh and Gurpal Singh**, as enumerated in his RTI application. First Appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (FAA) on **15.10.2020** and Second Appeal was filed in the Commission on **29.6.2021** under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act 2005. Notice was issued to the parties for first hearing in the Commission on **5.10.2021**.

2. The appellant is absent without intimation. An Advocate, Sh. J.P. Rana appeared via Cisco Webex claiming to represent the appellant, Amrik Singh. However, he has neither submitted any authority letter from the appellant nor a Vakalatnama. The respondent PIO, represented by Jagdev Kaur, APIO-cum-Superintendent Grade-II, present via Cisco Webex, has submitted a reply vide Letter No. 473 Dated 4.10.2021, informing the Commission that the information was denied to the appellant under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act, 2005, vide Letter No. 1792 of 23.11.2020. It is notable here that the appellant did not attend the hearing held by the First Appellate Authority on 1.12.2020, whereon the FAA upheld the PIO's decision.

3. This Commission concurs with the PIO's decision that the information requested in this RTI application is personal and pertains to third parties and has no relation to any public activity. This Appeal Case is herewith **CLOSED**.

**Sd/-**  
**(ASIT JOLLY)**  
State Information Commissioner, Punjab.  
Chandigarh  
5.10.2021

# PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,  
Madhya Marg, Sector 16, Chandigarh.

Ph: 0172-2864111, Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com),  
Email: [psic21@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic21@punjabmail.gov.in)



## FINAL ORDER

**Gourav kumar,**  
S/o Sh. Subhash Chander,  
VPO-Kabul Shah Khuban,  
Tehsil & District Fazilka-152121

Versus

**Public Information officer,**  
Superintendent of Police,  
NH-95, GT Road, Friends Colony,  
District Moga-142001  
**First Appellate Authority,**  
o/o Senior Superintendent of Police,  
District Moga-142001

### **Appeal Case No. 2333 of 2021 (Video Conference Proceedings)**

PRESENT:

(Appellant) Absent

ASI Charanjeet Singh (for the Respondent) 97800-01275

ORDER:

1. The RTI application is dated **30.12.2020** vide which the appellant has sought information **regarding complaint filed by his wife Vishali r/o Kot Ise Khan, against Gauarv Kumar, Subhash Chander, Savita Rani, Sourav Girdhar, Shaina Rani, r/o Kabul Shah Khuban, in February or March 2020,** as enumerated in his RTI application. First Appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (FAA) on **24.2.2021** and Second Appeal was filed in the Commission on **13.5.2021** under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act 2005. Notice was issued to the parties for first hearing in the Commission on **5.10.2021**.

2. The appellant is absent without intimation. The respondent PIO, represented by ASI Charanjeet Singh, present via Video Conference Facility from Moga, has submitted vide Letter No. 49-SPL-RTI Dated 29.9.2021, that the appellant did not give the specific number and date of the complaint cited in the RTI application due to which it was difficult to trace it. The PIO wrote a letter to the appellant to provide the aforesaid details, but he received no reply.

3. Subsequently, on receipt of this Commission's Notice of Hearing, the cited complaint (No. 317PC-7/2020 Dated 21.2.2020) traced out, and certified copies of said complaint along with related documents have been sent vide Letter No. 49-SPL-RTI Dated 29.9.2021, by registered post as well as via email.

4. Under the circumstances, there is no further cause for action and this Appeal Case is herewith **CLOSED**.

**Sd/-**  
**(ASIT JOLLY)**  
State Information Commissioner, Punjab.

Chandigarh  
5.10.2021

# PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,  
Madhya Marg, Sector 16, Chandigarh.

Ph: 0172-2864111, Visit us @ [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com),  
Email: [psic21@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic21@punjabmail.gov.in)



## FINAL ORDER

**Vipan Grover,**  
S/o Sh. Lekh Raj,  
Village-Fatehgarh Panjtoor,  
District Moga.

Versus

**Public Information officer,**  
o/o Senior Superintendent of Police,  
District Moga.

### Complaint Case No. 739 of 2021 (Video Conference Proceedings)

PRESENT:

(Complainant) Absent

ASI Charanjeet Singh (for the Respondent) 97800-01275

ORDER:

1. The complainant, **Vipan Grover**, filed this RTI application dated **15.4.2021** and sought information regarding District Revenue Officer G.S Benipal, from the PIO o/o **Senior Superintendent of Police, Moga**. When no information was received, the Complainant filed a complaint under Section 18 of the RTI Act, 2005 to the Commission on **9.6.2021**. Notice was issued to the parties for first hearing in the Commission on **5.10.2021**.

2. The complainant is absent but has informed the Commission via email Dated 4.10.2021 that he has received the information and satisfied with it. The respondent PIO, represented by ASI, Charanjeet Singh, is present via Video Conference Facility from Moga. Meanwhile, the respondent PIO has made a submission to the Commission vide Letter No. 48-SPL-RTI Dated 29.9.2021, that a letter was written to the complainant vide No. 538-RTI Dated 22.4.2021 raising a demand for cost of copying the requested information. However, the complainant did not deposit the requested sum. Subsequently, on receiving this Commission's Notice of Hearing, the requested information was sent to the complainant despite the fact that he has not deposited the cost for photo copying.

3. The respondent PIO is advised that in future requests for information under the RTI Act 2005, where appellants/complainants do not deposit the cost of photocopying despite being notified within the stipulated 30 days period, the information must be withheld until such costs are realized from them.

4. Under the circumstances, there is no further cause for action and this Complaint Case is herewith **CLOSED**.

**Sd/-**  
**(ASIT JOLLY)**  
State Information Commissioner, Punjab.

Chandigarh  
5.10.2021