



Shri Manjit Singh
s/o Shri Sohan Singh
House No. 388/3,
Dhahdholian Road,
Patiala

....Appellant

Vs

Public Information Officer,
o/o The Deputy Commissioner,
Mini Secretariat,
Patiala & ors

....Respondents

Appeal Case(AC) No.3531 of 2019, AC No.3532 of 2019, AC No.3930 of 2019, AC No.4575 of 2019, AC No.4576 of 2019, AC No.4577 of 2019, AC No.4578 of 2019, AC No.4579 of 2019, AC No.4618 of 2019, AC No.4619 of 2019, AC No.4620 of 2019, AC No.4621 of 2019, AC No.4622 of 2019, AC No.3931 of 2019, AC No.3530 of 2019

Present:- None on behalf of the appellant.
Sh. Gagandeep Singh, Registry Clerk o/o Tehsildar, Patiala on behalf of the respondents.

ORDER

This order may be read with the previous order dated 27.2.2020 vide which the appellant was advised to visit the office of the Tehsildar, Patiala for inspection of documents and the respondents were directed to make available the record for inspection and provide the copies of documents in case of identification by the appellant.

2. Since none is present on behalf of the appellant, however, a handwritten request has been received through email in the Commission, which is taken on record, in which it has been requested for the next date due to pain of stone etc.

3. The representative of the respondents submits the copy of letter no.213/RC dated 4.6.2020, as reply in these cases, which is taken on record. He states that as per the last order of the Commission, the appellant attended the office of the Tehsildar and around 50 BAHIs comprising 25 registries in each BAHIs were placed before the appellant for inspection. He further states that after gazing the huge record, the appellant said that it is not possible for him to look into the huge record and he left the office without inspection. In addition to the above, he also states that earlier on 7.1.2020, the Commission directed the appellant to inspect the record but he did not come. He also states that again on 1.3.2020, the Commission directed the appellant to inspect the record but he left the office without inspection. Furthermore, he states that during the last hearing he brought the complete record at Chandigarh for the inspection but at that point of time, he requested the Commission to inspect the record at Patiala and now he is not inspecting the documents even the date and time was mutually agreed upon especially as convenient to the appellant. In addition to the above,

Contd..P/2

the representative of the respondents states that he is not requesting for any particular copies nor he is inspecting the record, hence the case may be disposed of as the precious time of the administration is being wasted.

2. After going through the case files and hearing the representative of the respondents, it emerges that the appellant has not inspected the record during the last hearing when the representative of the respondents brought the complete record with him at Chandigarh but opt out for inspection at Patiala. Also the appellant has not submitted any response/request/letter after the inspection when the date and time was given to both the parties with mutual understanding especially as convenient to the appellant. Accordingly, it appears before the Commission that neither the appellant wants to inspect the record nor any specific information is being sought. Hence, the cases are disposed of and closed. However, the appellant is given a liberty to inspect the record of the public authority within one month from the issue of this order after the prior intimation to the respondents and get the documents in case of identification after making the necessary payment.

(Khushwant Singh)
State Information Commissioner,
Punjab
Dated: 8.6.2020

(Mrs. Preety Chawla)
State Information Commissioner,
Punjab

(Suresh Arora)
Chief Information Commissioner,
Punjab