

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864120



Email: psic25@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: www.infocommpunjab.com

Sh. MadanLal, s/o Sh. Om Parkash,
Zone 2 H No. 10803, Street No. 18,
Guru TegBahadur Nagar, Parinda Road 18
Bathinda - 151001 (M-9872367068)

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o MC Bathinda

First Appellate Authority
O/o Commissioner MC Bathinda

Respondents

APPEAL CASE NO. 2946 of 2024

Present :- (i) Sh.Madan Lal the appellant through VC
(ii) For the respondent- Sh.Lakhvir Singh, Clerk (9023540042) in the
Commission

ORDER

The RTI application is dated 13.12.2023 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter FAA) and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 18.04.2024 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act).

2. Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for 02.06.2026 in the Commission.
3. Today the appellant Sh.Madan Lal states that no information has been given to him so far.
4. Respondent - Sh.Lakhvir Singh states that the information cannot be provided to the appellant as the same is third party information. He further states that the reply has already been sent to the appellant.
5. The perusal of the case file shows that the appellant vide RTI application dated 13.12.2023, sought certified copies of all "Nakal Forms" on which no-dues reports were issued and records relating to up-dation of UID number for the period from 01.06.2022 to 30.06.2022.



APPEAL CASE NO. 2946 of 2024

6. During the proceedings the respondent shows the proforma of the Nakal Forms for the perusal of the bench. After examining the proforma, it is observed that the information demanded by the appellant is third party information and is not confined to the appellant. The Commission finds that disclosure of the information demanded by the appellant would amount to disclosure of personal information of third parties, the disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or public interest and would cause an unwarranted invasion of the privacy of such persons. The appellant has failed to establish any larger public interest warranting disclosure of the information.

7. Reliance is placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India vs **Subhash Chandra Aggarwal, Civil Appeal No. 10044 of 2010**, wherein the scope of personal information and the protection available under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act was elaborately discussed. The Hon'ble Supreme Court held that personal information relating to third parties is exempt from disclosure unless a larger public interest justifies such disclosure.

The Commission also takes note of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Canara Bank v. C.S. Shyam, Civil Appeal No. 22 of 2009**, wherein it was held that personal information relating to third parties cannot be disclosed in the absence of any demonstrable larger public interest.

8. In view of the above and after perusal of the records produced by the respondent department, the Commission is satisfied that the information sought by the appellant is third-party information and is exempt from disclosure under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act, 2005. No larger public interest has been shown to justify its disclosure.

9. Accordingly, the action of the respondent department is upheld and no further intervention of the Commission is warranted. The appeal is hereby dismissed and disposed of accordingly. Copy of the order be sent to the parties. Sd/-

Date :02.06.2026

(Dr. Bhupinder S Batth)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864120



Email: psic25@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: www.infocommpunjab.com

Sh. MadanLal, s/o Sh. Om Parkash,
Zone 2 H No. 10803, Street No. 18,
Guru TegBahadur Nagar, Parinda Road 18
Bathinda - 151001 (M-9872367068)

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o MC Bathinda

First Appellate Authority
O/o Commissioner McBathinda

Respondents

APPEAL CASE NO. 2947 of 2024

Present :- (i) Sh.Madan Lal the appellant through VC
(ii) For the respondent- Sh.Lakhvir Singh, Clerk (9023540042) in the
Commission

ORDER

The RTI application is dated 13.12.2023 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter FAA) and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 18.04.2024 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act).

2. Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for 02.06.2026 in the Commission.
3. Today the appellant Sh.Madan Lal states that no information has been given to him so far.
4. Respondent - Sh.Lakhvir Singh states that the information cannot be provided to the appellant as the same is third party information. He further states that the reply has already been sent to the appellant.
5. The perusal of the case file shows that the appellant vide RTI application dated 13.12.2023, sought certified copies of all "Nakal Forms" on which no-dues reports were issued and records relating to up-dation of UID number for the period from 01.05.2022 to 31.05.2022.



APPEAL CASE NO. 2947 of 2024

6. During the proceedings the respondent shows the proforma of the Nakal Forms for the perusal of the bench. After examining the proforma, it is observed that the information demanded by the appellant is third party information and is not confined to the appellant. The Commission finds that disclosure of the information demanded by the appellant would amount to disclosure of personal information of third parties, the disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or public interest and would cause an unwarranted invasion of the privacy of such persons. The appellant has failed to establish any larger public interest warranting disclosure of the information.

7. Reliance is placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India vs **Subhash Chandra Aggarwal, Civil Appeal No. 10044 of 2010**, wherein the scope of personal information and the protection available under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act was elaborately discussed. The Hon'ble Supreme Court held that personal information relating to third parties is exempt from disclosure unless a larger public interest justifies such disclosure.

The Commission also takes note of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Canara Bank v. C.S. Shyam, Civil Appeal No. 22 of 2009**, wherein it was held that personal information relating to third parties cannot be disclosed in the absence of any demonstrable larger public interest.

8. In view of the above and after perusal of the records produced by the respondent department, the Commission is satisfied that the information sought by the appellant is third-party information and is exempt from disclosure under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act, 2005. No larger public interest has been shown to justify its disclosure.

9. Accordingly, the action of the respondent department is upheld and no further intervention of the Commission is warranted. The appeal is hereby dismissed and disposed of accordingly. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Sd/-

Date :02.06.2026

(Dr. Bhupinder S Batth)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864120



Email: psic25@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: www.infocommpunjab.com

Sh. MadanLal, s/o Sh. Om Parkash,
Zone 2 H No. 10803, Street No. 18,
Guru TegBahadur Nagar, Parinda Road 18
Bathinda - 151001 (M-9872367068)

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o MC Bathinda

First Appellate Authority
O/o Commissioner McBathinda

Respondents

APPEAL CASE NO. 2948 of 2024

Present :- (i) Sh.Madan Lal the appellant through VC
(ii) For the respondent- Sh.Lakhvir Singh, Clerk (9023540042) in the
Commission

ORDER

The RTI application is dated 13.12.2023 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter FAA) and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 18.04.2024 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act).

2. Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for 02.06.2026 in the Commission.

3. Today the appellant Sh.Madan Lal states that no information has been given to him so far.

4. Respondent - Sh.Lakhvir Singh states that the information cannot be provided to the appellant as the same is third party information. He further states that the reply has already been sent to the appellant.

5. The perusal of the case file shows that the appellant vide RTI application dated 13.12.2023, sought certified copies of all "Nakal Forms" on which no-dues reports were issued and records relating to up-dation of UID number for the period from 01.04.2022 to 30.04.2022.



APPEAL CASE NO. 2948 of 2024

6. During the proceedings the respondent shows the proforma of the Nakal Forms for the perusal of the bench. After examining the proforma, it is observed that the information demanded by the appellant is third party information and is not confined to the appellant. The Commission finds that disclosure of the information demanded by the appellant would amount to disclosure of personal information of third parties, the disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or public interest and would cause an unwarranted invasion of the privacy of such persons. The appellant has failed to establish any larger public interest warranting disclosure of the information.

7. Reliance is placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India vs **Subhash Chandra Aggarwal, Civil Appeal No. 10044 of 2010**, wherein the scope of personal information and the protection available under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act was elaborately discussed. The Hon'ble Supreme Court held that personal information relating to third parties is exempt from disclosure unless a larger public interest justifies such disclosure.

The Commission also takes note of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Canara Bank v. C.S. Shyam, Civil Appeal No. 22 of 2009**, wherein it was held that personal information relating to third parties cannot be disclosed in the absence of any demonstrable larger public interest.

8. In view of the above and after perusal of the records produced by the respondent department, the Commission is satisfied that the information sought by the appellant is third-party information and is exempt from disclosure under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act, 2005. No larger public interest has been shown to justify its disclosure.

9. Accordingly, the action of the respondent department is upheld and no further intervention of the Commission is warranted. The appeal is hereby dismissed and disposed of accordingly. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Sd/-

(Dr. Bhupinder S Batth)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

Date :02.06.2026

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864120



Email: psic25@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: www.infocommpunjab.com

Sh. MadanLal, s/o Sh. Om Parkash,
Zone 2 H No. 10803, Street No. 18,
Guru TegBahadur Nagar, Parinda Road 18
Bathinda - 151001 (M-9872367068)

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o MC Bathinda

First Appellate Authority
O/o Commissioner McBathinda

Respondents

APPEAL CASE NO. 2949 of 2024

Present :- (i) Sh.Madan Lal the appellant through VC
(ii) For the respondent- Sh.Lakhvir Singh, Clerk (9023540042) in the
Commission

ORDER

The RTI application is dated 15.12.2023 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter FAA) and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 18.04.2024 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act).

2. Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for 02.06.2026 in the Commission.
3. Today the appellant Sh.Madan Lal states that no information has been given to him so far.
4. Respondent - Sh.Lakhvir Singh states that the information cannot be provided to the appellant as the same is third party information. He further states that the reply has already been sent to the appellant.
5. The perusal of the case file shows that the appellant vide RTI application dated 13.12.2023, sought certified copies of all "Nakal Forms" on which no-dues reports were issued and records relating to up-dation of UID number for the period from 01.03.2022 to 31.03.2022.



APPEAL CASE NO. 2949 of 2024

6. During the proceedings the respondent shows the proforma of the Nakal Forms for the perusal of the bench. After examining the proforma , it is observed that the information demanded by the appellant is third party information and is not confined to the appellant. The Commission finds that disclosure of the information demanded by the appellant would amount to disclosure of personal information of third parties, the disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or public interest and would cause an unwarranted invasion of the privacy of such persons. The appellant has failed to establish any larger public interest warranting disclosure of the information.

7. Reliance is placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India vs **Subhash Chandra Aggarwal, Civil Appeal No. 10044 of 2010**, wherein the scope of personal information and the protection available under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act was elaborately discussed. The Hon'ble Supreme Court held that personal information relating to third parties is exempt from disclosure unless a larger public interest justifies such disclosure.

The Commission also takes note of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Canara Bank v. C.S. Shyam, Civil Appeal No. 22 of 2009** , wherein it was held that personal information relating to third parties cannot be disclosed in the absence of any demonstrable larger public interest.

8. In view of the above and after perusal of the records produced by the respondent department, the Commission is satisfied that the information sought by the appellant is third-party information and is exempt from disclosure under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act, 2005. No larger public interest has been shown to justify its disclosure.

9. Accordingly, the action of the respondent department is upheld and no further intervention of the Commission is warranted. The appeal is hereby dismissed and disposed of accordingly. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Sd/-

(Dr. Bhupinder S Batth)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

Date :02.06.2026

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864120



Email: psic25@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: www.infocommpunjab.com

Sh. MadanLal, s/o Sh. Om Parkash,
Zone 2 H No. 10803, Street No. 18,
Guru TegBahadur Nagar, Parinda Road 18
Bathinda - 151001 (M-9872367068)

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o MC Bathinda

First Appellate Authority
O/o Commissioner McBathinda

Respondents

APPEAL CASE NO. 2950 of 2024

Present :- (i) Sh.Madan Lal the appellant through VC
(ii) For the respondent- Sh.Lakhvir Singh, Clerk (9023540042) in the
Commission

ORDER

The RTI application is dated 15.12.2023 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter FAA) and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 18.04.2024 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act).

2. Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for 02.06.2026 in the Commission.
3. Today the appellant Sh.Madan Lal states that no information has been given to him so far.
4. Respondent - Sh.Lakhvir Singh states that the information cannot be provided to the appellant as the same is third party information. He further states that the reply has already been sent to the appellant.
5. The perusal of the case file shows that the appellant vide RTI application dated 13.12.2023, sought certified copies of all "Nakal Forms" on which no-dues reports were issued and records relating to up-dation of UID number for the period from 01.02.2022 to 28.02.2022.



APPEAL CASE NO. 2950 of 2024

6. During the proceedings the respondent shows the proforma of the Nakal Forms for the perusal of the bench. After examining the proforma, it is observed that the information demanded by the appellant is third party information and is not confined to the appellant. The Commission finds that disclosure of the information demanded by the appellant would amount to disclosure of personal information of third parties, the disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or public interest and would cause an unwarranted invasion of the privacy of such persons. The appellant has failed to establish any larger public interest warranting disclosure of the information.

7. Reliance is placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India vs **Subhash Chandra Aggarwal, Civil Appeal No. 10044 of 2010**, wherein the scope of personal information and the protection available under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act was elaborately discussed. The Hon'ble Supreme Court held that personal information relating to third parties is exempt from disclosure unless a larger public interest justifies such disclosure.

The Commission also takes note of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Canara Bank v. C.S. Shyam, Civil Appeal No. 22 of 2009**, wherein it was held that personal information relating to third parties cannot be disclosed in the absence of any demonstrable larger public interest.

8. In view of the above and after perusal of the records produced by the respondent department, the Commission is satisfied that the information sought by the appellant is third-party information and is exempt from disclosure under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act, 2005. No larger public interest has been shown to justify its disclosure.

9. Accordingly, the action of the respondent department is upheld and no further intervention of the Commission is warranted. The appeal is hereby dismissed and disposed of accordingly. Copy of the order be sent to the parties

Sd/-

(Dr. Bhupinder S Batth)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

Date :02.06.2026

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864120



Email: psic25@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: www.infocommpunjab.com

Sh. MadanLal, s/o Sh. Om Parkash,
Zone 2 H No. 10803, Street No. 18,
Guru TegBahadur Nagar, Parinda Road 18
Bathinda - 151001 (M-9872367068)

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o MC Bathinda

First Appellate Authority
O/o Commissioner MCBathinda

Respondents

APPEAL CASE NO. 2951 of 2024

Present :- (i) Sh.Madan Lal the appellant through VC
(ii) For the respondent- Sh.Lakhvir Singh, Clerk (9023540042) in the
Commission

ORDER

The RTI application is dated 15.12.2023 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter FAA) and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 18.04.2024 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act).

2. Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for 02.06.2026 in the Commission.

3. Today the appellant Sh.Madan Lal states that no information has been given to him so far.

4. Respondent - Sh.Lakhvir Singh states that the information cannot be provided to the appellant as the same is third party information. He further states that the reply has already been sent to the appellant.

5. The perusal of the case file shows that the appellant vide RTI application dated 13.12.2023, sought certified copies of all "Nakal Forms" on which no-dues reports were issued and records relating to up-dation of UID number for the period from 01.01.2022 to 31.01.2022.



APPEAL CASE NO. 2951 of 2024

6. During the proceedings the respondent shows the proforma of the Nakal Forms for the perusal of the bench. After examining the proforma, it is observed that the information demanded by the appellant is third party information and is not confined to the appellant. The Commission finds that disclosure of the information demanded by the appellant would amount to disclosure of personal information of third parties, the disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or public interest and would cause an unwarranted invasion of the privacy of such persons. The appellant has failed to establish any larger public interest warranting disclosure of the information.

7. Reliance is placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India vs **Subhash Chandra Aggarwal, Civil Appeal No. 10044 of 2010**, wherein the scope of personal information and the protection available under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act was elaborately discussed. The Hon'ble Supreme Court held that personal information relating to third parties is exempt from disclosure unless a larger public interest justifies such disclosure.

The Commission also takes note of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Canara Bank v. C.S. Shyam, Civil Appeal No. 22 of 2009**, wherein it was held that personal information relating to third parties cannot be disclosed in the absence of any demonstrable larger public interest.

8. In view of the above and after perusal of the records produced by the respondent department, the Commission is satisfied that the information sought by the appellant is third-party information and is exempt from disclosure under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act, 2005. No larger public interest has been shown to justify its disclosure.

9. Accordingly, the action of the respondent department is upheld and no further intervention of the Commission is warranted. The appeal is hereby dismissed and disposed of accordingly. Copy of the order be sent to the parties

Sd/-

(Dr. Bhupinder S Batth)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

Date :02.06.2026

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864120



Email: psic25@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: www.infocommpunjab.com

Sh. MadanLal, s/o Sh. Om Parkash,
Zone 2 H No. 10803, Street No. 18,
Guru TegBahadur Nagar, Parinda Road 18
Bathinda - 151001 (M-9872367068)

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o MC Bathinda

First Appellate Authority
O/o Commissioner MCBathinda

Respondents

APPEAL CASE NO. 2952 of 2024

Present :- (i) Sh.Madan Lal the appellant through VC
(ii) For the respondent- Sh.Lakhvir Singh, Clerk (9023540042) in the
Commission

ORDER

The RTI application is dated 15.12.2023 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter FAA) and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 18.04.2024 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act).

2. Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for 02.06.2026 in the Commission.
3. Today the appellant Sh.Madan Lal states that no information has been given to him so far.
4. Respondent - Sh.Lakhvir Singh states that the information cannot be provided to the appellant as the same is third party information. He further states that the reply has already been sent to the appellant.
5. The perusal of the case file shows that the appellant vide RTI application dated 13.12.2023, sought certified copies of all "Nakal Forms" on which no-dues reports were issued and records relating to up-dation of UID number for the period from 01.12.2021 to 31.12.2021.



APPEAL CASE NO. 2952 of 2024

6. During the proceedings the respondent shows the proforma of the Nakal Forms for the perusal of the bench. After examining the proforma, it is observed that the information demanded by the appellant is third party information and is not confined to the appellant. The Commission finds that disclosure of the information demanded by the appellant would amount to disclosure of personal information of third parties, the disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or public interest and would cause an unwarranted invasion of the privacy of such persons. The appellant has failed to establish any larger public interest warranting disclosure of the information.

7. Reliance is placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India vs **Subhash Chandra Aggarwal, Civil Appeal No. 10044 of 2010**, wherein the scope of personal information and the protection available under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act was elaborately discussed. The Hon'ble Supreme Court held that personal information relating to third parties is exempt from disclosure unless a larger public interest justifies such disclosure.

The Commission also takes note of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Canara Bank v. C.S. Shyam, Civil Appeal No. 22 of 2009**, wherein it was held that personal information relating to third parties cannot be disclosed in the absence of any demonstrable larger public interest.

8. In view of the above and after perusal of the records produced by the respondent department, the Commission is satisfied that the information sought by the appellant is third-party information and is exempt from disclosure under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act, 2005. No larger public interest has been shown to justify its disclosure.

9. Accordingly, the action of the respondent department is upheld and no further intervention of the Commission is warranted. The appeal is hereby dismissed and disposed of accordingly. Copy of the order be sent to the parties

Sd/-

(Dr. Bhupinder S Batth)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

Date :02.06.2026

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864120



Email: psic25@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: www.infocommpunjab.com

Sh. MadanLal, s/o Sh. Om Parkash,
Zone 2 H No. 10803, Street No. 18,
Guru TegBahadur Nagar, Parinda Road 18
Bathinda - 151001 (M-9872367068)

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o MC Bathinda

First Appellate Authority
O/o Commissioner MCBathinda

Respondents

APPEAL CASE NO. 2953 of 2024

Present :- (i) Sh.Madan Lal the appellant through VC
(ii) For the respondent- Sh.Lakhvir Singh, Clerk (9023540042) in the
Commission

ORDER

The RTI application is dated 18.12.2023 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter FAA) and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 18.12.2024 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act).

2. Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for 02.06.2026 in the Commission.
3. Today the appellant Sh.Madan Lal states that no information has been given to him so far.
4. Respondent - Sh.Lakhvir Singh states that the information cannot be provided to the appellant as the same is third party information. He further states that the reply has already been sent to the appellant.
5. The perusal of the case file shows that the appellant vide RTI application dated 13.12.2023, sought certified copies of all "Nakal Forms" on which no-dues reports were issued and records relating to up-dation of UID number for the period from 01.08.2021 to 31.08.2021.



APPEAL CASE NO. 2953 of 2024

6. During the proceedings the respondent shows the proforma of the Nakal Forms for the perusal of the bench. After examining the proforma, it is observed that the information demanded by the appellant is third party information and is not confined to the appellant. The Commission finds that disclosure of the information demanded by the appellant would amount to disclosure of personal information of third parties, the disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or public interest and would cause an unwarranted invasion of the privacy of such persons. The appellant has failed to establish any larger public interest warranting disclosure of the information.

7. Reliance is placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India vs **Subhash Chandra Aggarwal, Civil Appeal No. 10044 of 2010**, wherein the scope of personal information and the protection available under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act was elaborately discussed. The Hon'ble Supreme Court held that personal information relating to third parties is exempt from disclosure unless a larger public interest justifies such disclosure.

The Commission also takes note of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Canara Bank v. C.S. Shyam, Civil Appeal No. 22 of 2009**, wherein it was held that personal information relating to third parties cannot be disclosed in the absence of any demonstrable larger public interest.

8. In view of the above and after perusal of the records produced by the respondent department, the Commission is satisfied that the information sought by the appellant is third-party information and is exempt from disclosure under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act, 2005. No larger public interest has been shown to justify its disclosure.

9. Accordingly, the action of the respondent department is upheld and no further intervention of the Commission is warranted. The appeal is hereby dismissed and disposed of accordingly. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Sd/-

(Dr. Bhupinder S Batth)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

Date :02.06.2026

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864120



Email: psic25@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: www.infocommpunjab.com

Sh. MadanLal, s/o Sh. Om Parkash,
Zone 2 H No. 10803, Street No. 18,
Guru TegBahadur Nagar, Parinda Road 18
Bathinda - 151001 (M-9872367068)

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o MC Bathinda

First Appellate Authority
O/o Commissioner MCBathinda

Respondents

APPEAL CASE NO. 2954 of 2024

Present :- (i) Sh.Madan Lal the appellant through VC
(ii) For the respondent- Sh.Lakhvir Singh, Clerk (9023540042) in the
Commission

ORDER

The RTI application is dated 18.12.2023 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter FAA) and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 18.04.2024 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act).

2. Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for 02.06.2026 in the Commission.
3. Today the appellant Sh.Madan Lal states that no information has been given to him so far.
4. Respondent - Sh.Lakhvir Singh states that the information cannot be provided to the appellant as the same is third party information. He further states that the reply has already been sent to the appellant.
5. The perusal of the case file shows that the appellant vide RTI application dated 13.12.2023, sought certified copies of all "Nakal Forms" on which no-dues reports were issued and records relating to up-dation of UID number for the period from 01.09.2021 to 30.09.2021.



APPEAL CASE NO. 2954 of 2024

6. During the proceedings the respondent shows the proforma of the Nakal Forms for the perusal of the bench. After examining the proforma , it is observed that the information demanded by the appellant is third party information and is not confined to the appellant. The Commission finds that disclosure of the information demanded by the appellant would amount to disclosure of personal information of third parties, the disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or public interest and would cause an unwarranted invasion of the privacy of such persons. The appellant has failed to establish any larger public interest warranting disclosure of the information.

7. Reliance is placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India vs **Subhash Chandra Aggarwal, Civil Appeal No. 10044 of 2010**, wherein the scope of personal information and the protection available under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act was elaborately discussed. The Hon'ble Supreme Court held that personal information relating to third parties is exempt from disclosure unless a larger public interest justifies such disclosure.

The Commission also takes note of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Canara Bank v. C.S. Shyam, Civil Appeal No. 22 of 2009** , wherein it was held that personal information relating to third parties cannot be disclosed in the absence of any demonstrable larger public interest.

8. In view of the above and after perusal of the records produced by the respondent department, the Commission is satisfied that the information sought by the appellant is third-party information and is exempt from disclosure under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act, 2005. No larger public interest has been shown to justify its disclosure.

9. Accordingly, the action of the respondent department is upheld and no further intervention of the Commission is warranted. The appeal is hereby dismissed and disposed of accordingly. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Sd/-

(Dr. Bhupinder S Batth)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

Date :02.06.2026

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864120



Email: psic25@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: www.infocommpunjab.com

Sh. MadanLal, s/o Sh. Om Parkash,
Zone 2 H No. 10803, Street No. 18,
Guru TegBahadur Nagar, Parinda Road 18
Bathinda - 151001 (M-9872367068)

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o MC Bathinda

First Appellate Authority
O/o Commissioner MCBathinda

Respondents

APPEAL CASE NO. 2955 of 2024

Present :- (i) Sh.Madan Lal the appellant through VC
(ii) For the respondent- Sh.Lakhvir Singh, Clerk (9023540042) in the
Commission

ORDER

The RTI application is dated 13.12.2023 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter FAA) and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 18.04.2024 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act).

2. Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for 02.06.2026 in the Commission.
3. Today the appellant Sh.Madan Lal states that no information has been given to him so far.
4. Respondent - Sh.Lakhvir Singh states that the information cannot be provided to the appellant as the same is third party information. He further states that the reply has already been sent to the appellant.
5. The perusal of the case file shows that the appellant vide RTI application dated 13.12.2023, sought certified copies of all "Nakal Forms" on which no-dues reports were issued and records relating to up-dation of UID number for the period from 01.10.2021 to 31.10.2021.



APPEAL CASE NO. 2955 of 2024

6. During the proceedings the respondent shows the proforma of the Nakal Forms for the perusal of the bench. After examining the proforma, it is observed that the information demanded by the appellant is third party information and is not confined to the appellant. The Commission finds that disclosure of the information demanded by the appellant would amount to disclosure of personal information of third parties, the disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or public interest and would cause an unwarranted invasion of the privacy of such persons. The appellant has failed to establish any larger public interest warranting disclosure of the information.

7. Reliance is placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India vs **Subhash Chandra Aggarwal, Civil Appeal No. 10044 of 2010**, wherein the scope of personal information and the protection available under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act was elaborately discussed. The Hon'ble Supreme Court held that personal information relating to third parties is exempt from disclosure unless a larger public interest justifies such disclosure.

The Commission also takes note of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Canara Bank v. C.S. Shyam, Civil Appeal No. 22 of 2009**, wherein it was held that personal information relating to third parties cannot be disclosed in the absence of any demonstrable larger public interest.

8. In view of the above and after perusal of the records produced by the respondent department, the Commission is satisfied that the information sought by the appellant is third-party information and is exempt from disclosure under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act, 2005. No larger public interest has been shown to justify its disclosure.

9. Accordingly, the action of the respondent department is upheld and no further intervention of the Commission is warranted. The appeal is hereby dismissed and disposed of accordingly. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Sd/-

(Dr. Bhupinder S Batth)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

Date :02.06.2026

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864120



Email: psic25@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: www.infocommpunjab.com

Sh. MadanLal, s/o Sh. Om Parkash,
Zone 2 H No. 10803, Street No. 18,
Guru TegBahadur Nagar, Parinda Road 18
Bathinda - 151001 (M-9872367068)

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o MC Bathinda

First Appellate Authority
O/o Commissioner MCBathinda

Respondents

APPEAL CASE NO. 2956 of 2024

Present :- (i) Sh.Madan Lal the appellant through VC
(ii) For the respondent- Sh.Lakhvir Singh, Clerk (9023540042) in the
Commission

ORDER

The RTI application is dated 18.12.2023 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter FAA) and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 18.04.2024 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act).

2. Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for 02.06.2026 in the Commission.

3. Today the appellant Sh.Madan Lal states that no information has been given to him so far.

4. Respondent - Sh.Lakhvir Singh states that the information cannot be provided to the appellant as the same is third party information. He further states that the reply has already been sent to the appellant.

5. The perusal of the case file shows that the appellant vide RTI application dated 13.12.2023, sought certified copies of all "Nakal Forms" on which no-dues reports were issued and records relating to up-dation of UID number for the period from 01.11.2021 to 30.11.2021.



APPEAL CASE NO. 2956 of 2024

6. During the proceedings the respondent shows the proforma of the Nakal Forms for the perusal of the bench. After examining the proforma, it is observed that the information demanded by the appellant is third party information and is not confined to the appellant. The Commission finds that disclosure of the information demanded by the appellant would amount to disclosure of personal information of third parties, the disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or public interest and would cause an unwarranted invasion of the privacy of such persons. The appellant has failed to establish any larger public interest warranting disclosure of the information.

7. Reliance is placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India vs **Subhash Chandra Aggarwal, Civil Appeal No. 10044 of 2010**, wherein the scope of personal information and the protection available under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act was elaborately discussed. The Hon'ble Supreme Court held that personal information relating to third parties is exempt from disclosure unless a larger public interest justifies such disclosure.

The Commission also takes note of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Canara Bank v. C.S. Shyam, Civil Appeal No. 22 of 2009**, wherein it was held that personal information relating to third parties cannot be disclosed in the absence of any demonstrable larger public interest.

8. In view of the above and after perusal of the records produced by the respondent department, the Commission is satisfied that the information sought by the appellant is third-party information and is exempt from disclosure under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act, 2005. No larger public interest has been shown to justify its disclosure.

9. Accordingly, the action of the respondent department is upheld and no further intervention of the Commission is warranted. The appeal is hereby dismissed and disposed of accordingly. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Sd/-

(Dr. Bhupinder S Batth)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

Date :02.06.2026

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864120



Email: psic25@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: www.infocommpunjab.com

Sh. MadanLal, s/o Sh. Om Parkash,
Zone 2 H No. 10803, Street No. 18,
Guru TegBahadur Nagar, Parinda Road 18
Bathinda - 151001 (M-9872367068)

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o MC Bathinda

First Appellate Authority
O/o Commissioner MCBathinda

Respondents

APPEAL CASE NO. 2957 of 2024

Present :- (i) Sh.Madan Lal the appellant through VC
(ii) For the respondent- Sh.Lakhvir Singh, Clerk (9023540042) in the
Commission

ORDER

The RTI application is dated 19.12.2023 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter FAA) and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 18.04.2024 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act).

2. Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for 02.06.2026 in the Commission.
3. Today the appellant Sh.Madan Lal states that no information has been given to him so far.
4. Respondent - Sh.Lakhvir Singh states that the information cannot be provided to the appellant as the same is third party information. He further states that the reply has already been sent to the appellant.
5. The perusal of the case file shows that the appellant vide RTI application dated 13.12.2023, sought certified copies of all "Nakal Forms" on which no-dues reports were issued and records relating to up-dation of UID number for the period from 01.07.2021 to 31.07.2021.



APPEAL CASE NO. 2946 of 2024

6. During the proceedings the respondent shows the proforma of the Nakal Forms for the perusal of the bench. After examining the proforma, it is observed that the information demanded by the appellant is third party information and is not confined to the appellant. The Commission finds that disclosure of the information demanded by the appellant would amount to disclosure of personal information of third parties, the disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or public interest and would cause an unwarranted invasion of the privacy of such persons. The appellant has failed to establish any larger public interest warranting disclosure of the information.

7. Reliance is placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India vs **Subhash Chandra Aggarwal, Civil Appeal No. 10044 of 2010**, wherein the scope of personal information and the protection available under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act was elaborately discussed. The Hon'ble Supreme Court held that personal information relating to third parties is exempt from disclosure unless a larger public interest justifies such disclosure.

The Commission also takes note of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Canara Bank v. C.S. Shyam, Civil Appeal No. 22 of 2009**, wherein it was held that personal information relating to third parties cannot be disclosed in the absence of any demonstrable larger public interest.

8. In view of the above and after perusal of the records produced by the respondent department, the Commission is satisfied that the information sought by the appellant is third-party information and is exempt from disclosure under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act, 2005. No larger public interest has been shown to justify its disclosure.

9. Accordingly, the action of the respondent department is upheld and no further intervention of the Commission is warranted. The appeal is hereby dismissed and disposed of accordingly. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Sd/-

(Dr. Bhupinder S Batth)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

Date :02.06.2026

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864120



Email: psic25@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: www.infocommpunjab.com

Sh. MadanLal, s/o Sh. Om Parkash,
Zone 2 H No. 10803, Street No. 18,
Guru TegBahadur Nagar, Parinda Road 18
Bathinda - 151001 (M-9872367068)

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o MC Bathinda

First Appellate Authority
O/o Commissioner MCBathinda

Respondents

APPEAL CASE NO. 2958 of 2024

Present :- (i) Sh.Madan Lal the appellant through VC
(ii) For the respondent- Sh.Lakhvir Singh, Clerk (9023540042) in the
Commission

ORDER

The RTI application is dated 19.12.2023 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter FAA) and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 18.04.2024 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act).

2. Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for 02.06.2026 in the Commission.
3. Today the appellant Sh.Madan Lal states that no information has been given to him so far.
4. Respondent - Sh.Lakhvir Singh states that the information cannot be provided to the appellant as the same is third party information. He further states that the reply has already been sent to the appellant.
5. The perusal of the case file shows that the appellant vide RTI application dated 13.12.2023, sought certified copies of all "Nakal Forms" on which no-dues reports were issued and records relating to up-dation of UID number for the period from 01.06.2021 to 30.06.2021.



APPEAL CASE NO. 2958 of 2024

6. During the proceedings the respondent shows the proforma of the Nakal Forms for the perusal of the bench. After examining the proforma , it is observed that the information demanded by the appellant is third party information and is not confined to the appellant. The Commission finds that disclosure of the information demanded by the appellant would amount to disclosure of personal information of third parties, the disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or public interest and would cause an unwarranted invasion of the privacy of such persons. The appellant has failed to establish any larger public interest warranting disclosure of the information.

7. Reliance is placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India vs **Subhash Chandra Aggarwal, Civil Appeal No. 10044 of 2010**, wherein the scope of personal information and the protection available under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act was elaborately discussed. The Hon'ble Supreme Court held that personal information relating to third parties is exempt from disclosure unless a larger public interest justifies such disclosure.

The Commission also takes note of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Canara Bank v. C.S. Shyam, Civil Appeal No. 22 of 2009** , wherein it was held that personal information relating to third parties cannot be disclosed in the absence of any demonstrable larger public interest.

8. In view of the above and after perusal of the records produced by the respondent department, the Commission is satisfied that the information sought by the appellant is third-party information and is exempt from disclosure under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act, 2005. No larger public interest has been shown to justify its disclosure.

9. Accordingly, the action of the respondent department is upheld and no further intervention of the Commission is warranted. The appeal is hereby dismissed and disposed of accordingly. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Sd/-

(Dr. Bhupinder S Batth)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

Date :02.06.2026

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864120



Email: psic25@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: www.infocommpunjab.com

Sh. MadanLal, s/o Sh. Om Parkash,
Zone 2 H No. 10803, Street No. 18,
Guru TegBahadur Nagar, Parinda Road 18
Bathinda - 151001 (M-9872367068)

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o MC Bathinda

First Appellate Authority
O/o Commissioner MCBathinda

Respondents

APPEAL CASE NO. 2959 of 2024

Present :- (i) Sh.Madan Lal the appellant through VC
(ii) For the respondent- Sh.Lakhvir Singh, Clerk (9023540042) in the
Commission

ORDER

The RTI application is dated 19.12.2023 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter FAA) and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 18.04.2024 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act).

2. Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for 02.06.2026 in the Commission.

3. Today the appellant Sh.Madan Lal states that no information has been given to him so far.

4. Respondent - Sh.Lakhvir Singh states that the information cannot be provided to the appellant as the same is third party information. He further states that the reply has already been sent to the appellant.

5. The perusal of the case file shows that the appellant vide RTI application dated 13.12.2023, sought certified copies of all "Nakal Forms" on which no-dues reports were issued and records relating to up-dation of UID number for the period from 01.05.2021 to 31.05.2021.



APPEAL CASE NO. 2959 of 2024

6. During the proceedings the respondent shows the proforma of the Nakal Forms for the perusal of the bench. After examining the proforma, it is observed that the information demanded by the appellant is third party information and is not confined to the appellant. The Commission finds that disclosure of the information demanded by the appellant would amount to disclosure of personal information of third parties, the disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or public interest and would cause an unwarranted invasion of the privacy of such persons. The appellant has failed to establish any larger public interest warranting disclosure of the information.

7. Reliance is placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India vs **Subhash Chandra Aggarwal, Civil Appeal No. 10044 of 2010**, wherein the scope of personal information and the protection available under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act was elaborately discussed. The Hon'ble Supreme Court held that personal information relating to third parties is exempt from disclosure unless a larger public interest justifies such disclosure.

The Commission also takes note of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Canara Bank v. C.S. Shyam, Civil Appeal No. 22 of 2009**, wherein it was held that personal information relating to third parties cannot be disclosed in the absence of any demonstrable larger public interest.

8. In view of the above and after perusal of the records produced by the respondent department, the Commission is satisfied that the information sought by the appellant is third-party information and is exempt from disclosure under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act, 2005. No larger public interest has been shown to justify its disclosure.

9. Accordingly, the action of the respondent department is upheld and no further intervention of the Commission is warranted. The appeal is hereby dismissed and disposed of accordingly. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Sd/-

(Dr. Bhupinder S Batth)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

Date :02.06.2026

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,

Sector 16, Chandigarh.

Ph: 0172-2864120

Email: psic25@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: www.infocommpunjab.com



Sh. MadanLal, s/o Sh. Om Parkash,
Zone 2 H No. 10803, Street No. 18,
Guru TegBahadur Nagar, Parinda Road 18
Bathinda - 151001 (M-9872367068)

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o MC Bathinda

First Appellate Authority
O/o Commissioner MCBathinda

Respondents

APPEAL CASE NO. 2960 of 2024

Present :- (i) Sh.Madan Lal the appellant through VC
(ii) For the respondent- Sh.Lakhvir Singh, Clerk (9023540042) in the
Commission

ORDER

The RTI application is dated 19.12.2023 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter FAA) and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 18.04.2024 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act).

2. Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for 02.06.2026 in the Commission.
3. Today the appellant Sh.Madan Lal states that no information has been given to him so far.
4. Respondent - Sh.Lakhvir Singh states that the information cannot be provided to the appellant as the same is third party information. He further states that the reply has already been sent to the appellant.
5. The perusal of the case file shows that the appellant vide RTI application dated 13.12.2023, sought certified copies of all "Nakal Forms" on which no-dues reports 01.04.2021 to 30.04.2021.



APPEAL CASE NO. 2960 of 2024

6. During the proceedings the respondent shows the proforma of the Nakal Forms for the perusal of the bench. After examining the proforma, it is observed that the information demanded by the appellant is third party information and is not confined to the appellant. The Commission finds that disclosure of the information demanded by the appellant would amount to disclosure of personal information of third parties, the disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or public interest and would cause an unwarranted invasion of the privacy of such persons. The appellant has failed to establish any larger public interest warranting disclosure of the information.

7. Reliance is placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India vs **Subhash Chandra Aggarwal, Civil Appeal No. 10044 of 2010**, wherein the scope of personal information and the protection available under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act was elaborately discussed. The Hon'ble Supreme Court held that personal information relating to third parties is exempt from disclosure unless a larger public interest justifies such disclosure.

The Commission also takes note of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Canara Bank v. C.S. Shyam, Civil Appeal No. 22 of 2009**, wherein it was held that personal information relating to third parties cannot be disclosed in the absence of any demonstrable larger public interest.

8. In view of the above and after perusal of the records produced by the respondent department, the Commission is satisfied that the information sought by the appellant is third-party information and is exempt from disclosure under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act, 2005. No larger public interest has been shown to justify its disclosure.

9. Accordingly, the action of the respondent department is upheld and no further intervention of the Commission is warranted. The appeal is hereby dismissed and disposed of accordingly. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Sd/-

(Dr. Bhupinder S Batth)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

Date :02.06.2026

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864120



Email: psic25@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: www.infocommpunjab.com

Sh. MadanLal, s/o Sh. Om Parkash,
Zone 2 H No. 10803, Street No. 18,
Guru TegBahadur Nagar, Parinda Road 18
Bathinda - 151001 (M-9872367068)

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o MC Bathinda

First Appellate Authority
O/o Commissioner MCBathinda

Respondents

APPEAL CASE NO. 2972 of 2024

Present :- (i) Sh.Madan Lal the appellant through VC
(ii) For the respondent- Sh.Lakhvir Singh, Clerk (9023540042) in the
Commission

ORDER

The RTI application is dated 29.12.2023 vide which the appellant has sought information as enumerated in his RTI application. First appeal was filed with the First Appellate Authority (hereinafter FAA) and second appeal was filed in the Commission on 19.04.2024 under Section 19 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter RTI Act).

2. Notice of hearing was issued to the parties for 02.06.2026 in the Commission.
3. Today the appellant Sh.Madan Lal states that no information has been given to him so far.
4. Respondent - Sh.Lakhvir Singh states that the information cannot be provided to the appellant as the same is third party information. He further states that the reply has already been sent to the appellant.
5. The perusal of the case file shows that the appellant vide RTI application dated 13.12.2023, sought certified copies of all "Nakal Forms" on which no-dues reports were issued and records relating to up-dation of UID number for the period from 01.12.2023 to 29.12.2023.



APPEAL CASE NO. 2972 of 2024

6. During the proceedings the respondent shows the proforma of the Nakal Forms for the perusal of the bench. After examining the proforma, it is observed that the information demanded by the appellant is third party information and is not confined to the appellant. The Commission finds that disclosure of the information demanded by the appellant would amount to disclosure of personal information of third parties, the disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or public interest and would cause an unwarranted invasion of the privacy of such persons. The appellant has failed to establish any larger public interest warranting disclosure of the information.

7. Reliance is placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India vs **Subhash Chandra Aggarwal, Civil Appeal No. 10044 of 2010**, wherein the scope of personal information and the protection available under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act was elaborately discussed. The Hon'ble Supreme Court held that personal information relating to third parties is exempt from disclosure unless a larger public interest justifies such disclosure.

The Commission also takes note of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Canara Bank v. C.S. Shyam, Civil Appeal No. 22 of 2009**, wherein it was held that personal information relating to third parties cannot be disclosed in the absence of any demonstrable larger public interest.

8. In view of the above and after perusal of the records produced by the respondent department, the Commission is satisfied that the information sought by the appellant is third-party information and is exempt from disclosure under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act, 2005. No larger public interest has been shown to justify its disclosure.

9. Accordingly, the action of the respondent department is upheld and no further intervention of the Commission is warranted. The appeal is hereby dismissed and disposed of accordingly. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Sd/-

(Dr. Bhupinder S Batth)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

Date :02.06.2026

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864120



Email: psic25@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: www.infocommpunjab.com

Sh.Bittu, Guru Nanak Nagar
Village Bholapur, PO Ramgarh,
Chandigarh road, Distt.Ludhiana - 141123

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Secretary, Regional Transport Authority,
Bathinda

First Appellate Authority
O/o Secretary, Regional Transport Authority,
Bathinda

Respondents

APPEAL CASE NO. 622 of 2024

Present :- (i) None for the appellant

(ii) For the respondent- Sh.Gurtej Singh, PIO (9915616771) and Sh.Kulveer Singh, ATO (8054903939)

ORDER

This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 23.04.2026, passed by the Commission.

2. Today the appellant is not present. He has not informed the Commission about his absence for today's hearing. Respondent states that the reply has already been sent to the appellant. He further states that he has also brought copy of the reply today in the Commission. The same is taken on record.

3. The perusal of the case file shows that the appellant, despite service of repeated notices and grant of sufficient opportunities, has failed to appear personally in any of the said hearings and no submissions have been received from him. The appellant's continued silence and failure to participate indicates a lack of interest in prosecuting this case.

4. Keeping in view the above prevailing circumstances, the Commission is of the view that no further action is required to be taken in this case. As such, the present case is **disposed of and closed. Copy of the , reply as submitted by the respondent be sent to the respondent alongwith these orders.** Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Sd/-

(Dr. Bhupinder S Batth)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

Date :02.06.2026

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864120



Email: psic25@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: www.infocommpunjab.com

Sh.Bittu, Guru Nanak Nagar
Village Bholapur, PO Ramgarh,
Chandigarh road, Distt.Ludhiana - 141123

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Secretary, Regional Transport Authority,
Jalandhar

First Appellate Authority
O/o Secretary, Regional Transport Authority,
Jalandhar

Respondents

APPEAL CASE NO. 621 of 2024

Present :- None for the parties.

ORDER

This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 23.04.2026, passed by the Commission.

2. Today neither the appellant nor the respondent is present. The appellant has not informed the Commission about his absence for today's hearing. Respondent has sent his reply through email vide dated 02.06.2026. The same is taken on record.

3. The perusal of the case file shows that the appellant, despite service of repeated notices and grant of sufficient opportunities, has failed to appear personally in any of the said hearings and no submissions have been received from him. The appellant's continued silence and failure to participate indicates a lack of interest in prosecuting this case.

4. Keeping in view the above prevailing circumstances, the Commission is of the view that no further action is required to be taken in this case. As such, the present case is **disposed of and closed. Copy of the , reply as sent by the respondent be sent to the respondent alongwith these orders.** Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Sd/-

(Dr. Bhupinder S Batth)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

Date :02.06.2026

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION
Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,
Sector 16, Chandigarh.
Ph: 0172-2864120



Email: psic25@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: www.infocommpunjab.com

Sh.Bittu, Guru Nanak Nagar
Village Bholapur, PO Ramgarh,
Chandigarh road, Distt.Ludhiana - 141123

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o Secretary, Regional Transport Authority,
Ludhiana

First Appellate Authority
O/o Secretary, Regional Transport Authority,
Ludhiana

Respondents

APPEAL CASE NO. 624 of 2024

Present :- None for the parties.

ORDER

This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 23.04.2026, passed by the Commission.

2. Today neither the appellant nor the respondent is present. The appellant has not informed the Commission about his absence for today's hearing. Respondent has sent his reply through email vide dated 02.06.2026. The same is taken on record.

3. The perusal of the case file shows that the appellant, despite service of repeated notices and grant of sufficient opportunities, has failed to appear personally in any of the said hearings and no submissions have been received from him. The appellant's continued silence and failure to participate indicates a lack of interest in prosecuting this case.

4. Keeping in view the above prevailing circumstances, the Commission is of the view that no further action is required to be taken in this case. As such, the present case is **disposed of and closed. Copy of the , reply as sent by the respondent be sent to the respondent alongwith these orders.** Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Sd/-

(Dr. Bhupinder S Batth)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

Date :02.06.2026



Email: psic25@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: www.infocommpunjab.com

Ms. Neetu Rani, S/o Sh. Ashwani Kumar,
19059, Street No. 13, Near Dhillon
GYM BibiWala Road, GTB Nagar,
Tehsil and Distt. Bathinda- 151001
(RTI application no. 63313)

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,
O/o DC, Bathinda

First Appellate Authority
O/o DC, Bathinda

Respondents

APPEAL CASE NO. 4717 of 2023

Present :- (i) Sh Ashutosh Bansal, on behalf of the appellant
(ii) For the respondent: None

ORDER

This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 21.04.2026 passed by the Commission.

2. Sh Ashutosh Bansal is appearing on behalf of the appellant without authority letter. He states that the complete information has not been provided by the respondent.
3. The respondent is not present today. However, he has filed the copy of the information sent to the appellant through e-mail.
4. The perusal of the case file shows that the appellant through her RTI application has sought the following information-

CITIZEN RTI REQUEST:

ਇਕ ਅਤਿ ਬ੍ਰਿਧ ਵਿਧਵਾ ਔਰਤ ਉਮਰ 82 ਸਾਲ ਦੇ ਆਪਣੇ ਨਾਮ ਦੇ ਇਕ ਅਰਬਨ ਏਰੀਆ ਦੇ ਪੁਰਾਣੇ ਪੁਸ਼ਤੋਨੀ ਮਕਾਨ ਦੇ ਮਿਊਂਸਿਪਲ ਕਮੇਟੀ ਤੋਂ ਪਹਿਲਾਂ ਤੋਂ ਪਾਸ ਪੁਰਾਣੇ ਨਕਸ਼ੇ ਦੇ ਆਧਾਰ ਤੇ ਉਸੇ ਮਕਾਨ ਦਾ ਪੁਨਰ ਨਵੀਨੀਕਰਨ ਦੀ ਪ੍ਰਕਿਰਿਆ ਦੱਸੀ ਜਾਵੇ ਇਕ ਅਤਿ ਬ੍ਰਿਧ ਵਿਧਵਾ ਔਰਤ ਉਮਰ 82 ਸਾਲ ਲਈ ਆਪਣੇ ਨਾਮ ਦੇ ਪੁਰਾਣੇ ਪੁਸ਼ਤੋਨੀ ਮਕਾਨ ਨੂੰ ਪਹਿਲਾਂ ਤੋਂ ਮਿਊਂਸਿਪਲ ਕਮੇਟੀ ਤੋਂ ਪਾਸ ਪੁਰਾਣੇ ਨਕਸ਼ੇ ਦੇ ਆਧਾਰ ਤੇ ਪੁਨਰ ਨਵੀਨੀਕਰਨ ਕਰਨ ਤੇ ਮਿਲਣ ਵਾਲਿਆਂ ਸਰਕਾਰੀ ਫੋਟੋ ਦੱਸਿਆ ਜਾਵੇ ਇਕ ਅਤਿ ਬ੍ਰਿਧ ਵਿਧਵਾ ਔਰਤ ਉਮਰ 82 ਸਾਲ ਆਪਣੇ ਨਾਮ ਦੇ ਪੁਰਾਣੇ ਪੁਸ਼ਤੋਨੀ ਮਕਾਨ ਨੂੰ ਪਹਿਲਾਂ ਤੋਂ ਮਿਊਂਸਿਪਲ ਕਮੇਟੀ ਤੋਂ ਪਾਸ ਪੁਰਾਣੇ ਨਕਸ਼ੇ ਦੇ ਆਧਾਰ ਤੇ ਜਿਸ ਪੁਰਾਣੇ ਪੁਸ਼ਤੋਨੀ ਮਕਾਨ ਦੀਆਂ ਪੁਰਾਣੀਆਂ ਛੋਟਾਂ ਫਰਸ਼ ਦੇ ਲੇਬਲ ਜੋ ਕਿ ਮਿਊਂਸਿਪਲ ਕਾਰਪੋਰੇਸ਼ਨ ਦੇ ਬਾਰ ਬਾਰ ਗਲੀ ਸੜਕ ਦਾ ਲੇਬਲ ਉੱਚਾ ਕਰਨ ਕਰਕੇ ਹੁਣ ਗਲੀ ਸੜਕ ਦੇ ਲੈਵਲ ਤੋਂ ਨੀਵੇਂ ਹੋ ਗਏ ਹੋਣ ਤੇ ਉਸ ਔਰਤ ਲਈ ਛੋਟਾਂ ਫਰਸ਼ ਉੱਚਾ ਚੁੱਕਣ ਦੀ ਪ੍ਰਕਿਰਿਆ ਦੱਸੀ ਜਾਵੇ ਨਗਰ ਨਿਗਮ ਬਠਿੰਡਾ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਇੱਕ ਸਾਲ ਵਿੱਚ ਆਮ ਜਨਤਾ ਨੂੰ ਘਰੇਲੂ ਪਾਣੀ ਅਤੇ ਸੈਂਟਰੇਜ਼ ਦਾ ਬਿੱਲ ਜਾਰੀ ਕਰਨ ਦੀ ਮਿਸ਼ਨ ਸਮਾਂ ਪੀਰੀਅਡ ਬਾਰੇ ਦੱਸਿਆ ਜਾਵੇ ਅਤੇ ਇਸ ਬਿੱਲ ਉੱਤੇ ਨਗਰ ਨਿਗਮ ਬਠਿੰਡਾ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਇਸ ਦੇ ਮਾਸਿਕ ਖਰਚਿਆਂ ਬਿਲ ਵਿੱਚ ਸਾਲਾਨਾ ਵਾਧੇ ਦਾ ਪ੍ਰਤੀਸ਼ਤ ਸਲੈਬ ਵਧਾਉਣ ਦੀ ਪ੍ਰਕਿਰਿਆ ਬਾਰੇ ਦੱਸਿਆ ਜਾਵੇ ਇਮਪਰੋਵਮੈਂਟ ਟਰੱਸਟ ਬਠਿੰਡਾ ਦਵਾਰਾ ਕੀਤੀ ਗਈ ਪੂਰੀ ਤਰ੍ਹਾਂ ਰਿਹਾਇਸ਼ੀ ਵੀਰ ਕਾਲੋਨੀ ਬਠਿੰਡਾ ਵਿਖੇ ਕਿਸੇ ਵੀ ਮਕਾਨ ਨੂੰ ਕਮਰਸ਼ੀਅਲ ਦੁਕਾਨ ਯਾ ਹਸਪਤਾਲ ਵਿਚ ਤਬਦੀਲ ਕਰਨ ਦੀ ਪ੍ਰਕਿਰਿਆ Scanned by Camera Scanner

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,

Sector 16, Chandigarh.

Ph: 0172-2864120

Email: psic25@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: www.infocommpunjab.com



APPEAL CASE NO. 4717 of 2023

The respondent has filed the copy of the information sent to the appellant as under:-

ਉਪਰੋਕਤ ਵਿਸ਼ੇ ਸਬੰਧੀ ਹਵਾਲੇ ਅਧੀਨ ਪੱਤਰ ਨਾਲ ਨੱਥੀ ਆਰ.ਟੀ.ਆਈ. ਵਿੱਚ ਆਪ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਨਗਰ ਸੁਧਾਰ ਟਰੱਸਟ, ਬਠਿੰਡਾ ਪਾਸੋਂ ਜੋ ਸੂਚਨਾ ਮੰਗੀ ਗਈ ਹੈ, ਬਾਰੇ ਦੱਸਿਆ ਜਾਂਦਾ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਵਿਕਾਸ ਸਕੀਮ ਅਮਰੀਕ ਸਿੰਘ ਰੋਡ (ਵੀਰ ਕਲੋਨੀ) ਰਿਹਾਇਸ਼ੀ ਮਕਾਨ ਨੂੰ ਕਮਰਸ਼ੀਅਲ ਦੁਕਾਨ ਜਾਂ ਹਸਪਤਾਲ ਵਿੱਚ ਤਬਦੀਲ ਨਹੀਂ ਕੀਤਾ ਜਾ ਸਕਦਾ। ਇਸ ਤੋਂ ਇਲਾਵਾ ਦੱਸਿਆ ਜਾਂਦਾ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਉਕਤ ਸਕੀਮ ਨਗਰ ਨਿਗਮ, ਬਠਿੰਡਾ ਨੂੰ ਹੈਂਡਓਵਰ ਕੀਤੀ ਹੋਈ ਹੈ। ਜਿਸ ਦਾ ਬਿਲਡਿੰਗ ਕੰਟਰੋਲ ਵੀ ਨਗਰ ਨਿਗਮ ਬਠਿੰਡਾ ਪਾਸ ਹੀ ਹੈ। ਇਹ ਆਪ ਦੀ ਜਾਣਕਾਰੀ ਹਿੱਤ ਹੈ।

Scanned by Camera Scanner

5. After going through the contents of the RTI application of the appellant, the Commission observes that the appellant has not sought any specific information available on record. Rather the queries are in the nature of clarification/explanation, which do not fall within the definition of 'information' under Section 2(f) of the RTI Act, 2005. However, the respondent has provided the permissible reply to the appellant.

Reliance is placed on the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in CBSE vs. Aditya Bandopadhyay, wherein it was held that a public authority is not required to create information, draw inferences, or provide opinions/clarifications under the RTI Act.

6. In view of the above, no further cause of action is required to be taken in this case. Therefore, the appeal case filed by the appellant is **disposed of and closed**. Copy of the orders be sent to the parties.

Sd/-

(Dr. Bhupinder S Batth)
State Information Commissioner
Punjab

Date :02.06.2026