

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

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

Ph: 0172-2864101, Helpline 0172-2864100

Email: pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: www.infocommpunjab.com



Sh. Sukhraj Singh Raju
(Editor-in-Chief)
Kothi No. 1058,
Sector 46-B, Chandigarh
M: 9316275162

....Appellant

V/s

Public Information Officer,
O/o District Public Relation Officer,
Punjab, Patiala

First Appellate Authority,
O/o Director, Information &
Public Relations Punjab,
Punjab Civil Seretariat-1,
Chandigarh

....Respondents

Appeal Case No. 6161 of 2024

ORDER

This order may be read with reference with the previous order dated 08.10.2025 vide which an order was reserved to be pronounced.

2. The appellant sought the following information:

3. Particulars of information. - *Certified/Attested Copies of Full + Initial Signatures of Mr. Ashok Kumar (Petro as APO) since 01-01-2011 to onwards of office of DPRD Patiala (Jan 2011 to onwards)*
 - (a) Concerned department : *office of DPRD Patiala*
 - (b) Particulars of information required : *Full + Initial Signatures of Mr. Ashok Kumar Sharma ex APO*
 - i. Details of information required : *As stated above*
 - ii. Period for which information asked for : *01-01-2011 to till his retirement*
 - iii. Other details : *Refer to Court No. 213/2024 of Sd/- Jt Secy in PWD Court of India. Already filed in the office of DPRD to Joint Director's Protocol Section*
4. A fee of Rs 10/- (Rupee ten only) has been deposited in the office of the Public

3. Thereafter, the appellant filed the first appeal and feeling aggrieved, he filed the second appeal before the Commission. Accordingly, a notice of hearing was issued to the parties. In the interest of natural justice, the case was adjourned number of times and the reasonable opportunities were given to the parties in this case.

4. After the detailed deliberations with both the parties, the case was reserved on 08.10.2025 with the liberty to both the parties to make their final submissions within thirty days. The appellant made the submission in support of his claim and also the response of the respondent is already available in the case file and no submissions has been received from the respondent after the case was reserved.

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

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

Ph: 0172-2864101, Helpline 0172-2864100

Email: pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: www.infocommpunjab.com



Appeal Case No. 6161 of 2024

5. It is appropriate to mention that section 2 (f) and 2 (j) of the RTI, act, 2005 provide:
- 2 (f) "information" means any material in any form, including records, documents, memos, e-mails, opinions, advices, press releases, circulars, orders, logbooks, contracts, reports, papers, samples, models, data material held in any electronic form and information relating to any private body which can be accessed by a public authority under any other law for the time being in force;
- 2 (j) "right to information" means the right to information accessible under this Act which is held by or under the control of any public authority and includes the right to—
- (i) inspection of work, documents, records;
 - (ii) taking notes, extracts or certified copies of documents or records;
 - (iii) taking certified samples of material;
 - (iv) obtaining information in the form of diskettes, floppies, tapes, video cassettes or in any other electronic mode or through printouts where such information is stored in a computer or in any other device;"
6. It is also appropriate to mention that the RTI application of appellant was also considered in terms of office memorandum issued by the Department of Personnel & Training, Government of India vide No. 11/2/2008-IR dated 10.7.2008 in which it has been stated that the Public Information Officer has to supply the 'material' in the form as held by the public authority and it is not required to do research on behalf of the citizen to deduce anything from the material and then supply it to him.
7. It is also appropriate to mention the decision given by the Supreme Court of India in the matter of Central Board of Secondary Education & Anr. Vs. Aditya Bandopadhyay & Ors. (Civil Appeal No. 6454 of 2011) reported as 2011(3) RCT(Civil) and circulated by the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances & Pensions, Department of Personnel and Training vide No. 1/18/2011-IR dated 16.9.2011 which is as follows:-

PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

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

Ph: 0172-2864101, Helpline 0172-2864100

Email: pcic20@punjabmail.gov.in Visit us: www.infocommpunjab.com



Appeal Case No. 6161 of 2024

“35. At this juncture, it is necessary to clear some misconceptions about the RTI Act. The RTI Act provides access to all information that is available and existing. This is clear from a combined reading of section 3 and the definitions of ‘information’ and ‘right to information’ under clauses (f) and (j) of section 2 of the Act. If a public authority has any information in the form of data or analysed data, or abstracts, or statistics, an applicant may access such information, subject to the exemptions in section 8 of the Act. But where the information sought is not a part of the record of a public authority, and where such information is not required to be maintained under any law or the rules or regulations of the public authority, the Act does not cast an obligation upon the public authority, to collect or collate such non available information and then furnish it to an applicant. A public authority is also not required to furnish information which require drawing of inferences and/or making of assumptions. It is also not required to provide ‘advice’ or ‘opinion’ to an applicant, nor required to obtain and furnish any ‘opinion’ or ‘advice’ to an applicant. The reference to ‘opinion’ or ‘advice’ in the definition of ‘information’ in section 2(f) of the Act, only refers to such material available in the records of the public authority. Many public authorities have, as a public relation exercise, provide advice, guidance and opinion to the citizens. But that is purely voluntary and should not be confused with any obligation under the RTI Act.”

8. In view of the above, the request of the appellant is not sustainable as the appellant has sought the full signature and initial signature from 01.01.2011 to date. Therefore, no further directions can be given to the respondent PIO as per the provisions of the RTI Act, 2005. As such, the case is **disposed of & closed.**

Dated: 17.02.2026

(Inderpal Singh)
Chief Information Commissioner,
Punjab