

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

**Email: [psic25@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic25@punjabmail.gov.in) Visit us: [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)**



Sh.Karnail Singh, Ex Beldar,  
S/o Sh. Maghar Singh  
R/o Village Surtapur,  
Tehsil and Distt.Ropar

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o XEN, Water Management Investigation Division  
Ropar

First Appellate Authority  
O/o Chief Engineer,  
Drainage and Mining, Sector 18 Chandigarh

Respondents

**APPEAL CASE NO.576 OF 2025**  
**APPEAL CASE NO.577 OF 2025**  
**ALONGWITH**  
**APPEAL CASE NO.578 OF 2025**

Present :- (i) Sh. Karnail Singh the appellant  
(ii) For the respondent- Sh.Nishant Gupta, SDO (9888996609), Sh. Harinder Singh, Sr.  
Assistant (9888324798)

**ORDER**

This order may be read in continuation of the previous orders passed by the Commission. The present appeals were earlier clubbed together as the same Appellant and Respondent-PIO are involved in all the three appeals. It is pertinent to mention that vide the last order, the Appellant was specifically directed to point out the deficiencies, if any, in the information supplied by the Respondent-PIO and to place the same on record before the Commission, so that the Respondent could furnish the requisite information, if any, found deficient

2. Today the appellant, Sh. Karnail Singh, states that he has received complete information except Service Book of Sh. Jaswant Singh. The respondent submitted that the requisite information, as available on record, has already been supplied to the appellant. With regard to the Service Book of Sh. Jaswant Singh, the respondent submitted that the same pertains to a third party. It was further submitted that Sh. Jaswant Singh has objected to/denied the disclosure of his Service Book and his written denial/objection has also been placed on record.

3. In view of the above, the Commission observes that the information has been provided to the appellant except the Service Book of Sh. Jaswant Singh, which pertains to a third party and against the disclosure of which the concerned third party has submitted his objection/denial.

4. Further, as regards the penalty of Rs. 25,000/- imposed by the Commission, the matter has been challenged before the Hon'ble High Court and the operation of the said penalty has been stayed by the Hon'ble High Court. Therefore, no further action with regard to the said penalty is called for at this stage, and the same shall remain subject to the final outcome/orders of the Hon'ble

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,**

**Sector 16, Chandigarh.**

**Ph: 0172-2864120**

**Email: [psic25@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic25@punjabmail.gov.in) Visit us: [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)**



**APPEAL CASE NO.576 OF 2025**

**APPEAL CASE NO.577 OF 2025**

**ALONGWITH**

**APPEAL CASE NO.578 OF 2025**

High Court. Accordingly, as no further issue regarding supply of information survives for adjudication before the Commission, the proceedings concerning the information sought by the appellant are closed. The proceedings with regard to the penalty of Rs. 25,000/- are adjourned **sine die**, subject to the outcome of the matter pending before the Hon'ble High Court. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Sd/-

**(Dr. Bhupinder S Batth)**  
**State Information Commissioner**  
**Punjab**

**Date :02.09.2026**

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

**Email: [psic25@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic25@punjabmail.gov.in) Visit us: [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)**



Sh.AnkitSehgal, C/o  
Bombay Studio, Near Main Post office  
Chowk, Pathankot

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o SDO, Provincial Sub Division,  
PWD B&R, Roopnagar

First Appellate Authority  
O/o SE, Construction Circle,  
PWD B&R, Punjab, Chandigarh

Respondents

**APPEAL CASE NO. 584 OF 2024**

Present :- (i) Sh.Ankit Sehgal the appellant  
(ii) For the respondent- (i) Sh.Manjeet Singh, SDE-cum-PIO (9478930250), Sh.Amandeep Singh, Clerk (8146798623)

**ORDER**

This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 05.05.2026 passed by the Commission.

2. Today the respondent states that the information has been sent to the appellant
3. Appellant Sh. Ankit Sehgal states that he has received the information and is satisfied.
4. Since the appellant has received the information and is satisfied, no further cause of action is left hence the above said appeal case filed by the appellant is **disposed of and closed**. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

Sd/-

**(Dr. Bhupinder S Batth)**  
**State Information Commissioner**  
**Punjab**

**Date :02.09.2026**

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

Email: [psic25@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic25@punjabmail.gov.in) Visit us: [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)



ShVarinder Singh, (M-87290-12793)  
S/o ShDalbir Singh,  
Village Khanpur, Rajputtan,  
Tehsil- Shahkot, Distt Jalandhar

.....Appellant

**.Vs**

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o SSP, Jalandhar (Rural)

**First Appellate Authority**  
O/o SSP, Jalandhar (Rural)

.....Respondent

**APPEAL CASE NO. 652 of 2024**

Present :- None for the parties.

**ORDER**

This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 25.06.2026 vide which an opportunity was given to the appellant to point out deficiencies in the information provided by the appellant.

2. Today neither the appellant nor the respondent is present. However, the appellant has sent an e-mail intimating that the information provided to him does not pertain to his RTI application.

3. Today neither the appellant nor the respondent is present. The record reveals that the appellant appeared only once during the hearing held in 14.10.2025. Thereafter, despite repeated opportunities, the appellant neither appeared before the Commission nor informed any valid reason for his absence. Although written submissions have been received from the appellant, he has consistently failed to prosecute the appeal by remaining absent during the subsequent hearings. The respondent has also failed to appear despite due notice. The Commission is of considered view that an appellant who invokes the appellate jurisdiction of the Commission is expected to diligently pursue the matter by participating in the proceedings. Mere filing of written submissions, without attending the hearing despite repeated opportunities, does not justify keeping the appeal pending indefinitely. In the absence of the parties and as no useful purpose would be served by granting further adjournments, no further intervention of the Commission is called for. Accordingly, the above said appeal case filed by the appellant is **disposed of and closed**. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

**Date :02.09.2026**

**Sd/-**  
**(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](mailto:psic25@punjabmail.gov.in) Visit us: [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)**



Sh.VivekBakhshi(reporter)  
# 102 ,SugandhVihar,Pakowal Road  
Phullawal,Ludhiana

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o BDPO,Block -I, Ludhiana

First Appellate Authority  
O/o DDPO,Ludhiana

Respondents

**APPEAL CASE NO. 4813 of 2025**

Present :- None for the parties.

**ORDER**

This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 09.04.2026 vide which an opportunity was given to the respondent to appear before the Commission and state his case.

2. Today neither the appellant nor the respondent is present. However, the appellant has sent an e-mail intimating that he wants to withdraw his case. Copy of the said e-mail is taken on record.

3. Since the appellant wants to withdraw this case, therefore no further cause of action is left. Therefore, the appeal case filed by the appellant is **disposed of and closed**. Copy of the orders be sent to the parties.

**Date :02.09.2026**

**Sd/-**  
**(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](mailto:psic25@punjabmail.gov.in) Visit us: [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)



ShRupinder Singh,  
S/o ShGurnam Singh,  
R/o Village Chakmafi,  
Tehsil Samrala, Distt Ludhiana

..... Appellant

**Public Information Officer,**  
O/o PanchayatSecy,  
Gram Panchayat, Chakmafi,  
Block Samrala, Distt Ludhiana

**.Vs**

**First Appellate Authority**  
O/o DDPO, Ludhiana

.....Respondent

**AC No.3288of 2025**

Present :-None for the parties.

**ORDER**

This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 30.06.2026 vide which an opportunity was also given to both the parties to appear before the Commission and state their case.

2. Today neither the appellant nor the respondent is present. Despite repeated opportunities, the appellant neither appeared before the Commission nor informed any valid reason for his absence. Even the last orders dated 30.06.2026 sent to him has not been returned undelivered which makes it clear that the same has been duly received by him. The respondent has also failed to appear despite due notice. The Commission is of considered view that an appellant who invokes the appellate jurisdiction of the Commission is expected to diligently pursue the matter by participating in the proceedings. In the absence of the parties and as no useful purpose would be served by granting further adjournments, no further intervention of the Commission is called for .Hence, 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 :02.09.2026**

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

**Email: [psic25@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic25@punjabmail.gov.in) Visit us: [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)**



Sh. Sunny Marwaha, Royal country colony,  
Near Taru Da Wara, Phagwara, Distt. Kapurthala

Appellant  
Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o DC, Kapurthala

First Appellate Authority  
O/o DC, Kapurthala

Respondents

**APPEAL CASE NO. 2994 of 2024**

Present :- None for the parties.

**ORDER**

This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 30.06.2026 vide which the submissions of the respondent was sent to the appellant along with the orders. Further, an opportunity was also given to both the parties to appear before the Commission and state their case.

2. Today neither the appellant nor the respondent is present. Despite repeated opportunities, the appellant neither appeared before the Commission nor informed any valid reason for his absence. The respondent has also failed to appear despite due notice. The Commission is of considered view that an appellant who invokes the appellate jurisdiction of the Commission is expected to diligently pursue the matter by participating in the proceedings. In the absence of the parties and as no useful purpose would be served by granting further adjournments, no further intervention of the Commission is called for. Hence, the appeal case filed by the appellant is **disposed of and closed**. Copy of the orders be sent to the parties.

**Date :02.09.2026**

**Sd/-**  
**(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](mailto:psic25@punjabmail.gov.in) Visit us: [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)**



Sh. Rakesh Kumar Grover,  
S/o Sh.MohanLal, # 109, Chhabra Street, Jalalabad  
Distt.Fazilka- 152024 (M-9872850654)  
(RTI application no. 110638)

Appellant

Versus

Public Information Officer,  
O/o DETC Patiala

First Appellate Authority  
O/o DETC Patiala

Respondents

**APPEAL CASE NO.2999of 2024**

Present :- None for the parties.

**ORDER**

This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 30.06.2026 vide which the appellant had requested for online hearing of his case. Hence, this case was adjourned to be heard through CISCO-webex (online video conferencing) for today, i.e 02.09.2026.

2. The respondent has sent their reply through e-mail, mentioning that the information sought by the appellant does not relate to their office.

3. The appellant is not present today. He has not even informed the Commission about his absence. The perusal of the case file shows that, on the request of the appellant, the case was taken up for hearing today through online mode. Yet the appellant has chosen not to appear before the Commission. Hence, The Commission is of considered view that an appellant who invokes the appellate jurisdiction of the Commission is expected to diligently pursue the matter by participating in the proceedings. Mere filing of written submissions, without attending the hearing despite repeated opportunities, does not justify keeping the appeal pending indefinitely. In the absence of the parties and as no useful purpose would be served by granting further adjournments, no further intervention of the Commission is called for. Hence, the appeal case filed by the appellant is **disposed of and closed**. Copy of the orders be sent to the parties.

**Date :02.09.2026**

**Sd/-**  
**(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](mailto:psic25@punjabmail.gov.in) Visit us: [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)**



Sh. Rajesh Kumar, (9815148139),  
S/o Sh. Kewal Singh,  
Flat No-11-A, Srideva Ji Residency,  
Kishanpura, Dhakoli, Zirakpur,  
Distt S.A.S Nagar.

....Appellant

V/s

Public Information Officer,  
O/o The Executive Officer,  
Nagar Council, Zirakpur,  
Distt S.A.S Nagar.

First Appellate Authority,  
O/o The Additional Deputy Commissioner,  
(Urban Development) , S.A.S Nagar.

...Respondents

**AC No. 3869 of 2023**

Present : (i) Sh. Rajesh Kumar the appellant alongwith Anil Bhatia  
(ii) For the respondent: Sh. Gulshan Mehta, Sh. Puneet, Draftsman (9501695680)

**ORDER**

This order may be read with reference to the previous order dated 29.04.2026 passed by the Commission.

2. It is pertinent to mention that the matter had earlier been heard by the then Hon'ble Commissioner Shri Amrit Partap Singh Sekhon , dated 18.10.2023 . At that stage, it was observed that the requisite information had already been furnished by the Respondent, but the appellant was not satisfied with the same and was unnecessarily dragging the matter. The relevant paras of the said order is reproduced as under:-

6. *It is observed that Sh. Rajesh Kumar is filing RTI applications without realizing the practical difficulties which the Public Authorities have to face. It is not incumbent upon the Public authorities to give answers to the queries of the appellant. He may note that the information, as exists, in the record has been provided. The appellant may note that it is settled legal position that information that can be provided under the RTI Act is that which is already on record of the Public Authority. The PIO cannot be asked to create any record for answering the RTI questions. As per the Supreme Court decision in **Khanapuram Gandaiah vs Administrative Officer & Ors on 4 January, 2010 in SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (CIVIL) NO.34868 OF 2009** the definition of information as given under Section 2(f) of the RTI Act 2005, shows that an applicant under Section 6 of the RTI Act can get any information which is already in existence and accessible to the public authority under law.*

7. *It has been seen that the appellant has demanded some personal information which smacks of its use not for any public cause. Accordingly from the perusal of this RTI application it has become*



**AC No. 3869 of 2023**

*abundantly clear that the purpose of the Appellant in seeking this kind of information does not involve any larger public interest for asking the information as per the details mentioned in his application which are in the form of queries /questions and personal information and was not supplied as per the stance taken by the respondents and it should not be in the public domain as has been upheld by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and other Hon'ble Courts to avoid the humiliation and harassment. Allowing this kind of information will certainly strengthen the abuse of the process of law.*

8. *As discussed above Appellant for seeking the personal information in the instant case has not been made with due bona fides and in larger public interest. The furnishing of the information asked for, if provided, would cause unwarranted invasion of privacy of the individual under Section 8(1)(j) of the RTI Act and may also lead to intimidation of such officials.*

9. *It has also been viewed that the appellant is never satisfied with the provided information by the public authorities. His behaviour towards the public authorities and the Bench is not conducive to the working of the Commission. He does not hesitate to cast aspersions on the bench hearing his appeal case (s). In fact, he is using RTI applications as a tool to create terror amongst the public authorities and to exploit them with some ulterior motives. This behaviour of the appellant needs to be curbed with a heavy hand*

10. *During the arguments, the appellant Sh. Rajesh Kumar has pressurized to transfer his case to another bench. Hence, it would be appropriate that the case file is sent to Deputy Registrar for placing the same before the Hon'ble Chief Information Commissioner for due consideration and taking an appropriate final decision in the matter. Copies of order be sent to the parties.*

Accordingly, the then Hon'ble Commissioner considered it appropriate that the case file be sent to the Deputy Registrar for placing the matter before the Hon'ble Chief Information Commissioner for appropriate orders and for taking an appropriate final decision in the matter. Thereafter, the matter came to be listed before the undersigned. The matter has thereafter been taken up on three occasions before the undersigned.

3. On the hearing dated 22.01.2026, the respondent furnished a copy of the reply to the appellant in the Court/Commission and the appellant was granted an opportunity to file his rejoinder, if any. On the last date of hearing also, the appellant was specifically directed to file his rejoinder. Despite the said opportunities, the appellant has neither filed any rejoinder nor submitted any further response before the Commission.

4. Today, the respondent has again placed his reply on record. When the appellant was asked regarding his rejoinder, he did not file any rejoinder or place any substantive response on record. Instead, the appellant started addressing the Commission in a raised and aggressive tone and made allegations to the effect that the Commission was favouring the Government. He further stated that he wanted the matter to be transferred. The manner in which the appellant addressed the Commission was disrespectful, discourteous and wholly inappropriate for proceedings before a quasi-judicial authority.



**AC No. 3869 of 2023**

5. It is also observed that the appellant continued to raise his voice and make such remarks even after leaving the courtroom. Such conduct is not conducive to the orderly and dignified conduct of proceedings before the Commission.

6. The Commission makes it clear that a party appearing before a judicial or quasi-judicial authority has every right to place his grievance on record and to seek such relief as may be available to him in law. However, such right does not extend to making unfounded allegations against the impartiality or functioning of the Commission or to adopting an aggressive, disrespectful or discourteous manner during the proceedings.

7. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in O.P. Sharma & Ors. v. High Court of Punjab & Haryana, (2011) 6 SCC 86, has emphasized the importance of maintaining dignity, decorum and discipline in judicial proceedings and has deprecated conduct which undermines the dignity of the judicial institution. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has also, in Dr. D.C. Saxena v. Hon'ble Chief Justice of India, (1996) 5 SCC 216, dealt with the impermissibility of reckless and scandalous allegations against a judicial authority and emphasized the need to preserve the dignity and majesty of judicial proceedings.

8. The above principles apply with equal force to proceedings before a statutory quasi-judicial authority. A party cannot be permitted to obstruct, delay or derail proceedings by making allegations against the Presiding Authority, particularly when adequate opportunities have already been granted to the party to place his case on record.

9. In the present matter, the appellant was given sufficient opportunity to file his rejoinder. Despite repeated directions, he failed to do so. No satisfactory explanation has been placed on record for such failure. The oral allegations made by the appellant during the hearing, without any supporting material on record, cannot be treated as a substitute for a rejoinder or a substantive response.

10. The Commission, therefore, takes a serious view of the conduct of the appellant. The appellant is hereby strictly cautioned to maintain proper decorum, discipline and restraint in all future proceedings before the Commission. He is further cautioned that repetition of such conduct, including making unfounded allegations against the Commission or addressing the Presiding Authority in an aggressive or disrespectful manner, may invite appropriate action in accordance with law.

11. As regards the request of the appellant for transfer of the matter, it is observed that mere dissatisfaction with the proceedings or an adverse perception of the appellant cannot, by itself, constitute a ground for transfer. The appellant has already availed the opportunity to seek transfer earlier, pursuant to which the matter was transferred and thereafter heard by the undersigned on three occasions.

12. In view of the fact that the appellant has been afforded adequate opportunity to file his rejoinder and has failed to avail the same, no further opportunity is warranted. The matter shall,

**PUNJAB STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION**

**Red Cross Building, Near Rose Garden,**

**Sector 16, Chandigarh.**

**Ph: 0172-2864120**

**Email: [psic25@punjabmail.gov.in](mailto:psic25@punjabmail.gov.in) Visit us: [www.infocommpunjab.com](http://www.infocommpunjab.com)**



**AC No. 3869 of 2023**

therefore, be considered on the basis of the material available on the record. Accordingly, the appeal is **disposed of and closed**. Copy of the order be sent to the parties.

**Date :02.09.2026**

**sd/-  
(Dr. Bhupinder S Batth)  
State Information Commissioner  
Punjab**