

CWP-20000-2023;
CWP-20025-2023 &
CWP-20043-2023

-1-

2023:PHHC:119686

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH
(107 + 109 + 110)**

1. CWP-20000-2023

Ashok KumarPetitioner
Versus

Punjab State Information Commission and othersRespondents

2. CWP-20025-2023

Ashok KumarPetitioner
Versus

Punjab State Information Commission and othersRespondents

3. CWP-20043-2023

Ashok KumarPetitioner
Versus

Punjab State Information Commission and othersRespondents

Date of decision: - 12.09.2023

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Mr. Sunny K. Singla, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ferry Sofat, Additional Advocate General, Punjab.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present order would dispose of three writ petitions i.e., CWP-20000-2023 titled as 'Ashok Kumar Vs. Punjab State Information Commission and others'; CWP-20025-2023 titled as 'Ashok Kumar Vs. Punjab State Information Commission and others'; and CWP-20043-2023

titled as 'Ashok Kumar Vs. Punjab State Information Commission and others'. Challenge in all the writ petitions is to the orders (Annexure P-6) passed in the three appeals filed by the petitioner before the State Information Commission, Punjab in the proceedings under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter referred to as 'RTI Act')

2. Brief facts of the case are that the petitioner had filed three applications under the RTI Act and the said applications are annexed as Annexure P-1 with each of the three writ petitions. When the information sought was not supplied by the Public Information Officer, then, three separate appeals were filed by the petitioner before the first appellate authority. When the information was still not provided, three separate appeals i.e., Appeal No.4716-2022 (subject matter of CWP-20000-2023); Appeal No.4714-2022 (subject matter of CWP-20025-2023) and Appeal No.4715-2022 (subject matter of CWP-20043-2023) were filed by the petitioner. Two separate orders dated 06.03.2023 were passed by the State Information Commission in the Appeal No.4716-2022 and Appeal No.4715-2022 and the reading of the said orders would show that they are almost identical. The relevant portion of the order dated 06.03.2023 (Annexure P-4) passed in Appeal No.4716-2022 is reproduced herein below: -

“3. Respondent represented by Sh. Ashok Kumar stated that complete information pertaining to appeal case no. AC: 4713, 4714 and 4718 of 2022 has been provided to the appellant dated 27.02.2023 and nothing is pending in these aforesaid cases. For appeal case no. 4712, 4715, 4716, 4717 of 2022 he seeks some more time to furnish the sought information. In addition to this he further submitted the unconditional apologies for the delay in dealing this RTI application

and assured the Commission that he will furnish a reply/information within 20 days.

4. *In view of above the Commission directs the respondent PIO, to provide the sought information to the appellant within 30 days from issue of this order. Failing to which action under section 20 (1) of RTI act will be initiated against the PIO. Accordingly, on the assurance of respondent Sh. Ashok Kumar, this instant appeal case is Disposed of with directions to the respondent PIO . A Compliance report shall be submitted by the Respondent before the Commission by 10.04.2023. It is made clear that non-compliance of these directions shall attract penal action by the Commission.*

However, the liberty is granted to the appellant to approach the Commission within 45 days in case any submission regarding the receiving of information.

NOTE for PIO: All documents / information supplied to appellants/complainants must mandatorily be attested as :Information supplied under the RTI Act, 2005, Signature of the PIO, Name of the PIO, Name of the Public Authority, Date.”

A perusal of the above order would show that with respect to Appeal No.4716 of 2022 and Appeal No.4715 of 2022, the respondent authorities had submitted that they would furnish the information sought and had apologized for the delay and thereafter, the State Information Commission had directed the respondent PIO to provide the information to the petitioner within 30 days from the date of issuance of the said order, failing which, action under Section 20(1) of the RTI Act would be initiated against the PIO and liberty was granted to the petitioner to approach the Commission within 45 days in case any submission regarding the receiving of the information was to be addressed. In Appeal No.4714 of 2022, which is the subject matter of CWP-20025 of 2023, liberty was granted to the petitioner to approach the Commission within

10 days from the issuance of the order in case any further submissions were required to be made. It is the case of the petitioner that within the period, so prescribed, the petitioner had moved three applications in the said three appeals bringing to the notice of the authorities that the information had still not been supplied and the compliance report has also not been submitted and a prayer was made for taking penal action against respondent PIO, with a further prayer for directing the authorities to provide the information to the petitioner. The State Information Commission, Punjab dismissed the said applications by merely making an endorsement on the ground “**no action required**”. A perusal of the impugned order in each of the writ petitions, annexed as Annexure P-6, would show that where the second page of the grounds of appeal ends, an endorsement has been made by the State Information Commission, Punjab to the following effect: -

“No action required”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that once the State Information Commission, Punjab while disposing of the second statutory appeals had granted liberty to the petitioner to approach the Commission within a specified period with respect to making any submissions regarding the information sought and the petitioner had approached the State Information Commission within the said period, thus, it was incumbent upon the authorities to have heard the petitioner and after considering the submissions made by the petitioner, to decide the applications in accordance with law after passing a speaking order. It is further submitted that in Appeal No.4716 of 2022 as well as Appeal

No.4715 of 2022, the stand of the authorities was that the information would be supplied, but the same has not been supplied from the date of passing of order dated 06.03.2023, thus, it was also incumbent on the State Information Commissioner to have considered the appeals of the petitioner and to proceed under Section 20 of the RTI Act, 2005 for non-compliance of the said order. It is stated that even with respect to Appeal No.4714 of 2022, although in the absence of the petitioner, it was stated by the respondent authorities that the information had been provided, but in pursuance of the liberty granted to the petitioner, the petitioner had approached the Commission, by moving an application dated 13.03.2023 (Annexure P-5), attached with CWP-20025-2023, to highlight the fact that incomplete information had been given and even with respect to the same, there was no adjudication as the said application was also disposed of with a similar endorsement as was done in the other two cases. It is argued that the impugned orders, in all the three writ petitions, are in violation of the law laid down by this Court in “**Gagnish Singh Khurana Vs. State of Punjab and others**, reported as 2023(3) R.C.R. (Civil) 847 as well as in **CWP-17672-2023** titled as “**Rajwinder Singh Vs. State of Punjab and others**”, decided on 16.08.2023. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that thus the impugned orders deserve to be set aside and has prayed that the State Information Commission be directed to consider the said applications/appeals filed by the petitioner in pursuance of the orders passed by the State Information Commission in accordance with law and after giving opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and by passing a speaking order.

4. Learned State counsel has submitted that the State Information Commission, Punjab would pass a speaking order after taking into consideration the judgment of this Court in **Gagnish Singh Khurana's case (supra)** and in **Rajwinder Singh's case (supra)**, as expeditiously as possible.

5. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties and has gone through the paper-book.

6. This Court in **Gagnish Singh Khuranas's case (supra)** has held as under: -

“12. In the above said affidavit, it has been stated that the information is not traceable/available in the office record without clarifying as to whether the brochure was ever issued or not or that the same was issued but is not traceable and in case, same was not traceable whether any DDR with respect to its loss was registered or in case, the same was destroyed as to whether the due procedure for destroying the same had been followed or not. Similarly, the said affidavit is also vague with respect to point No.2, in which, copies of the minutes of meeting of PSIEC with respect to adding of amenities was sought. The judgment of the Delhi High Court in the case of Union of India (Supra), relevant paras of which have been reproduced hereinabove, had observed that it is not uncommon in the Government departments to evade disclosure of the information by taking the standard plea that the information sought by the applicant is not available and in case, such a plea is taken, then the authority under the Act of 2005, should make necessary enquiries into the aspect as to whether a thorough search has been conducted or not and as to whether it is a case where originally, the information was available with the authority but subsequently, the same has been destroyed in accordance with the Rules framed by the Department or that same has been lost and after considering all the said aspects, in case, the authority comes to the conclusion that though, the said information was available but could not be traced then the responsibility of the

person who has lost the record is required to be fixed. It was further observed that unless the same is done, it would be possible for any department/office to deny the information sought by conveniently stating that the same is not available and the same would defeat the very objective behind the enactment of the Act of 2005. A perusal of the impugned order would show that the above aspects have not even been remotely considered. In the order passed, no reference to the facts of the case has been made nor the details of the information sought by the applicant has been mentioned, nor the fact as to whether any information on any of the points had been given or not has been stated. Even the contesting claims of both the petitioner as well as respondent Nos.2 and 3 have neither been noticed nor been answered. The relevant law including the judgment of the Delhi High Court in the abovesaid case has not been taken into consideration. Respondent No.4 is a quasi judicial authority which was required to adjudicate the said statutory second appeal filed by the petitioner under Section 19 (3) of the Act of 2005 and was required to state the facts of the case, the pleas raised by the relevant parties and the reasons for rejecting the pleas of one party and for accepting the pleas of the other while passing the final order. Same having not been done, the impugned order, thus, deserves to be set aside solely on the ground that same is non-speaking and cryptic.

13. It is a matter of settled law that quasi judicial authorities must record reasons in support of its conclusion and insistence on recording of reasons is meant to serve the wider principle of justice that justice must not only be done but also appear to have been done and that recording of reasons is indispensable in the decision making process and the same facilitates the process of judicial review by the Superior Courts and it is also necessary to give reasons for sustaining the litigants' faith in the justice delivery system. It has further been repeatedly held that reasons so given in support of a decision must be cogent and clear and should not be "rubber stamp reasons". Reference in this regard may be made to the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case titled as "M/s Kranti Associates Pvt. Ltd. & Anr. Vs. Sh. Masood Ahmed Khan & Others" reported as 2010 (3) SCC (Civil) 852, in which it has been held as under:-

"xxx xxx

51. Summarizing the above discussion, this Court holds:

a. In India the judicial trend has always been to record reasons, even in administrative decisions, if such decisions affect anyone prejudicially.

b. A quasi-judicial authority must record reasons in support of its conclusions.

c. Insistence on recording of reasons is meant to serve the wider principle of justice that justice must not only be done it must also appear to be done as well.

d. Recording of reasons also operates as a valid restraint on any possible arbitrary exercise of judicial and quasi-judicial or even administrative power.

e. Reasons reassure that discretion has been exercised by the decision maker on relevant grounds and by disregarding extraneous considerations.

f. Reasons have virtually become as indispensable a component of a decision making process as observing principles of natural justice by judicial, quasi-judicial and even by administrative bodies.

g. Reasons facilitate the process of judicial review by superior Courts.

h. The ongoing judicial trend in all countries committed to rule of law and constitutional governance is in favour of reasoned decisions based on relevant facts. This is virtually the life blood of judicial decision making justifying the principle that reason is the soul of justice.

i. Judicial or even quasi-judicial opinions these days can be as different as the judges and authorities who deliver them. All these decisions serve one common purpose which is to demonstrate by reason that the relevant factors have been objectively considered. This is important for sustaining the litigants' faith in the justice delivery system.

j. Insistence on reason is a requirement for both judicial accountability and transparency.

k. If a Judge or a quasi-judicial authority is not candid enough about his/her decision making process then it is impossible to know whether the person deciding is faithful to the doctrine of precedent or to principles of incrementalism.

l. Reasons in support of decisions must be cogent, clear and succinct. A pretence of reasons or 'rubber-stamp reasons' is not to be equated with a valid decision making process.

m. It cannot be doubted that transparency is the sine qua non of restraint on abuse of judicial powers. Transparency in decision making not only makes the judges and decision makers less prone to errors but also makes them subject to broader scrutiny. (See David Shapiro in Defence of Judicial Candor (1987) 100 Harward Law Review 731-737).

n. Since the requirement to record reasons emanates from the broad doctrine of fairness in decision making, the said requirement is now virtually a component of human rights and was considered part of Strasbourg Jurisprudence. See (1994) 19 EHRR 553, at 562 para 29 and Anya vs. University of Oxford, 2001 EWCA Civ 405, wherein the Court referred to Article 6 of European Convention of Human Rights which requires, "adequate and intelligent reasons must be given for judicial decisions".

o. In all common law jurisdictions judgments play a vital role in setting up precedents for the future. Therefore, for development of law, requirement of giving reasons for the decision is of the essence and is virtually a part of "Due Process".

xxx xxx”

7. This Court in another judgment in the case of **Rajwinder Singh's case (supra)** has held as under: -

“9. This Court in another judgment dated 21.07.2023 passed in CWP-15500-2023 titled as “Gopal Krishan Gupta Vs. Central Information Commission and others”, while dealing with a cryptic and non-speaking order passed by the Central Information Commissioner under Section 19(3) read with Section 20 of the Act of 2005, had observed as under:-

“5. Relevant portion of the order dated 28.02.2023 (Annexure P11) is reproduced herein below: -

“The fact is that no final point-wise reply was provided on any of the points to the appellant as per the record. In view of the same, the CPIO is directed to provide a final consolidated reply on all the

points as provided by the concerned custodians within 7 days from the date of receipt of this order. The appeals are disposed of accordingly.”

6. *A perusal of the above-said order would show that after considering the entire matter, the Information Commissioner was of the opinion that no final point-wise reply has been provided to the appellant as per the record and thus, had directed the CPIO to provide a final consolidated reply on all the points as provided by the concerned custodians within 7 days from the date of receipt of this order. However, instead of waiting for the reply, the Information Commissioner disposed of the appeal without final adjudication of the matter and that the said procedure is not in accordance with law.*

7. *A perusal of Section 19 of the RTI Act would show that under sub-Section 3, an aggrieved person has a right to file the second appeal before the Central Information Commission or the State Information Commission and that, under sub-section (8), the Central Information Commission has been given several powers including the power requiring the public authority to compensate the complainant for any loss or detriment suffered or to impose any of the penalties provided under the Act. Section 19 of the RTI Act, is reproduced herein below: -*

“19. Appeal.—(1) Any person who, does not receive a decision within the time specified in sub-section (1) or clause (a) of sub-section (3) of section 7, or is aggrieved by a decision of the Central Public Information Officer or State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, may within thirty days from the expiry of such period or from the receipt of such a decision prefer an appeal to such officer who is senior in rank to the Central Public Information Officer or State Public Information Officer as the case may be, in each public authority:

Provided that such officer may admit the appeal after the expiry of the period of thirty days if he or she is satisfied that the appellant was prevented by sufficient cause from filing the appeal in time.

(2) Where an appeal is preferred against an order made by a Central Public Information Officer or a State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, under section 11 to disclose third party

information, the appeal by the concerned third party shall be made within thirty days from the date of the order.

(3) A second appeal against the decision under sub-section (1) shall lie within ninety days from the date on which the decision should have been made or was actually received, with the Central Information Commission or the State Information Commission: Provided that the Central Information Commission or the State Information Commission, as the case may be, may admit the appeal after the expiry of the period of ninety days if it is satisfied that the appellant was prevented by sufficient cause from filing the appeal in time.

(4) If the decision of the Central Public Information Officer or State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, against which an appeal is preferred relates to information of a third party, the Central Information Commission or State Information Commission, as the case may be, shall give a reasonable opportunity of being heard to that third party.

(5) In any appeal proceedings, the onus to prove that a denial of a request was justified shall be on the Central Public Information Officer or State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, who denied the request.

(6) An appeal under sub-section (1) or sub-section (2) shall be disposed of within thirty days of the receipt of the appeal or within such extended period not exceeding a total of forty-five days from the date of filing thereof as the case may be, for reasons to be recorded in writing.

(7) The decision of the Central Information Commission or State Information Commission, as the case may be, shall be binding.

(8) In its decision, the Central Information Commission or State Information Commission, as the case may be, has the power to—

(a) require the public authority to take any such steps as may be necessary to secure compliance with the provisions of this Act, including—

(i) by providing access to information, if so requested, in a particular form;

(ii) by appointing a Central Public Information Officer or State Public Information Officer, as the case may be;

(iii) by publishing certain information or categories of information;

(iv) by making necessary changes to its practices in relation to the maintenance, management and destruction of records;

(v) by enhancing the provision of training on the right to information for its officials;

(vi) by providing it with an annual report in compliance with clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 4;

(b) require the public authority to compensate the complainant for any loss or other detriment suffered;

(c) impose any of the penalties provided under this Act; (d) reject the application.

(9) The Central Information Commission or State Information Commission, as the case may be, shall give notice of its decision, including any right of appeal, to the complainant and the public authority.

(10) The Central Information Commission or State Information Commission, as the case may be, shall decide the appeal in accordance with such procedure as may be prescribed.

8. Section 20 of the RTI Act provides that in case, the Central Information Commission at the time of deciding any complaint or appeal, is of the opinion that the Central Public Information Officer has, without any reasonable cause, not furnished information within the time specified under subsection (1) of Section 7 or has malafidely denied the request for information etc., then, it is empowered to impose a penalty of two hundred and fifty rupees each day till the information is furnished. Section 20 of the RTI Act is reproduced as under: -

“20. Penalties.—(1) Where the Central Information Commission or the State Information Commission, as the case may be, at the time of deciding any complaint or appeal is of the opinion that the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, has, without any reasonable cause, refused to receive an application for information or has not furnished information within the time specified under sub-section (1) of section 7 or malafidely denied the request for information or knowingly given incorrect, incomplete or misleading information or destroyed

information which was the subject of the request or obstructed in any manner in furnishing the information, it shall impose a penalty of two hundred and fifty rupees each day till application is received or information is furnished, so however, the total amount of such penalty shall not exceed twenty-five thousand rupees:

Provided that the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, shall be given a reasonable opportunity of being heard before any penalty is imposed on him:

Provided further that the burden of proving that he acted reasonably and diligently shall be on the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer, as the case may be.

(2) Where the Central Information Commission or the State Information Commission, as the case may be, at the time of deciding any complaint or appeal is of the opinion that the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, has, without any reasonable cause and persistently, failed to receive an application for information or has not furnished information within the time specified under sub-section (1) of section 7 or malafidely denied the request for information or knowingly given incorrect, incomplete or misleading information or destroyed information which was the subject of the request or obstructed in any manner in furnishing the information, it shall recommend for disciplinary action against the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, under the service rules applicable to him.”

9. A conjoint reading of the above reproduced provisions would show that once a second appeal has been filed by an aggrieved person, then, after considering all the aspects, the matter is required to be finally adjudicated. In case, the Information Commissioner is of the opinion that the ingredients, as specified in Section 20 of the RTI Act are met, appropriate action is also required to be taken. In the present case, after prima facie holding in favour of the petitioner with respect to points No. (a) and (b) and after directing the CPIO to file a revised reply, the appeals have been disposed of by respondent No.2 without waiting for the said reply and without finally adjudicating the matter and thus, to the said extent, the impugned order deserves to be

set aside”

The State Information Commissioner, Punjab, while adjudicating the second statutory appeal filed by the petitioner under Section 19(3) of the Act of 2005 was acting as a quasi judicial authority and was, therefore, required to adjudicate the case after considering the facts of the case, pleas raised by both the parties and was required to record reasons for rejecting the pleas of one party and accepting the pleas of the other party by passing a reasoned order. The order should have been self-explanatory and reasons given in the same should not have been rubber stamp reasons. The same has not been done in the present case and the impugned order passed is cryptic and non-speaking as has been detailed in para 7 of the present order.

10. Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances, the present Civil Writ Petition is partly allowed and the impugned order dated 06.03.2023 (Annexure P-9) is set aside and the matter is remanded to the State Information Commissioner, Punjab for deciding Appeal Case No.452 of 2023 afresh after giving an opportunity of hearing to the contesting parties. The State Information Commissioner, Punjab, is directed to pass a speaking order dealing with the contentions raised by both the parties. The parties through their counsel are directed to appear before the State Information Commissioner, Punjab, on 24.08.2023.

11. It is, however, made clear that this Court has not given any final opinion on the merits of the case and it would be open to the State Information Commissioner, Punjab, to consider the case independently and in accordance with law.

12. This Court has found that in a large number of cases, the authorities including the first Appellate Authority {(while adjudicating the first statutory appeal under Section 19(1))} and the second Appellate Authority {(while adjudicating the second statutory appeal under Section 19(3))} under the Act, have been passing cryptic and non-speaking orders in violation of the judgments passed by the Hon’ble Supreme Court and various High Courts and also in violation of the mandate of the Act of 2005. It is, thus, found necessary to give the following directions to the first Appellate Authority and second Appellate Authority under the Act of 2005 to clearly specify

the following at the time of finally adjudicating the case:-

- i) The points on which the information is sought by the applicant as per his/her application filed under the Act of 2005.*
- ii) The point-wise reply with respect to the information sought.*
- iii) A categorical finding as to whether the information on any of the points has been supplied or not and if supplied, the date on which it has been supplied.*
- iv) In case, it is the stand of the authorities from whom the information is sought that the information sought under a particular point is not to be supplied on account of any bar contained in any provisions of the Act of 2005 or for any other reason, then, after recording the said stand and after considering the submissions made by both the parties with respect to said point/issue, return a finding with respect to the said issue/point.*
- v) Any other observation which the authority deems fit in the facts and circumstances of the case to be recorded.*

13. The Chief Secretary to the States of Punjab & Haryana and the Advisor to the Administrator, Chandigarh are directed to circulate the judgment passed in the present case i.e. CWP-17672-2023 titled as "Rajwinder Singh Vs. State of Punjab and others" and the judgment dated 13.07.2023 passed in CWP-1877-2022 titled as "Gagnish Singh Khurana Vs. State of Punjab and others" as well as the judgment dated 21.07.2023 passed in CWP-15500-2023 titled as "Gopal Krishan Gupta Vs. Central Information Commission and others", to all the authorities constituted under the Act for complying with the same."

8. In the present case, two appeals were disposed of by the Punjab State Information Commission vide two orders dated 06.03.2023 (Annexure P-4), passed in Appeal No.4716-2022 (subject matter in CWP-20000-2023) and in Appeal No.4714-2022 (subject matter in CWP-20025-2023). The relevant portion of the order passed in Appeal No.4716 of 2023 has already been reproduced in the preceding part of the present order. A perusal of the said orders would show that the respondent PIO

had stated that the information would be supplied and a compliance report regarding the same would be submitted by 10.04.2023. Liberty was granted to the petitioner to approach the Commission within a period of 45 days in case any submission after receiving the information was required to be made. The petitioner had filed two applications in Appeal No.4716 of 2022 and Appeal No.4715 of 2022 {(annexed as Annexure P-5) with both the writ petitions i.e., CWP-20000-2023 and CWP-20043-2023}, stating therein that the information has not been provided by the respondent PIO, and that a compliance report has also not been submitted and thus, penal action is required to be taken against PIO. A prayer was also made for directing the respondents to provide the information. The State Information Commission, Punjab instead of hearing the petitioner and deciding the said applications in accordance with law, had just rejected the same after making an endorsement to the effect that “**no action was required**”. The same being cryptic and non-speaking is illegal and against law and deserves to be set aside on the said points alone. In Appeal No.4714 of 2023, while passing the order dated 06.03.2023, liberty was granted to the petitioner to approach the Commission within 10 days for any submission to be made by the petitioner. The petitioner in pursuance of the said order had filed an application dated 13.03.2023 {(Annexure P-5) along with CWP-20025 of 2023} stating that incomplete information has been supplied. Even the said application was not adjudicated upon.

9. The above-said facts clearly show that the impugned orders passed by the State Information Commission, Punjab are cryptic and non-

speaking and thus, deserve to be set aside on the said ground alone and accordingly all the three writ petitions are partly allowed and the impugned order (Annexure P-6) in all the three writ petitions are set aside and the respondent-State Information Commission, Punjab is directed to consider the matter afresh and decide the applications/appeals (Annexure P-5), in all the three writ petitions afresh after granting an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and also after considering the pleas raised by all the concerned parties by passing speaking orders. While passing the said orders, the State Information Commission would also take into consideration the law laid down by this Court in **Gagnish Singh Khurana's case (supra)** and in **Rajwinder Singh's case (supra)**, and also follow the directions which have been given in para 12 of the judgment in **Rajwinder Singh's case (supra)**.

10. The parties are directed to appear before the State Information Commission, Punjab on 22.09.2023. The State Information Commission, Punjab would decide the matter afresh, as expeditiously as possible, preferably, within a period of four months from the date the parties appear before the State Information Commission, Punjab.

September 12, 2023
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes
Yes