



Mahesh Pratap Singh <yogimpsingh@gmail.com>


701671

2 messages

PADUM NARAYAN DWIVEDI <hearingcourts5.upic@up.gov.in>

13 July 2026 at 16:22

To: Commissioner Office Lucknow Division <commluc@nic.in>, ldartionline <ldartionline@gmail.com>, yogimpsingh <yogimpsingh@gmail.com>

**701671.pdf**
2806K**Mahesh Pratap Singh** <yogimpsingh@gmail.com>

18 August 2026 at 18:48

To: PADUM NARAYAN DWIVEDI <hearingcourts5.upic@up.gov.in>

Cc: Commissioner Office Lucknow Division <commluc@nic.in>, ldartionline <ldartionline@gmail.com>

BEFORE THE UTTAR PRADESH STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION

7/7A, RTI Bhawan, Vibhuti Khand, Gomti Nagar, Lucknow

HEARING ROOM NO. S-5**Second Appeal No.: S05/A/0518/2024****Registration No.: A-20240701671**

Date of Filing of Second Appeal: 22.07.2024

Date of Present Hearing: 19.08.2026**IN THE MATTER OF:****Yogi M.P. Singh**S/o Sri Rajendra Pratap Singh, R/o Mohalla Surekapuram Colony, Jabalpur Road, Sangmohal Post Office, District Mirzapur, Uttar Pradesh – 231001, Mobile No. 7379105911, Email: yogimpsingh@gmail.com**...APPELLANT****VERSUS**

Public Information Officer,

Office of the Lucknow Development Authority, Lucknow – 226012

...RESPONDENT**WRITTEN REPRESENTATION ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANT**

(Regarding continued, wilful non-compliance with the Commission's orders dated 28.11.2024, 24.02.2026 and 09.06.2026)

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH:**1. Background**

1. That the appellant filed an online RTI application dated 18.02.2024 (Registration No. LKDPAR/2024/60105) before the Public Information Officer, Lucknow Development Authority ("LDA"), seeking the following six specific, factual and record-based points of information, all supported by documentary references annexed to the application itself:

- Reasons why a 24-page PDF document sent by the appellant in Grievance No. GOVUP/E/2024/0006965 was not placed before the enquiry committee looking into the matter of corruption;

- Name and designation of the LDA staff/officials authorised to receive and entertain representations of parties/complainants on behalf of the said committee;
- Action-taken details on the representation dated 09.12.2023 of Shri Dinesh Pratap Singh (proved to have been booked by Speed Post on 11.12.2023 and delivered at LDA Colony S.O. on 16.12.2023, as per India Post tracking for Consignment No. EU950794838IN);
- Action-taken details on the representation dated 28.01.2023 of Shri Dinesh Pratap Singh;
- Action-taken details on the representation dated 11.09.2022 of Shri Dinesh Pratap Singh;
- Action-taken details on the representation dated 13.12.2022 of Shri Dinesh Pratap Singh.

2. That no response was furnished within the statutory period of thirty days prescribed under Section 7(1) of the Right to Information Act, 2005, compelling the appellant to file a First Appeal, which was decided on 30.05.2024 with a clear finding that no proof existed of information ever having been sent, and a direction to the PIO to supply the same within 15 days — a direction that was never complied with.

3. That the appellant was thus constrained to file the present Second Appeal on 22.07.2024 under Section 19(3) of the Act.

2. Chronology of Proceedings and Continued Non-Compliance

That the following chronology, drawn entirely from the record of this Hon'ble Commission and from the Respondent's own communications, demonstrates a sustained and deliberate pattern of default extending over more than thirty (30) months:

Date	Event / Order
18.02.2024	Original RTI application filed online by the appellant, Registration No. LKDPA/R/2024/60105, seeking six specific, factual, document-based points of information regarding action taken on four representations submitted by one Shri Dinesh Pratap Singh, and regarding the staff/committee authorised to entertain such representations, in relation to Grievance Registration No. GOVUP/E/2024/0006965.
21.04.2024	No response having been received within the statutory 30-day period under Section 7(1) of the RTI Act, 2005, the appellant filed a First Appeal online.
30.05.2024	First Appellate Authority (Sri Atul Krishna, Deputy Secretary / First Appellate Officer, LDA) heard the appeal (No. LKDPA/A/2024/60087). Order recorded that no documentary proof existed on record to show that information had ever been sent to the appellant, and directed the PIO to supply the information within 15 days of the order.
22.07.2024	The First Appellate Authority's order having not been complied with and no information having been received, the appellant filed the present Second Appeal under Section 19(3) of the RTI Act, 2005, before the Hon'ble State Information Commission, U.P. (Appeal No. S05/A/0518/2024, Registration No. A-20240701671).
28.11.2024	Commission (Hearing Room S-5) recorded that the PIO had still not supplied the information sought under Section 6(1). Notice issued directing the PIO/LDA to supply complete information within two weeks, and to appear in person with proof of dispatch, failing which a penalty of ₹250/day (max. ₹25,000) under Section 20(1) was proposed, together with disciplinary action under Section 20(2). Next hearing fixed for 31.12.2024.
19.05.2025	Both parties absent. No adverse order passed "in the interest of justice"; last opportunity granted; the Commission's earlier order dated 28.11.2024 re-served on both parties with a direction to ensure compliance. Next hearing fixed for 23.07.2025.
23.05.2025	PIO Sri Hemchandra Tiwari (Chakbandi Adhikari) finally disposed of the RTI application — 15 months after filing, and 12 months after the First Appellate Authority's compliance deadline — by REJECTING it under Rule 4(2)(b)(ii), on the stated ground that the information sought would require "new interpretation or

	analysis of existing data, drawing of inferences, making of assumptions, or providing advice or opinion."
18.07.2025	Appellant filed a detailed written objection before the Commission demonstrating that each of the six points sought is a plain factual/documentary Action Taken Report and does not call for any interpretation, analysis, inference, assumption, advice or opinion, and that the rejection is a mala fide misapplication of Rule 4(2)(b)(ii) to defeat a valid RTI request.
23.07.2025	Hearing before the Commission — reflected in subsequent notices; matter continued.
11.09.2025 & 24.09.2025	Respondent (LDA, through Special Officer Sri Ravi Nandan Singh) submitted written responses to the Commission — but these related to three entirely different and unconnected appeals (S10/A/1318/2024, S09/A/1768/2025 and S05/A/0428/2024) concerning alleged irregular allotment/registration of plots SS-1914 to SS-1918 under the Kanpur Road Scheme, and did not address the subject-matter of the present appeal at all.
11.12.2025	Appellant filed a Supplementary Submission before the Commission specifically objecting to the Respondent's practice of placing irrelevant documents (relating to unconnected appeals) on the record of this appeal, terming it a deliberate attempt to create a false impression of compliance, and reiterating the prayer for the correct point-wise information together with action under Section 20.
24.02.2026	Commission again found, on perusal of the record, that the Respondent/PIO had still not supplied the information sought under the original application dated 18.02.2024. A fresh Show Cause Notice under Section 20 was issued to the PIO, LDA, directing supply of complete information within two weeks with proof of dispatch, and directing the Vice-Chairman, LDA to ensure compliance before the next hearing, failing which a penalty of ₹250/day (max. ₹25,000) under Section 20(1) and disciplinary action under Section 20(2) would follow. Next hearing fixed for 13.05.2026.
13.05.2026	No information having been received and no communication whatsoever from the PIO's office, the appellant filed a written representation before the Commission recording deliberate and wilful disobedience of the Commission's directions and of the directions of the First Appellate Authority, and praying for (i) the maximum penalty of ₹25,000 under Section 20(1); (ii) disciplinary action under Section 20(2); (iii) a direction to the Vice-Chairman, LDA to personally ensure immediate release of the information; and (iv) compensation for harassment and delay.
09.06.2026	Commission once again recorded, on perusal of the record, that the Respondent had failed to supply the information within time or had supplied false, incomplete or misleading information, or had obstructed the furnishing of information, and held the matter fit for penalty under Section 20. A further Show Cause Notice was issued to the PIO to appear in person on the next date and show cause why the maximum penalty of ₹25,000 and disciplinary action under Section 20(2) should not be imposed. The Commission also directed the Divisional Commissioner (Mandalayukt), Lucknow to clarify the position regarding continued non-supply of information by the LDA. Next hearing fixed for 19.08.2026.
13.07.2026 & 20.07.2026	Formal notices issued by the Commission and by the office of the Divisional Commissioner, Lucknow to the PIO/LDA, referencing the order dated 09.06.2026 and directing that a written response (Para Vivran/KOF) be filed at least two days before the hearing fixed for 19.08.2026, and that effective compliance/pairvi be ensured before the Commission on that date.
19.08.2026	Matter listed for hearing. To date — a period exceeding thirty (30) months from the date of filing of the original RTI application — no complete, correct or point-wise information has been furnished to the appellant, despite five separate orders/show-cause notices of the Commission (28.11.2024, 19.05.2025, 24.02.2026, 09.06.2026 and the reiterations of 13.07.2026/20.07.2026).

3. Grounds

4. That the Respondent has, on its own showing, never furnished the six points of information sought in the original application — either within the statutory period, or pursuant to the order of the First Appellate Authority dated 30.05.2024, or pursuant to any of the four subsequent orders/show-cause notices of this Hon'ble Commission dated 28.11.2024, 19.05.2025, 24.02.2026 and 09.06.2026.

5. That the solitary occasion on which the PIO purported to act on the application — namely the order dated 23.05.2025 — resulted not in supply of information but in an outright and, it is submitted, mala fide rejection under Rule 4(2)(b)(ii), a provision that has no application whatsoever to the present request. Each of the six points sought is a plain, factual, record-based Action Taken Report or a request for the name/designation of specific staff — none of it requires the PIO to undertake any "new interpretation," "analysis," "drawing of inferences," "assumption," or "advice or opinion." The rejection order itself, being passed after a delay of 15 months, is ex facie an afterthought designed to defeat the application rather than a bona fide application of the exemption.

6. That the Respondent thereafter compounded the default by placing on the record of this very appeal documents relating to three entirely unconnected appeals (S10/A/1318/2024, S09/A/1768/2025 and S05/A/0428/2024) concerning a different subject-matter altogether (irregular allotment of plots SS-1914 to SS-1918), in a manner calculated to create a false impression of compliance before this Hon'ble Commission — a fact which the appellant specifically placed on record on 11.12.2025 and which has never been controverted by the Respondent.

7. That despite two further Show Cause Notices issued by this Hon'ble Commission under Section 20 of the Act — on 24.02.2026 and again on 09.06.2026 — directing the PIO to supply the information, and directing the Vice-Chairman, LDA and thereafter the Divisional Commissioner, Lucknow to personally ensure compliance, no information has been received by the appellant to date, nor has any communication whatsoever been received from the office of the PIO.

8. That the conduct of the Respondent, viewed cumulatively, constitutes a clear case of:

- failure to furnish information within the time specified under sub-section (1) of Section 7, without any reasonable cause;
- malafidely denying the request for information, warranting the higher scale of penalty contemplated under Section 20(1) proviso;
- obstruction, in the discharge of the PIO's official duty, of the furnishing of information sought — squarely attracting Section 20(1) of the Act; and
- persistent, repeated and wilful disobedience of the lawful directions of both the First Appellate Authority and this Hon'ble Commission, over a period exceeding two years, which independently warrants recommendation of disciplinary action under Section 20(2) of the Act.

9. That the appellant, a senior citizen, has been compelled to travel repeatedly between Mirzapur and Lucknow and to make numerous written representations over more than two years merely to obtain plain factual records to which he is entitled as a matter of right — resulting in avoidable harassment, expense and mental distress, for which he is entitled to be compensated.

4. Prayer

In light of the foregoing, the appellant most respectfully prays that this Hon'ble Commission may be pleased to:

10. Impose the maximum penalty of ₹25,000/- (Rupees Twenty-Five Thousand only) upon the Public Information Officer concerned under Section 20(1) of the Right to Information Act, 2005, for persistent and continuing failure/refusal, without reasonable cause, to furnish the information within the prescribed time and for malafidely denying the request;

11. Recommend disciplinary action against the concerned Public Information Officer(s) under Section 20(2) of the Act, having regard to the repeated and wilful disobedience of the orders of the First Appellate Authority and of this Hon'ble Commission on no fewer than four separate occasions;

12. Direct the Vice-Chairman, Lucknow Development Authority to personally ensure that the complete, correct, point-wise information sought in the original application dated 18.02.2024 is supplied to the

appellant forthwith, and in any event not later than seven days from the date of the order, with proof of dispatch/delivery filed before this Hon'ble Commission;

13. Direct that the false or misleading rejection order dated 23.05.2025 (citing Rule 4(2)(b)(ii)) be recalled/disregarded as being wholly inapplicable to the information sought;

14. Direct that the irrelevant material placed on record on 11.09.2025 and 24.09.2025, pertaining to unconnected appeals, be disregarded in the disposal of the present appeal;

15. Grant reasonable compensation to the appellant under Section 19(8)(b) of the Act for the detriment, harassment and delay suffered on account of the Respondent's conduct; and

16. Pass such further or other order(s) as this Hon'ble Commission may deem fit and proper in the interest of justice.

For all of which acts of kindness, the appellant, as in duty bound, shall ever pray.

Place: Lucknow

Date: 18.08.2026

Respectfully Submitted,
(Yogi M.P. Singh)

Appellant

Mobile: 7379105911

Email: yogimpsingh@gmail.com

On Mon, 13 Jul 2026 at 16:23, PADUM NARAYAN DWIVEDI <hearingcourts5.upic@up.gov.in> wrote:

8 attachments

-  **Document.pdf**
772K
-  **(Compressed)701671.pdf**
187K
-  **KOF1.pdf**
451K
-  **KOF2.pdf**
668K
-  **kof.pdf**
1199K
-  **RTIAppli.pdf**
255K
-  **Secapp.pdf**
214K
-  **KOF3.pdf**
1110K



उत्तर प्रदेश सूचना आयोग

7/7/ए. RTI भवन, विभूती खंड गोमती नगर लखनऊ

नोटिस संख्या :202607S05N200802

नोटिस प्रारूप - 2

दिनांक : 13/07/2026

अपील संख्या :S05/A/0518/2024

पंजीकृत संख्या : A-20240701671

अपीलकर्ता : योगी एमपी सिंह

वनाम

विपक्षी : जन सूचना अधिकारी

सुनवाई के लिए निर्धारित तिथि : 19/08/2026

सेवा मे,

(1) योगी एमपी सिंह

अपीलकर्ता

योगी एमपी सिंह

पिता /पति का नाम : राजेंद्र प्रताप सिंह

पता-सुरेकापुरम कॉलोनी जबलपुर रोड मिर्जापुर सिटी

जिला - मिर्जापुर

पिनकोड -231001

मोबाइल नंबर:- 7379105911

ई-मेल- yogimpsingh@gmail.com

इ.यू.संख्या :EUIN

विपक्षी : (1)जन सूचना अधिकारी

पता : Public Information Officer Office -

लखनऊ विकास प्राधिकरण लखनऊ ,पिन कोड :

226012

मोबाइल नंबर:- 9918001893

ई-मेल- raz.9125@gmail.com

इ.यू.संख्या :EU935251940IN

चूंकि उपर्युक्त योगी एमपी सिंह द्वारा सूचना का अधिकार अधिनियम २००५ के तहत द्वितीय अपील दिनांक 22/07/2024 को प्रस्तुत की गई है थी, जिस पर अग्रेतर सुनवाई दिनांक 19/08/2026 को की जाएगी।

अतएव उपर्युक्त अपील में दिनांक 09/06/2026 की सुनवाई में आयोग द्वारा पारित आदेश की प्रति संलग्न करते हुए अपीलकर्ता सम्बन्धित जन सूचना अधिकारी से अपेक्षा की जाती है कि उक्त आदेश के अनुक्रम में वांछित कार्यवाही पूर्ण करते हुए आगामी सुनवाई दिनांक 19/08/2026 हेतु निर्धारित तिथि से दो दिन पूर्व अपना लिखित कथन (ईमेल-hearingcourts5.upic@up.gov.in अथवा विभागीय पोर्टल-
<https://upsic.up.gov.in/>) पर स्कैन करते हुए पी0डी0एफ0 के फॉरमेट में मा0 राज्य सूचना आयुक्त, सुनवाई कक्ष संख्या एस-5 के समक्ष कृत कार्यवाही की आख्या प्रस्तुत करना सुनिश्चित करें।

राजेश कुमार
05/08/26

Rakesh Kumar Pushkar#541B2061BC9C8F6783DE2590BE595FF1

कृते पीठासीन अधिकारी

सु. एस-5

उत्तर प्रदेश सूचना आयोग



उत्तर प्रदेश सूचना आयोग
7/7ए, आर0टी0आई0 भवन, विभूति खण्ड, गोमती नगर, लखनऊ

अनुस्मारक

अपील संख्या एस-05/ए/0518/2024

अपीलकर्ता/शिकायतकर्ता	प्रतिवादी
श्री योगी एम0पी0 सिंह	लखनऊ विकास प्राधिकरण, लखनऊ
समक्ष : श्री पदुम नारायण द्विवेदी, मा0 राज्य सूचना आयुक्त।	
धारा	मांगी गई सूचना का सार
6(1)	आवेदक ने पंजीकरण संख्या जी0ओ0वी0यू0पी0/ई/2024/0006965 के लिए शिकायत की स्थिति एल0डी0ए0 के उप सचिव अतुल कृष्ण सिंह ने आवेदक की उपरोक्त शिकायत के संबंध में पत्र संख्या 220 दिनांक 17.02.2024 को एक रिपोर्ट प्रस्तुत की, आदि के सम्बन्ध में सूचन चाहिए है।

कारण बताओ नोटिस


पत्रावली प्रस्तुत हुई। पुकार करायी गई। उभयपक्ष अनुपस्थित है। सुनवाई कक्ष संख्या एस-5 में विचारार्थ अपील/शिकायत प्रकरण में सुनवाई के दौरान यह पाया गया कि आपने अपीलकर्ता/शिकायतकर्ता को विनिर्दिष्ट समय के भीतर सूचना नहीं दी अथवा असत्य, अपूर्ण या बहकावापूर्ण सूचना दी है अथवा निवेदित सूचना की विषय-वस्तु को नष्ट किया है अथवा सूचना देने में किसी भी ढंग से बाधा डाली है पाया गया है और इस तरह आपका मामला सूचना का अधिकार अधिनियम 2005 की धारा 20 में प्राविधानित दण्ड दिये जाने हेतु पाया गया है।

दण्ड जुर्माना अधिरोपित किये जाने से पूर्व आपको सुनवाई का युक्ति-युक्त अवसर दिए जाने हेतु उचित पाता हूँ। अतः इस नोटिस के साथ आपको सूचित किया जाता है कि आप दिनांक-19.08.2026 को सुनवाई कक्ष संख्या एस-5 में

सागर

उपरोक्त प्रकरण में उपस्थित होकर अपना पक्ष रखें, अन्यथा की स्थिति में आ
विरुद्ध धारा 20 में प्राविधानित जुर्माना अधिरोपित कर दिया जायेगा।

कार्यालय को आदेशित किया जाता है कि उक्त कारण बताओ नोटिस की
प्रति संलग्न करते हुए मण्डलायुक्त, लखनऊ को इस आशय के साथ प्रेषित की
जाये कि वह अपने स्तर से जन सूचनाधिकारी/कार्यालय लखनऊ विकास
प्राधिकरण, लखनऊ को निर्देशित करें कि वह अपीलकर्ता को वांछित सूचनाएं
उपलब्ध कराना सुनिश्चित करें। साथ ही सम्बन्धित जन सूचनाधिकारी को लिखे गये
पत्र की एक प्रति नियत तिथि पर स्वयं अथवा किसी सक्षम अधिकारी के माध्यम से
आयोग के समक्ष प्रस्तुत करें, ताकि प्रकरण में अग्रिम कार्यवाही की जा सके।



09.06.2026

पीठासीन अधिकारी
सुनवाई कक्ष संख्या एस-5