

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

CWP No.23514 of 2015

Date of Decision : 4.11.2015

Sarita

....Petitioner

Versus

State Information Commission, Haryana
and others

...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE MAHESH GROVER

Present: Mr. V.D.Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

MAHESH GROVER.J.

The petitioner impugns the order dated 21.9.2015.

Initially the petitioner submitted an application under the Right to Information Act, 2005 addressed to the District Revenue Officer-cum-Land Acquisition Officer, Gurgaon which was re-directed with the following remarks :-

“It is not pertained to Mini Secretariat. Service be effected in the office of HUDA, Sec-14.”

The Land Acquisition Officer, HUDA refused to accept the same.

The petitioner did not make any attempt further to submit application under the RTI Act but simultaneously chose to address similar grievance to the Chief Minister's Office which ostensibly was marked to the State Information Commissioner

and it was treated as a second appeal and notice issued to the concerned SPIO who responded to state that information was duly given to the petitioner on 25.8.2015. All the particulars of the shareholders of the land, date of acquisition, particulars of the land and the compensation received by the petitioner and other shareholders as also the remaining compensation which is deposited before the District Judge, Gurgaon and the particulars of the cheque were duly reflected in the information. The Chief Information Commissioner noticed that the information was delayed by about four days but condoned the same considering the explanation of the SPIO who attributed it to excessive workload.

The petitioner has now filed the instant petition with reference to Annexure P-1 and in particular para 2 that no information was given about the acquisition of the land to the mother of the petitioner late Raj Kumari and other shareholders. If the information supplied to the petitioner is seen, it details the entire sequences of the acquisition process and the compensation awarded. It also mentions the details of the compensation given to the shareholders including the mother of the petitioner. The petitioner herself has received compensation on 12.11.2014 of the amount which stands deposited before the District Judge vide cheque whose particulars have also been specified.

In view of the detailed information given to the petitioner, it is inconceivable that any grievance of the petitioner survives particularly with regard to the unawareness of the acquisition process.

In the considered view of this court, the instant petition is totally frivolous, lacks merit and is thus dismissed with costs of Rs.5,000/- to be deposited before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court within two weeks from today.

4.11.2015
dss

(MAHESH GROVER)
JUDGE