

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

**CWP No.20737 of 2010
Decided on : 01.12.2016**

Vinod Kumar

... Petitioner

Versus

Haryana Staff Selection Commission, Panchkula & others

... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE G.S. SANDHAWALIA

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr.Indresh Goel, Addl.A.G., Haryana.

G.S. Sandhawalia, J. (Oral)

Petitioner seeks information under the Right to Information Act, 2005, as per his application (Annexure P1). The information is sought regarding the selection made vide advertisement No.6 of 2006 under Category 23 and the result declared on 01.04.2010 by the respondent-Commission. Apart from the petitioner's own information, information regarding Sudesh Devi, Parveen Kumari and Manjeet Kumar, has been sought and also against a large number of candidates and the addresses of the candidates, their educational qualifications, marks obtained etc. were also sought.

Initially, on 28.05.2010 (Annexure P-2) information was supplied to the petitioner of a candidate who himself had applied for the post of Physical Training Instructor. The rest of information was declined on the ground that it had no relation with any public interest. An appeal was filed before the First Appellate Authority, in June, 2010 and thereafter, 2nd appeal was also filed on 27.08.2010 (Annexure P4).

Vide interim order dated 22.11.2010, direction was issued by this Court as to why the appeal is not being decided and the information sought was relevant as the petitioner was also applying in the process of selection for public service. Further direction was issued to decide the appeal by the Appellate Authority.

As per the affidavit filed by the SPIO, respondent-Commission, the First Appellate Authority called the petitioner for hearing on 30.07.2010 and he was informed of the marks obtained by the highest and the lowest selected candidates, both in the male and female categories. It was also mentioned that the 2nd appeal had been returned, vide communication dated 24.09.2010 (Annexure R4/2), on account of the fact that it was not as per Rule 6 of the Haryana Right to Information Rules, 2009.

In the affidavit filed, it has been further averred that the details in respect of the 4 candidates which had been demanded by the petitioner had been conveyed to him on 07.12.2010 (Annexure R4/3). Regarding the balance original application forms of 627 candidates, the same was transmitted to the SPIO, School Education Department, Haryana. It is further submitted that it was not practical to provide the data regarding large number of applicants who are applying for the civil posts and the figure may even reach up to lakhs and the labour, finance and time involved are not commensurate with the result.

Thus, from the above discussion, it would be clear that vide the communication dated 07.12.2010, the necessary information qua the

petitioner and other 4 candidates had been duly supplied to him. He had also been called to inspect the record. As per the communication dated 07.12.2010, the information regarding the application forms of all selected candidates was to be obtained from the SPIO of School Education Department, as the same had been sent to the said department. It is also to be noticed that no replication has been filed by the petitioner to counter the said allegations.

Resultantly, keeping in view the above, this Court is of the opinion that necessary compliance at the hands of the respondents has been made. Accordingly, in the facts and circumstances of the case, the present writ petition has been rendered infructuous and the same is, disposed of, as such.

DECEMBER 1st, 2016

s/ sailesh

**(G.S. SANDHAWALIA)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes

Whether Reportable: No