

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP No.12022 of 2016 (O & M)

Date of decision: 14.09.2016

Aseem Takyar

....Petitioner

Vs.

State Information Commission Haryana
and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.S.SARON
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE LISA GILL

Present: Mr. Rajpal Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Johan Kumar, Advocate for the petitioner.

S.S.SARON,J.

The Civil Writ Petition has been filed for issuing a writ of mandamus directing the respondents to provide video conferencing facility in all the Court rooms of Information Commissioners, Haryana for hearing the appeals and complainants under Right to Information Act, 2005 ('Act' - for short) and also implement the decision taken by the Information Commissioners on 18.07.2013 (Annexure P-2).

The Commissioners of the Information Commission held a meeting on 26.08.2013 and minutes of the 16th meeting of the State Information Commission, Haryana were recorded. The decision taken by Shri Naresh Gulati, State Chief Information Commissioner, Haryana on 18.07.2013 reads as under:-

"With the financial support of the Government of India, Department of Personnel & Training, New Delhi, the Commission has set up a studio in SCO No.114-115 (Ground Floor), Sector 8-C, Chandigarh to hear the cases

through Video Conferencing. The Studio has been set up with technical support of Hartron having SWAN facility. After the setting up of this facility the cases can be heard from Chandigarh by directing the appellants/complainants/respondents to be present in the SWAN studio at district headquarter. All the Information Commissioners are informed accordingly. They are requested to avail this facility henceforth.

(Naresh Gulati)
SCIC
18.07.2013"

The petitioner wants implementation of the said decision.

After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner, we are of the view that in case the State Chief Information Commissioner has passed the order dated 18.07.2013 (Annexure P-2) for providing video conferencing facility then this Court is not to act an executing Court to execute such an order.

In the circumstance, learned counsel for the petitioner prays that he may be allowed to withdraw the petition for the present and pursue his remedies with the State Government.

Dismissed as withdrawn.

(S.S. SARON)
JUDGE

(LISA GILL)
JUDGE

14.09.2016
A.Kaundal

Note:

- | | | |
|--|-----|----|
| 1. Whether the order is speaking/reasoned: | Yes | |
| 2. Whether the order is reportable | : | No |