

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

CWP No.1565 of 2016

Date of Decision :25.1.2016

Prithvi Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State Information Commissioner and another

...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE MAHESH GROVER

....

Present: Mr. Rajinder Singh Rana, Advocate
for the petitioner.

.....

MAHESH GROVER.J.

The petitioner impugns the order dated 10.12.2015 by which penalty of Rs.15,000/- was imposed upon him for delaying the information sought by respondent No.2 under the Right to Information Act.

It is undisputed that the petitioner had held up the supply of information and the only reason for doing so was pleaded to be shortage of staff and pre-occupation with other duties. An attempt has also been made to state that the information sought by respondent No.2 is insignificant.

After hearing the learned counsel for the petitioner and noticing that concededly the petitioner has supplied the information belatedly, which he attributes to shortage of staff and

pre-occupation with other assignments, I am of the view that there would be no justification for accepting the ground offered for delay in supplying the information under the Act. There is nothing on record to suggest that the petitioner was prevented from supplying the information on account of the aforesaid facts. Besides, if the petitioner was indeed overburdened, he ought to have taken up this issue with the competent authorities. Having not done so and there being no material to evaluate the stand of the petitioner, there would be no reason for this Court to interfere with the impugned order. The plea of the petitioner that he was overburdened and the information sought by respondent No.2 was insignificant hold no appeal for the simple reason that it is not for the SPIO under the Act to evaluate and question the significance of the information sought by an individual.

No ground to interfere.

Dismissed.

25.1.2016
dss

(MAHESH GROVER)
JUDGE