

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

CWP No. 12392 of 2015

Date of decision : 04.10.2017

Yasin Khan

...Petitioner

V/s

State Information Commission, Haryana & ors.

....Respondents

BEFORE : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJAN GUPTA

Present: Ms. Sunita Gupta, Advocate for
Mr. Mohammad Arshad, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. RKS Brar, Addl. A.G. Haryana.

RAJAN GUPTA J.

Petitioner has posed a challenge to order passed by State Information Commission, Haryana. Operative part thereof reads as under:-

“4. The case has been considered carefully and the record of the case file perused. The Commission observes that in response to appellant’s RTI application, the respondent SPIO has taken appropriate action and furnished the available requisite information to the appellant without undue delay, but the appellant is not satisfied with it. The Commission is of the view that complete information sought by the appellant should be available with the Headquarters. Therefore, the commission decides to give the appellant an opportunity for inspection of the complete record pertaining to the case. The commission finds no case for initiation of penal action against respondent SPIO.

5. In view of the above, the respondent SPIO is directed to afford the appellant an opportunity for inspection of the complete record pertaining to the case within ten working days of receipt of this order under intimation to the commission. Consequent to the inspection, the appellant shall have no

option of seeking specific information from it, free of cost, limited to 40 pages.”

Response on behalf of the State has also been filed. According to same, information sought by the petitioner has already been supplied to him. Learned State counsel has referred to the averments made in the reply in this regard. A query has been put to counsel appearing for the petitioner whether any cause of action survives despite stand taken by the State. No clear answer is forthcoming. On perusal of the order passed by State Information Commission, it appears that needful has already been done. There is, thus, no ground to interfere in writ jurisdiction. Petition is hereby dismissed.

October 04, 2017

Ajay

(RAJAN GUPTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether reportable:

Yes/No