

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

(103)

CWP-22415-2016

Decided on: April 05, 2017.

Gurdial Sharma

.... Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.M.S. BEDI

Present: Mr. Aman Dhir, Advocate, for the petitioner

M.M.S. BEDI, J (ORAL)

Through instant petition, petitioner seeks a writ in the nature of mandamus directing eight respondents to provide the information under Right to Information Act, 2005 after probing representations of the petitioner addressed to their higher authorities.

From the averments in the petition which has been drafted by the petitioner himself, it appears that he had filed representation to the President of India, New Delhi complaining about the functioning of Central Information Commission, New Delhi against whom the petitioner had lodged complaint. Petitioner claims that neither his representations were presented before Worthy President of India nor comments were sought by the President Secretariat from Central Information Commission on representation which took 48 months and 27 months respectively to decide. The Chief Information Commissioner, New Delhi vide Annexure P-4 had taken action on the representations which are mentioned in para 7 of Annexure P-4.

I have perused Annexures P-5 to P-11 and Annexures P-12 to P-16 indicating that the petitioner had sought different types of information from different Information Officers of different departments; some

pertaining to the ACRs of Bank employees; some pertaining to the inquiry reports of the Reserve Bank of India; few of the information appear to be regarding the authorities of PUDA; some information appear to be pertaining to reasonable business offices, Ferozepur Cantt. regarding the file noting ACRs and investigation report and few of the information appear to be pertaining to the Life Insurance Corporation of India regarding the benefit available to the handicapped persons.

The petitioner had filed a complaint to the President of India, New Delhi Annexure P-1 dated 26.02.2013, making reference to his six informations claiming that these have not been supplied. Vide Annexure P-2, the petitioner had sent another letter dated 19.04.2014 in continuation of original letter dated 26.02.2013. The RTI Office has informed the status of his complaint dated 26.02.2013 and 30.04.2014 advising him that he may avail the remedy of approaching the Appellate Authority, in case, some information is required by him.

The petitioner appears to have filed an appeal before the Central Information Commission seeking information pertaining to his representations dated 26.02.2013 and 19.04.2014 addressed to the President of India. The appeal has been disposed of by informing the petitioner about the status of his representations dated 26.02.2013 and 19.04.2014.

Perusal of the petition does not indicate whether the petitioner through the present writ petition seeks remedy for all the petitions filed by him in different departments or he is aggrieved by order Annexure P-4.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner, deputed by the High Court Legal Services Authority, at length, who has tried to explain the grievance of the petitioner in detail.

After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner, it appears that so far as representations dated 26.02.2013 and 19.04.2014 submitted in the office of President of India, are concerned, the same have been dealt with and the information pertaining to those has been supplied to the petitioner by Central Information Commission.

No further action appears to be necessary as the information has already been supplied regarding the status of his representations Annexure P-1 and P-2.

So far as the other relief claimed is concerned, it will always be open to the petitioner to file separate appeals against the orders passed by the Public Information Officers of the different departments or the order passed by the State Information Commission.

With said liberty, this petition is disposed of.

(M.M.S. BEDI)
JUDGE

April 05, 2017
harsha

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No