

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH.

CWP 25912 of 2016

Date of Decision: March 15, 2017

Ranbir Singh

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Union of India and others

.....Respondents

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

-. -

Present:- Mr.Vaibhav Jain, Advocate
for the petitioner.

-. -

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

Petitioner through instant writ petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India seeks issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the official respondents to supply information to the petitioner under Right to Information Act, 2005 pertaining to the particulars of respondent no.4 who was recruited in CISF in the year 1981/1982. The description of the information required by the petitioner is educational certificate submitted for recruitment; date of birth mentioned in the documents (eligible age limit) for recruitment in CISF and qualification; and date of birth of respondent No.4. The said information has been declined by the respondents on the ground that the information sought for by the petitioner cannot be provided as disciplinary authority of the institution does

not come under Punjab and Haryana Right to Information Rules and Section 24 read with second schedule of the RTI Act, 2005 exempts CISF from providing information except for the cases of corruption and human rights violation and the information sought for does not fall precisely within the ambit of the two categories mentioned above. His appeal under Section 19 (1) of the Right to Information Act has also been dismissed on the same grounds.

Petitioner in the present case is seeking information which relates to personal information of Dhian Singh. Counsel for the petitioner claims that the information required is connected with larger public interest as respondent No.4, at the time of selection, did not fulfill the requisite qualifications for entry into service.

The above said purpose has been disclosed by the petitioner on asking of the Court. No doubt, there is no provision under the Right to Information Act requiring an applicant to disclose the purpose but in the opinion of this Court, the disclosure of purpose has a rationale nexus to the determination of the point whether the information required justifies larger public interest. Unless and until the purpose is disclosed, it is not feasible for the Information Officer or the Appellate Authority to determine whether the supply of the information would justify larger public interest.

In the present case, respondent No.4 appears to have retired on attaining the age of superannuation. The information falls within the definition of Section 8 (1) (j) of the Right to Information Act and has rightly

not been supplied to the petitioner. The purpose disclosed does not indicate that supply of information will satisfy the test of being in larger public interest.

Dismissed.

March 15, 2017
sanjay

(M.M.S.BEDI)
JUDGE

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