

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

(114)

CWP-5972-2017

Decided on: March 23, 2017.

Sunil Kumar Bansal

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Sant Lal Barwala, Advocate, for the petitioner.

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

Notice to Advocate General, Haryana.

On asking of the Court, Mr. Kapil Bansal, DAG, Haryana, present in the Court, accepts notice. Copy given.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that a written information had been supplied by Parveen Kumar Clerk on behalf of Kamla Devi, SPIO-cum-Superintendent of the office of Director, Secondary Education, Branch PGT-II that the information pertaining to points No.2, 3 and 4 as mentioned in the application under RTI Act Annexure P-1 had been supplied to the petitioner as recorded in order dated 29.08.2016 passed by State Information Commission, Haryana. Application filed for review of the order has been dismissed.

It will not be feasible for this Court to enter into the disputed question of facts in the exercise of writ jurisdiction.

Presuming that the observation made by a quasi-judicial authority is in consonance with the actual facts, I dispose of this petition with a direction that in case the petitioner approaches the State Information Officer-cum-Superintendent of the office of Director, Secondary Education,

Branch PGT-II, and the Director, School Education, Panchkula, within a period of one month, the information pertaining to points No. 2, 3 and 4 which is alleged to have been supplied to the petitioner on 20.07.2016 (as recorded in order of the State Information Commissioner, Haryana dated 29.08.2016, the information at points No. 2, 3 and 4 will be re-supplied to the petitioner at the cost of the petitioner.

In case of non-compliance of this order, it will be open to the petitioner to approach this Court again.

(M.M.S. BEDI)
JUDGE

March 23, 2017
harsha

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No