

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARAYANA AT CHANDIGARH
201**

CWP-21437-2015

Date of decision:06.08.2018

Municipal Corporation, Faridabad and another *...PETITIONERS*

Vs.

State Information Commissioner, Haryana and another *..RESPONDENTS*

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH

Present: Mr. Anil Chawla, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Sandeep Singh Mann, Sr. DAG, Haryana,
for the State.

Mr. Ram Bilas Gupta, Advocate,
for respondent No. 2.

AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH, J. (ORAL)

Petitioners have approached this Court challenging the order dated 01.07.2015 (Annexure P-7) passed by the State Information Commission, Haryana, whereby the information, as sought by respondent No. 2 on points No. 3, 5 and 6 as per his RTI application dated 11.12.2014, has been ordered to be supplied within a period of three weeks from the date of the order.

It is the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioners that the petitioners have denied this information primarily on the ground that no tabulated information has been maintained by the petitioners with regard to point No. 5 and rest of the information was denied on the basis that the information was personal and cannot be conveyed to respondent

No. 2.

I have considered the submissions made by the counsel for the petitioners and with his assistance, have gone through the information, as has been sought by respondent No. 2.

It may be correct that the petitioners, qua point No. 5, are not maintaining the information, as sought, in the tabulated form but the said information cannot be said to be deniable to respondent No. 2 merely because it is not being maintained in the tabulated form. The said information qua point No. 5, therefore, be supplied to respondent No. 2 in the manner which is maintained by the petitioners within a period of two weeks from today.

As regards the information qua points No. 3 and 6 is concerned, this Court does not find any ground to interfere or even clarify the said aspect and, therefore, the said information be supplied to respondent No. 2 within the time already stipulated.

As regards the show cause notice issued to the PIO is concerned, it would be open to the Commission to proceed further in accordance with law.

The writ petition, therefore, stands dismissed.

August 06, 2018

pj

**(AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No