

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

102

**CIVIL WRIT PETITION NO.7577 OF 2019
DATE OF DECISION: MARCH 19, 2019**

Oriental Bank of Commerce, Gurgaon

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

The Central Information Commission, New Delhi and another

....Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH

Present: Mr. Anil K. Ahuja, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH, J. (ORAL)

Petitioner has approached this Court praying for quashing of the order dated 05.12.2018 (Annexure P-7) passed by the Central Information Commission-respondent No.1, vide which the appeal of the complainant-respondent No.2 (Rajesh Kumar Sharma) has been partly allowed, directing supply of information which does not relate to third party information as exempted under Section 8(1)(j) of the Right to Information Act.

It is the contention of learned counsel for the petitioner that the information, which is being sought by respondent No.2, is quite old and the same has earlier also been supplied to the said respondent. The application under the Right to Information Act has been filed with an intention to harass the officials of the petitioner Bank and, therefore, the order dated

05.12.2018 (Annexure P-7) passed by the Central Information Commission cannot sustain and deserves to be set-aside.

I have considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner and with his assistance have gone through the impugned order.

A perusal of the said impugned order dated 05.12.2018 (Annexure P-7) would indicate that the Commission has declined information with regard to points E, F, G, H of Part 1/1, Part 1/2 and points E, F and G of Part 2 and 3 of the RTI application pertaining to the personal information of third party. The information, which is ordered to be supplied, is on points A, B, C and D of Part 1/1, Part 1/2, Part 2 and Part 3 of the RTI application except for the details of quotations/tenders/invitations/bids received from the unsuccessful contractors/bidders to whom the contract/work order was not awarded. Rest of the information has to be supplied by the petitioner.

This court does not find any illegality in the order, which has been passed as the Commission has rightly proceeded to decline information, which was related to personal information as exempted under Section 8(1)(j) of the Right to Information Act.

So far as the contention of learned counsel for the petitioner that application has been filed by respondent No.2 with an intention to harass the officials of the petitioner-Bank, suffice it to say that intent has not to be gone into unless there is something which is exceptional. In the present case, there is nothing exceptional, which could be taken into consideration for the said purposes.

The writ petition, therefore, being devoid of merit stands dismissed.

March 19, 2019	(AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH)
khurmi	JUDGE
Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No