

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARAYANA AT CHANDIGARH
205**

CWP-13830-2016

Date of decision: 26.02.2019

DEEPAK SINGLA

...PETITIONER

VS.

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION AND OTHERS

..RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH

Present: Mr. Shrey Goel, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Aman Pal, Advocate,
for respondents No. 2 and 3.

AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH, J. (ORAL)

On 13.02.2019, the following order was passed:-

“ Learned counsel for respondents No.2 and 3 informs the Court that as per the order dated 13.12.2018 passed by this Court, petitioner had to appear before the First Appellate Authority, Central University of Haryana, Mohindergarh, on 08.01.2019 at 11 AM, however, as an e-mail was received by the Appellate Authority from the petitioner that he is unable to come because of the strike of the Haryana Roadways, 29.01.2019 was fixed for his appearance so that the orders dated 30.11.2018 as well as 13.12.2018 could be complied with. On the said date, petitioner has not put in appearance nor any intimation was received from him.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that since the petitioner is working, he was unable to appear before the First

Appellate Authority, Central University of Haryana, Mohindergarh, on 08.01.2019 at 11 AM as ordered by this Court and on the subsequent date, which was given.

It appears that the petitioner is no more interested in getting the said information but in the interest of justice, one more opportunity is given the petitioner that in case, he appears before the First Appellate Authority, Central University of Haryana, Mohindergarh, on 20.02.2019 at 11 AM, the order dated 30.11.2018 be complied with. If the petitioner does not appear on the said date, it would be presumed that the petitioner is not interested in getting the information as he had sought under the Right to Information Act, through his application.

List on **26.02.2019** for further consideration.

To be shown in the urgent list.”

Counsel for respondents No. 2 and 3 informs the Court that the petitioner has not approached the respondents to supply the information or to inspect the records and to get the documents, which may be required by him.

Counsel for the petitioner does not dispute the said fact.

In view of the above, no further orders are required to be passed in the present writ petition and the same stands disposed of as the petitioner appears to be no more interested in obtaining the information as he had sought earlier.

February 26, 2019

(AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH)
JUDGE

pj

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No