

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

**CWP-4614-2023**

**Date of Decision: 9<sup>th</sup> March, 2023**

Raghubir Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State Information Commission, Haryana and others

... Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN**

Present : Mr. J.S. Johal, Advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr. Samarth Sagar, Addl. A.G. Haryana.

\*\*\*

**AVNEESH JHINGAN , J.(Oral)**

1. This petition is filed with prayer to direct the respondents to provide the information to petitioner as per his application dated 17<sup>th</sup> January, 2022.

2. Brief facts are that petitioner served as a Home Guard from 1995 to 2009. He filed an RTI application seeking following information:-

*(i) List of all the Volunteers (regular or temporary) along with their full address currently serving/ superannuated in District Panipat, be provided.*

*(ii) Attested copies of Departmental directions, instructions/letters regarding the enrolment of all volunteers mentioned at point no.1.*

*(iii) Photocopies of application forms and all the required documents/certificates for enrolment of all the volunteers mentioned at point no.1, be provided.*

3. Aggrieved of information being declined, the petitioner filed the first appeal. The First Appellate Authority vide order dated 5<sup>th</sup> August, 2022 upheld the refusal of information qua point No. 1 and 3 dissatisfied

with the order in appeal, second appeal was preferred before the State Information Commissioner (for short 'commissioner'). The appeal was disposed of on 17<sup>th</sup> August, 2022 with directions that the list containing the names of the enrolled Home Guard volunteers be furnished to the appellant by masking their personal data. It was concluded that the information sought in point No.2 was supplied to the petitioner in another application filed by him.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner fairly submits that the directions of the commissioner in order dated 17<sup>th</sup> August, 2022 were complied with. He argues that the information sought under point no.2 was not supplied.

5. From the perusal of the impugned order, it is forthcoming that no issue was raised before the Second Appellate Authority that information *vis-a-vis* point No.2 was not supplied. The petitioner being satisfied with the information supplied to him on his earlier application never challenged it. There were no directions by the Commissioner to supply the information with regard to point no.2, there is no occasion for this Court to issue a writ of mandamus to the respondents for providing the information as per point no.2. It would not be out of place to mention that there is neither challenge to the order passed by the Commissioner nor there is prayer for quashing of order passed by the commissioner.

6. Consequently, the petition is dismissed.

(AVNEESH JHINGAN )  
JUDGE

9<sup>th</sup> March, 2023

|                |                           |        |
|----------------|---------------------------|--------|
| Parveen Sharma | Whether reasoned/speaking | Yes/No |
|                | Whether reportable        | Yes/No |