

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

CWP No. 6560 of 2016 (O&M)

DECIDED ON: 3rd March, 2023

Rajinder Kumar Gupta

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

UT of Chandigarh and others

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN.

Present: Ms. Anjali Sheoran, Advocate for petitioner.
Mr. M.K. Dogra, Addl. Standing counsel UT Chandigarh.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (ORAL)

This is a petition seeking direction to respondent Nos. 3 and 4 to comply with order dated 22.7.2015 and 23.7.2015 passed by the Central Information Commission.

The brief facts are that the petitioner filed nineteen applications seeking information pertaining to Fair Price Shop of M/s Aggarwal Karyana Store, Village Kajheri, U.T.

Aggrieved of non-supply of information, petitioner filed first appeal and thereafter second appeal. The second appeal was disposed of directing the respondents to provide complete and categorical information issue wise. The present petition has been filed for directions to respondent to comply with order. On 22.2.2023, learned counsel for respondent stated that in pursuance to order dated 12th September, 2019 of this court the petitioner had inspected the entire record and inspection done by him was duly videographed. Learned counsel for the petitioner took time to have instructions.

Today an application is moved for placing on record Annexures A1 to

A5.

It would be relevant to note that the writ petition is pending since 2016. The petitioner inspected the record in 2019 thereafter sat quietly for almost more than 3 ½ years and has now filed an application. Moreover, from perusal of Annexure-A4 dated 4.10.2019 annexed with application, it is evident that the petitioner was permitted to inspect entire record. The grievance is that 30 to 40 files were given to him for inspection to enable him to get the requisite information.

It would not be out of place to mention that after inspection the petitioner never approached the Central Information Commission with the grievance or a compliant that the information as asked for was not supplied during the inspection.

Considering that the entire record was provided to the petitioner for inspection and it is not a case of the petitioner that the copies of the requisite document asked for were not supplied. No cause of action survives.

The petition is dismissed.

Since the main case has been dismissed, pending application, if any is rendered infructuous.

3rd March, 2023
reema

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>No</i>