

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

CWP-31226-2019

Date of Decision: 15th February, 2023

Manjit Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Mandeep Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Charanpreet Singh, AAG, Punjab.

AVNEESH JHINGAN , J.(Oral)

1. The writ petition in the nature of Certiorari is filed seeking quashing of order dated 17.9.2019 passed by the Punjab State Information Commission (for short 'the Commission').

2. Brief facts are that the petitioner is RTI activist. He sought an information with regard to installation of CCTV Cameras at Kali Mata Mandir, Mini Secretariat, Patiala. As no information was supplied, petitioner preferred the first appeal and thereafter, second appeal was filed before the Commission. The Commission was informed that the respondent had supplied all the information asked for except the copies of the bills of CCTV Cameras which was a third party information. The Commission relying upon Section 8(1)(d) of Right to Information Act, 2005 (for short 'the Act') stated that third party information cannot be supplied and disposed of the appeal.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the public funds were utilized.

4. He has not addressed any arguments as to how bills issued by

third party for supply of material can be supplied in view of Section 8(1)(d) of the Act.

5. Section 8(1)(d) of the Act provides for exemption from disclosure of information. It deals with information including commercial, confidential, trade secrets or intellectual property which would harm the competitive position of a third party which cannot be disclosed unless it is in larger public interest.

6. In the case in hand, the entire information with regard to the supply of the material for installing CCTV cameras was provided to the petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner failed to show any public interest for seeking the details of bills issued by the third party.

7. No case is made out for interference. Petition is dismissed.

8. Since the main case has been decided, the pending application(s), if any is rendered infructuous.

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

15th February, 2023
anuradha

Whether reasoned/speaking	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No