

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

(101)

CWP-2846-2024

Date of decision: - 09.02.2024

Lal Chand Bansal

....Petitioner

Versus

Punjab State Information Commission and another

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Ms. Tanya Sehgal, Advocate, and
Mr. Abhishek Singla, Advocate, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ferry Sofat, Additional Advocate General, Punjab.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present writ petition has been filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondent No.1 to register the complaint dated 04.12.2023 (Annexure P-2) filed by the petitioner.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner had given an RTI application dated 22.11.2023 (Annexure P-1) to respondent No.2, who is a Public Information Officer-cum-Executive Officer, Department of Local Government, District Administrative Complex, Patiala and the said application has been sent through registered post, but however, an endorsement has been made on the same, which shows that the office of the authorities refused to accept the same.

It is further submitted that the petitioner, at this stage, would be satisfied

in case respondent No.2 considers the RTI application dated 22.11.2023 (Annexure P-1) in accordance with law, within a specified time frame.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the respondents has submitted that respondent No.2 would consider the said RTI application dated 22.11.2023 (Annexure P-1), filed by the petitioner, in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, within a period of one month from the date of certified copy of this order.

4. Keeping in view the above-said facts and circumstances, the present petition is disposed of, with a direction to respondent No.2 to consider the RTI application dated 22.11.2023 (Annexure P-1), filed by the petitioner, in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of one month from the date of certified copy of this order.

5. It is made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits of the case and respondent No.2 would consider and decide the matter independently, in accordance with law.

February 09, 2024
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

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