

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

(210)

CWP-3829-2017

Date of decision: - 23.04.2024

Sadhu Ram

....Petitioner

Versus

State Bank of Patiala and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Mr. Abhimanyu Batra, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

None for the respondents.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. This is a Civil Writ Petition filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ, order or direction especially in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to provide the required information under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter referred to as “Act of 2005”).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner had sought information under the Act of 2005 and since the written information was not supplied, thus, the petitioner had filed a second statutory appeal before respondent No.3. It is further submitted that during the course of the said proceedings, oral directions were issued to respondents No.1 and 2 to provide the required information and to correct errors in the information provided and no written order was passed and subsequent to the said directions, a letter dated 15.12.2016 (Annexure P-6) was given by respondent No.1. It is stated that by the said

letter dated 15.12.2016 (Annexure P-6), since the complete and correct information was not provided to the petitioner, thus, the petitioner, being dissatisfied with the same, had further filed an application dated 21.12.2016 (Annexure P-7) to respondent No.3, but no order has been passed on the said application. It is further stated that at this stage, the petitioner would be satisfied, in case, respondent No.3 is directed to consider the said application dated 21.12.2016 (Annexure P-7) and to decide the same as expeditiously as possible.

3. No one had appeared on behalf of the respondents on 16.03.2020, 24.05.2022 and 30.11.2023. Today also, none has appeared on behalf of the respondents to rebut the said aspect.

4. Keeping in view the above-said facts and circumstances and the limited prayer made on behalf of the petitioner, the present petition is disposed of, with a direction to respondent No.3 to consider the application dated 21.12.2016 (Annexure P-7) and to decide the same as expeditiously as possible, preferably, within a period of six months from the date of receipt of the 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.3 would consider and decide the matter independently, in accordance with law.

April 23, 2024
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

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