

2024:PHHC:032557

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

201

CWP-25704-2019

Decided on :06.03.2024

Mahender Partap Chatrath

. . . Petitioner

Versus

The Central Information Commissioner-cum-Appellate Authority and others

. . . Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

PRESENT: Mr. U. K. Agnihotri, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kapil Kakkar, Advocate
for respondent Nos. 2 to 4.

VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)

1. Present Civil Writ Petition has been filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari quashing the impugned order dated 15.04.2019 passed by respondent No. 1.

2. Learned counsel for respondent Nos. 2 to 4 has submitted that as per their stand, all the information sought in Annexure P-1 has been provided but has fairly submitted that in case, the petitioner has some grievance left, then the petitioner may move a representation to the Public Information Officer of respondent No. 4-Bank and every endeavor would be made to meet the grievance of the petitioner and in case, for some reason, any document sought has not been supplied then the order giving reasons regarding the same would be passed within a period of one month from the date of receipt of the said application/representation.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the said stand of respondent Nos. 2 to 4 satisfies the petitioner and in view of the same, the present petition be disposed of.
4. Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances, the present Civil Writ Petition is disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to move an application/representation to the Public Information Officer of respondent No. 4-Bank and the Public Information Officer of respondent No. 4-Bank is directed to consider the same, in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of one month from the date of receipt of the said application/representation and in case, the pleas raised by the petitioner are found to be meritorious then the Public Information Officer of respondent No. 4-Bank would grant necessary relief in accordance with law and in case, the Public Information Officer of respondent No. 4-Bank is of the opinion that the pleas raised by the petitioner are not meritorious then a speaking order rejecting the same be passed within a period of one month from the date of receipt of the abovesaid application/representation.
5. This Court has not opined on the merits of the case and Public Information Officer of respondent No. 4-Bank would consider and decide the case of the petitioner independently, in accordance with law.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

06.03.2024

Mehak

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/~~No~~
~~Yes~~/No