



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(107)

CWP No. 10156 of 2025

Date of Decision : 08.04.2025

Rajnish Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State Information Commission, Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Prince Goyal, Advocate, Legal Aid Counsel
for the petitioner.

Harsimran Singh Sethi J. (Oral)

1. In the present petition, the petitioner demanded the information with regard to the MLR conducted by the hospital, which MLR, concededly has been given to the petitioner.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has also asked the information as to what is the procedure for carrying out the stitches by the Doctor, which has not been provided and the petitioner has also not been provided the name of the Doctor, who treated the petitioner.

3. It may be noticed that the procedure for stitching a wound is not an information but an opinion, hence, the same cannot be granted under the Right to Information Act, 2005 and in case, the petitioner wants to know the process, the same can be done from the literature available.

4. With regard to the name of the Doctor who had treated the petitioner, according to the respondents, the same was not mentioned in the



MLR and, therefore, whatever was mentioned in the MLR, the same has been granted and in case, the petitioner is aggrieved in any manner qua the non-mentioning of the name, the petitioner can avail appropriate remedy.

5. No ground is made out for any interference by this Court in the present petition.

6. Dismissed.

April 08, 2025
kanchan

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No