



CWP-10576-2019

-1-

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

216

CWP-10576-2019

Date of Decision :18.02.2025

Vijay Hans

...Petitioner

Versus

State Information Commissioner, Punjab
and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Mayank Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. T.P.S. Chawla, Senior DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Ashish Kaushik, Advocate for
Mr. A.P.S. Sandhu, Advocate for respondent No.4.

* * *

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the grievance being raised by the petitioner in the present petition is that the information sought by the petitioner vide his application dated 10.02.2018 (Annexure P/1 & P/2) has been wrongly denied by the respondents and even the appeal preferred before the State Information Commissioner, Punjab to seek the said information has been rejected vide impugned order dated 13.11.2018 (Annexure-P/9) hence, it is the prayer of the petitioner that the respondents be directed to provide the information sought by the petitioner vide his application dated 10.02.2018 (Annexure P/1 & P/2).

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents submits that the information being sought by the petitioner was personal information of respondent No.4, which is a third party information, which is

**CWP-10576-2019****-2-**

either not available with the department concerned or cannot be disclosed under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (in short, '2005 Act') as the same is prohibited by virtue of Section 8 of the 2005 Act.

3. Learned counsel for the respondents further submits that any personal information cannot be provided as is stipulated in the 2005 Act and that is why, the order dated 13.11.2018 (Annexure P/9) whereby an appeal was preferred by petitioner has been passed even by the State Information Commissioner, Punjab denying the same hence, the present petition is liable to be dismissed.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record with their able assistance.

5. A bare perusal of the application dated 10.02.2018 (Annexure P/1 & P/2) vide which the information was sought by the petitioner, shows that the same was personal information of respondent No.4 which is a third party information and keeping the provisions of 2005 Act in mind the same cannot be supplied.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner has not been able to show any provision under the 2005 Act, which can underpin his claim so as to supply the said information.

7. Keeping in view the fact that there is no perversity in the impugned order qua the provisions of law or the fact, no ground for interference by this Court is made out and the writ petition is accordingly dismissed.

February 18, 2025*aarti***(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)****JUDGE***Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes**Whether reportable : No*