

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

204

CWP-4904-2014 (O&M)

Date of Decision : September 02, 2025

SONEPAT URBAN COOPERATIVE BANK LTD., SONEPAT

-PETITIONER

V/S

STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION, HARYANA AND ORS.

-RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Ms. Shivani Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (ORAL)

IOIN-1-CWP-4904-2014

1. The main case is taken on board today itself for hearing.
2. IOIN stands disposed of accordingly.

CWP-4904-2014

3. The Sonapat Urban Co-operative Bank Ltd., through its Chief Executive Officer, has filed the instant writ petition challenging the orders dated 28.01.2014 and 07.02.2014, passed by respondent No.1-State Information Commission.
4. The respondent No.4 filed an application under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter referred to as the 'R.T.I. Act') seeking certain information. The supply of information was declined on the ground that Co-operative Societies are not bound under the R.T.I. Act to supply the requisite information. Consequently, the respondent No.4 filed an appeal

before the First Appellate Authority-cum-Deputy Registrar, Cooperative Societies, Karnal, which was allowed in his favour on 10.07.2013 and the State Public Information Officer-cum-Assistant Registrar, Cooperative Societies, Sonapat, was directed to supply the point wise information. Resultantly, the Public Information Officer-cum-Assistant Registrar, vide letter dated 11.07.2023, directed the petitioner to supply the point wise information in view of the order passed by the First Appellate Authority. However, this direction was not complied with by the petitioner, and this propelled the respondent No.4 to file the second appeal before the respondent No.1- State Information Commission. The second appeal was disposed of vide order dated 28.01.2014 with the following directions:-

“4. The Commission has considered the matter carefully and case file has also been perused. After hearing both the parties, the Commission has passed the following orders:-

(i) A notice shall be issued under Section 20(1) of the RTI Act to SPIO-cum-Assstt. Registrar, Co-op. Societies, Sonapat asking him to show cause as to why penalty @ Rs.250/-, subject to maximum of Rs.25,000/- for each day of delay in forwarding the appellant's application/ in furnishing the requisite information to the appellant be not imposed upon him. He is directed to submit his reply to the Commission's notice within three weeks & be personally present during the hearing on 01.04.14 at 11.00 AM.

(ii) A notice be issued the C.E.O., The Sonapat Urban Co-op. Bank Ltd. Sonapat to be personally present during the next date of hearing on 01.04.2014 at 11.00 A.M. alongwith the balance sheet of the Bank for the last two years.”

5. However, when the order (supra) was not complied with by the concerned, it led the respondent No.1- State Information Commission, by order dated 07.02.2014, to invoke the penalty provisions envisaged under Section 20(1) of the R.T.I. Act. Consequently, the show cause notice (supra)

was served upon the State Public Information Officer-cum-Assistant Registrar, Co-operative Societies, Sonapat.

6. The instant writ petition has been pending before this Court since 2014. As per the office report, the demise of respondent No.4 occurred during the pendency of the instant writ petition. However, no efforts have been made by the legal representatives of the deceased respondent No.4 to get themselves impleaded or substituted in his place and to pursue the instant writ petition.

7. In view of the supervening events, namely the demise of respondent No.4 and the absence of any efforts by his legal representatives to pursue the instant writ petition, this Court is of the view that no fruitful purpose would be served by directing the petitioner to supply the requisite information. Consequently, the instant writ petition is **allowed** and the **impugned orders are set aside**. However, liberty is reserved to the legal representatives of the deceased respondent No.4 to, if they still desire to obtain the information sought by the respondent No.4 can approach the petitioner by making an appropriate application.

September 02, 2025
devinder

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No