

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

(206)

CWP-767-2017

Date of decision: - 20.02.2024

Archana Pandey

....Petitioner

Versus

State Information Commission Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- None for the petitioner.

Ms. Palika Monga, DAG, Haryana.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present writ petition has been filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the impugned order dated 17.10.2016 (Annexure P-6) passed by respondent No.1, vide which respondent No.1 had dismissed the appeal filed by the petitioner.

2. On 16.05.2017, a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court was pleased to pass the following order: -

Present:- Mr.Shalender Mohan, Advocate for the petitioner.

-.-

Counsel for the petitioner is directed to satisfy this Court as to who is the State Public Information Officer for the purpose of the information sought for in paras 1 to 8, as a cursory look at the information sought for indicates that the information sought for by the petitioner pertains to different departments, for instance, the information pertaining to the application submitted to Governor, Himachal Pradesh mentioned in para 7 and the information sought for in para 8 pertains to the office of Prime Minister. Petitioner will

also satisfy this Court that the Sanskrit Sanskriti Protection Council is covered under the Chief Secretary, Government of Haryana for the purpose of supplying of information.

The State Information Commissioner, Haryana, vide annexure P-6 has considered the application of the petitioner and observed that the petitioner has sought information which pertains to SPIOs of multiple Public Authorities. Public Authority concerned implies that the public authority who would be holding information which an applicant seeks as per Section 2 (f) read with Section 2 (j) of the Right to Information Act.

Prima facie the application of the petitioner appears to be vague and frivolous having no relevance to any public interest.

Adjourned to July 11, 2017.

May 16, 2017

*(M.M.S. BEDI)
JUDGE”*

2. Nobody has appeared on behalf of the petitioner although the matter has been called twice.
3. Dismissed for non-prosecution.
4. Liberty is granted to the petitioner to move an application for restoration of the present petition or to file a fresh petition in case any cause survives.

February 20, 2024
naresh.k

**(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE**

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No