



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

**LPA-2099-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 19.08.2025**

PAWAN KUMAR **... APPELLANT**
VS.
STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION, HARYANA & ORS
... RESPONDENTS

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ROHIT KAPOOR**

Present: Mr. Sukhandeep Singh, Advocate,
for the appellant.

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA, J. (ORAL)

CM-5267-LPA-2025

Prayer in the present application is for condonation of delay of 64 days in filing the present appeal.

For the reasons stated in the application, the same is allowed and delay of 64 days in filing the present appeal is condoned.

LPA-2099-2025

1. This appeal arises out of an order passed by learned Single Judge dismissing the writ petition of the appellant, wherein order passed by respondent No.1 was assailed, whereby, information sought by the petitioner/appellant qua respondent No.6 was denied. The information claimed by the appellant was in respect to the appointment offered to the private respondent. It is undisputed that the respondents, under the RTI Act, have informed the appellant that the private respondent has been appointed in general cadre. The appellant, however, insists that he should be provided

personal information with regard to the private respondent so that he may be satisfied that the appointment offered to the private respondent is valid.

2. On a pointed query made by the Court, learned counsel for the appellant states that the appellant and the private respondent are the residents of the same village.

3. Learned Single Judge has taken note of the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India passed in Civil Appeal No.22 of 2009 titled as 'Canara Bank Rep.by its Deputy Gen. Manager Vs. C.S.Shyam and another', decided on 31.08.2017. The relevant paragraphs 13 and 14 of the said judgement are as under:-

“13) In Girish Ramchandra Deshpande's case (supra), the petitioner therein (Girish) had sought some personal information of one employee working in Sub Regional Office (provident fund) Akola. All the authorities, exercising their respective powers under the Act, declined the prayer for furnishing the information sought by the petitioner. The High Court in writ petition filed by the petitioner upheld the orders. Aggrieved by all the order, he filed special leave to appeal in this Court. Their Lordships dismissed the appeal and upholding the orders passed by the High Court held as under:-

“12. We are in agreement with the CIC and the courts below that the details called for by the petitioner i.e. copies of all memos issued to the third respondent, show-cause notices and orders of censure/punishment, etc. are qualified to be personal information as defined in clause (j) of Section 8(1) of the RTI Act. The performance of an employee/officer in an organisation is primarily a matter between the employee and the employer and normally those aspects are governed by the service rules which fall under the expression “personal information”, the disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or public interest. On the other hand, the disclosure of which would cause unwarranted invasion of privacy of that individual. Of course, in a given case, if the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer or the appellate authority is satisfied that the larger public interest justifies the disclosure of such information, appropriate orders could be passed but the petitioner cannot claim those details as a matter of right.

13. The details disclosed by a person in his income tax returns are “personal information” which stand exempted from disclosure under clause (j) of Section 8(1) of the RTI Act, unless involves a larger public interest and the Central Public Information Officer or the State Public Information Officer or the appellate authority is satisfied that the larger public interest justifies the disclosure of such information.”

14) In our considered opinion, the aforementioned principle of law applies to the facts of this case on all force. It is for the reasons that, firstly, the information sought by respondent No.1 of individual employees working in the Bank was personal in nature; secondly, it was exempted from being disclosed under Section 8(j) of the Act and lastly, neither respondent No.1 disclosed any public interest much less larger public interest involved in seeking such information of the individual employee and nor any finding was recorded by the Central Information

Commission and the High Court as to the involvement of any larger public interest in supplying such information to respondent No.1.”

4. The laudable object for enacting the RTI Act is to bring in transparency in public administration. Very often, it is found that such proceedings are made a tool for settling individual grievances by invoking the provisions of RTI Act. This appears to be one such case where despite requisite information being furnished, the appellant insists that he be provided further details with regard to personal information of the private respondent. The appellant has been pursuing his remedy under the RTI Act and has not only filed a writ petition but has gone to the extent of filing a Letters Patent Appeal. It appears that the object of filing of the writ petition is to settle some personal score.

5. In that view of the matter, we are not inclined to interfere in the appeal and the same is, hereby, dismissed.

6. Pending application(s), if any, also stand(s) dismissed.

(ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA)
JUDGE

(ROHIT KAPOOR)
JUDGE

19.08.2025

smriti

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