

**CWP-24948-2019****1**

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

(203)**CWP-24948-2019****Date of Decision : July 22, 2025****D.K. Saldi****.. Petitioner****Versus****Information Commissioner, Punjab State Information Commission,
Chandigarh and others****.. Respondents****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI**

Present: Mr. Munish Jolly, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Kanav Singla, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

None for respondents No.2, 4, and 5.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J. (ORAL)

1. In the present writ petition, the challenge is to the order dated 02.07.2019 (Annexure P-11) passed by the Punjab State Information Commission Chandigarh by which, a sum of Rs.25,000/- was imposed as cost under Section 20 (1) of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter mentioned as '2005 Act') and further direction was given to initiate departmental proceedings against the petitioner.

2. On 30.09.2019, the Department was restrained from initiating any departmental proceedings, which interim order continued to operate even as of now.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he has instructions to state that petitioner is ready to deposit Rs.25,000/- as imposed by the Information Commission but as the petitioner has already retired from service, the departmental proceedings will create problem in getting the retiral benefits as well and therefore, the said direction in the

**CWP-24948-2019****2**

impugned order be quashed.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that *prima facie*, the petitioner has no role to play in supplying of the information sought but has been brought into the controversy though, the responsibility to give the information lies with the Block Development and Panchayat Officer.

5. Learned counsel for the respondent-State submits that they are only complying with the order passed by the Information Commission qua initiation of the departmental proceedings.

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

7. Once, the petitioner is not averse to pay Rs.25,000/- as imposed as a cost under Section 20 (1) of the 2005 Act, no interference is called for qua the said issue.

8. As the petitioner has already retired from service, no useful purpose will be achieved in proceeding against the petitioner departmentally and further coupled with the fact that the departmental proceedings will withhold his retiral benefits, the issue in the departmental proceedings is not such so as to punish the petitioner in such a grave manner hence, the departmental proceedings directed to be initiated against the petitioner be dropped.

9. The present writ petition is disposed of in above terms.

July 22, 2025*harsha***(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)****JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No