



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(209)

CWP No. 8848 of 2022

Date of Decision : 24.02.2025

Sukhpal Singh Gill

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Deepak Nayyar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. T.P.S. Chawla, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

Ms. Eliza Gupta, Advocate with

Mr. Hakikat Singh Grewal, Advocate for respondent No. 4.

Harsimran Singh Sethi J. (Oral)

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that vide letter dated 21.10.2019 (Annexure P-1) the information sought by the petitioner has not been supplied for by the respondent No. 2 but still, the second appeal filed by the petitioner has been disposed of by the Chief Information Commissioner vide impugned order dated 18.08.2021 (Annexure P-4).

2. On being asked to point out as to how the impugned order dated 18.08.2021 (Annexure P-4) passed by Appellate Authority is incorrect, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that even the Vigilance Department vide letter dated 29.01.2019 (Annexure P-5) has sought certain information from the Department but the Department is not releasing the said information, which is arbitrary and illegal.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents submits that the issue being raised by the petitioner has already been enquired into by



the Department and nothing objectionable was found and in case, the Vigilance Department seeks any information, the same will be supplied as the said issue is between the Vigilance Department and the Department of the Rural Development and the petitioner has no role to file the present petition and that too under Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter referred to as '2005 Act').

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

5. As no perversity in the order dated 18.08.2021 (Annexure P-4) passed by the Chief Information Commission, Punjab has been brought to the notice of this Court, no interference is called for by this Court qua setting-aside of the impugned order.

6. With regard to any information being sought by the Vigilance Department from the Department of Rural Development, the Vigilance Department has enough strength to seek the record from the Department of Rural Development in case, the Vigilance Department comes to the conclusion that any irregularity has been done by anyone while working in the Department of Rural Development. The petitioner need not come to the rescue of the Vigilance Department as the said department has enough jurisdiction to seek the documents in case those are necessary for proceeding further.

7. Present petition is disposed of in above terms.

February 24, 2025

kanchan

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No