

**CWP-19732-2023****1**

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

(224)**CWP-19732-2023****Date of Decision : March 11, 2025****Raj Kumar****.. Petitioner**

Versus

State of Haryana and others**.. Respondents****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI**

Present: Mr. Anshul Baghla, Advocate, for
Mr. Chanderhas Yadav, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurabh Girdhar, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Mithun, Advocate, for
Mr. Abhishek Jindal, Advocate, for respondents No. 2 & 3.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J. (ORAL)

1. In the present writ petition, the grievance being raised by the petitioner is that the information which is being sought by the petitioner vide application dated 07.03.2018 (Annexure P-2), is not being provided to him, which is causing prejudice to him. Hence, it is the prayer of the petitioner that order dated 17.04.2018 (Annexure P-7) passed by First Appellate Authority and order dated 13.09.2018 (Annexure P-10) passed by the Information Commission vide which complete information sought by petitioner has been denied, be set aside.

2. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that the personal information about the employee is being sought vide application dated

**CWP-19732-2023****2**

07.03.2018 (Annexure P-2), which is not permissible as per Section 8 (1) (j) of the Right to Information Act, 2005 hence, the same cannot be granted.

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

4. A bare perusal of the application dated 07.03.2018 (Annexure P-2) through which the information required was sought, copy of which has been appended as Annexure P-2, clearly shows that the information sought by the petitioner is regarding the employees working with the Maharaja Aggersen Post Graduate College for Women, Jhajjar. The personal information with regard to their qualification, their application, the photocopies of the certificate deposited, their father name, mother name, address as well as the members of the selection committee have been asked for.

5. The question which arise for consideration in the present case is whether such information as has been sought in the present case can be provided under the Right to Information Act, 2005 or not. The said issue has already been decided by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India while passing order 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 paragraph 14 of the said judgment is as under:

“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



CWP-19732-2023

3

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.

6. A bare perusal of the above reproduction would show that any information sought with regard to the employees working which information is personal in nature, cannot be granted. Further, providing of such information, which is personal in nature, has been exempted because of it being 3rd party information as is envisaged under Section 8 (1) (j) of the Right to Information Act, 2005. Furthermore, it has been stipulated in aforementioned judgment that no larger public interest would be served while supplying such personal information.

7. In the present petition, similar information which is personal in nature is being asked qua the employees working in the respondent-Institution.

8. Learned counsel for the petitioner has not been able to rebut that in view of the judgment in ***C.S. Shyam's case (supra)***, the information sought cannot be supplied.

9. Keeping in view the above, no ground is made out for any interference by this Court in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

10. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed.

March 11, 2025*harsha***(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)****JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No