



CWP-30378-2019 (O&M)

1

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

(203)

**CWP-30378-2019 (O&M)
Date of Decision : 16.09.2025**

Subhash

...Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Sandeep Bhardwaj, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Bhatia, Sr. Standing Counsel
for respondents No.1 and 2-Union of India.

Mr. Arvind Seth, Advocate
for respondent No.3.

None for respondent No.4.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J.(ORAL)

1. Through the instant writ petition, cast under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, a prayer is made for issuance of *mandamus*, upon the respondents, to provide the complete information to the petitioner, sought under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter to be referred as 'the Act of 2005'), vide his application dated 11.09.2017 (Annexure P-1).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that despite there being specific direction by the Central Information Commission, New Delhi (respondent No.2), dated 28.02.2019 (Annexure P-2), incomplete information has been provided to the petitioner, and therefore, apposite action under Section 20 of the Act of 2005, be taken against the authorities concerned.



3. Succinctly, the petitioner filed an application dated 15.04.2019 (Annexure P-1) under the Act of 2005, seeking information on seven points, as mentioned in the application itself. The Central Public Information Officer (CPIO), Sarva Haryana Gramin Bank Ltd., Rohtak, filed its response to the said application, on 24.05.2017. However, the petitioner was not satisfied with the said reply, and aggrieved with the same, he preferred the first appeal before the learned First Appellate Authority, on 03.07.2017, and the appeal was disposed of by the learned First Appellate Authority, vide order dated 19.07.2017.

4. The order passed by the learned First Appellate Authority, does not satisfy the petitioner, and therefore, he preferred the second appeal, before the Central Information Commission, New Delhi. The petitioner remained absent before the Commission. However, the Commission has passed the hereinafter extracted order :-

“6. The Commission after adverting to the facts and circumstances of the case, hearing the respondent and perusal of the records, notes that the appellant in his second appeal only wants to know that under which reserved category the loan was sanctioned to application No. WBF008292 by the respondent's H.S.G.B. Branch, District Rohtak. This information cannot be considered exempted under any provisions of the RTI Act. The respondent also agreed to provide the same, hence, the Commission directs the respondent to provide this information to the appellant in the form certified copy, within 10 days from the date of receipt of this order.”

5. Thereafter, in compliance to the directions (supra), the CPIO, Sarva Haryana Gramin Bank Ltd., Rohtak (respondent No.4), has supplied the hereinafter extracted information :-



Item No.	Details of information sought
1.	In this regard, it is intimated that the application No.WBF:008294 for HUDA, Plot was applied under DEPER (Defence Personnel) Category for Sector-14, Part-II, Hisar.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the above said information is rather incorrect and incomplete. Therefore, a *mandamus* be passed upon the CPIO, Sarva Haryana Gramin Bank, Rohtak (respondent No.4), to forthwith provide the information as directed by the Central Information Commission, New Delhi, and impose the punishment, by invoking the provisions of Section 20 of the Act of 2005.

7. This Court finds that the prayer made through the instant writ petition, is in fact, a misconceived prayer. Furthermore, for redressal of his grievance, the petitioner, ought to have approached the Central Information Commission, New Delhi, in case, he was not satisfied with the information provided by the CPIO, Sarva Haryana Gramin Bank, Rohtak (respondent No.4), and thereafter, the CPIO concerned, after taking cognizance of the matter, can pass apposite orders and the steps include taking decision, as to whether, Section 20 of the Act of 2005, is to be invoked, or not?

8. It transpires from the record that the petitioner has already filed a complaint, which is pending consideration. However, the petitioner is unable to apprise this Court, with regard to the present status of the said complaint. It reflects from the communication dated 27.05.2019, made by Registrar, Central Information Commission, New Delhi, to Sarva Haryana Gramin Bank, Rohtak (respondent No.4), whereupon, its response was called upon.

**CWP-30378-2019 (O&M)****4**

9. In view of the above, the instant writ petition is **disposed of**, being not maintainable, before this Court. However, the petitioner is at liberty to raise all such pleas, which are raised through the instant petition, before the Central Information Commission, New Delhi, as per law.

10. Ordered accordingly.

11. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of accordingly.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

September 16, 2025
Manpreet

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No