IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

(221) **CWP No. 28372 of 2024**
Date of Decision : 14.01.2025

Bharat Kapur

...Petitioner

Versus

Central Information Commissioner and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Petitioner in person.

Mr. D.R. Bansal, Advocate for
Mr. Varun Katyal, Advocate for respondent No. 2-Bank.

***

Harsimran Singh Sethi J. (Oral)

1. In the present petition, the challenge is to the order passed by the Central Information Commission dated 26.12.2023 (Annexure P-8) by which the appeal filed by the petitioner with regard to non-supply of certain information required by him has been dismissed, by recording a finding that information asked for has already been supplied.

2. The petitioner who appears in person has been asked, as to what information has not been supplied to him. The petitioner submits that he has already prepared a comparative analysis of the information sought under the Right to Information Act and as per the analysis which he has attached along with the petition at page No. 61, the information required has not been supplied.

Kanchan
2025.01.18 16:30
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this
order/judgment

3. Learned counsel for respondent No. 2-Bank submits that the information which was available with the Bank and asked by the petitioner has already been supplied with and the order passed by the Central Information Commissioner supports the said view and, therefore, in the absence of any material evidence to show that the information has not been supplied with, the relief claimed by the petitioner may kindly be declined.

4. I have heard the petitioner in person and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent No. 2-Bank and have gone through the record with their able assistance.

5. The validity of the order passed by the Central Information Commission is to be seen in the light that whether the facts of the case have been noticed and dealt with or not.

6. In the present case, the facts which were brought to the notice of the Central Information Commission have been noticed and have been dealt with to arrive at a conclusion that the information asked for by the petitioner has been supplied.

7. The analysis which the petitioner has attached at Page 61 of the paper book, is only according to his own view as to how such information was required to be supplied and what he meant by his application seeking information. Merely that the petitioner has another view of the information asked for but once the authorities envisaged under the Right to Information Act have already considered the application and supplied the information, at a given point of time, the said issue has to come to an end.

8. Further, the perversity in the order passed by the Central Information Commission has not been pointed out, hence, no relief can be

Kanchan
2025.01.18 16:30
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this
order/judgment

granted to the petitioner at this stage qua order dated 26.12.2023 (Annexure P-8).

9. At this stage, petitioner submits that he was also a humiliated and he intends to avail the appropriate remedy for defaming him, which was done at the hands of the Officers of the respondent No. 2-Bank.

10. In case, the petitioner is of the view that his reputation has been damaged and he has been defamed, he is free to avail appropriate remedy as envisaged under law for the redressal of his grievance by availing appropriate remedy before appropriate forum.

11. With the above observation, no ground is made out for any interference by this Court in the present petition.

12. Dismissed.

January 14, 2025 **(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)**
kanchan **JUDGE**

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

Kanchan
2025.01.18 16:30
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this
order/judgment