



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

(215)

CWP No. 26199 of 2023 (O&M)

Date of Decision : 13.02.2025

Lucky Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

Punjab State Information Commission and others

...Respondents

***CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI***

Present: Ms. Meena Bansal, Advocate and  
Ms. Navjot Kaur, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Akshita Chauhan, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

\*\*\*

**Harsimran Singh Sethi J. (Oral)**

1. In the present petition, the grievance being raised by the petitioner is that he had asked certain information, which is not being supplied.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the personal information of one of the employee was sought, namely, Veena Kumari from respondent No. 3 so as to give the name and the address of her husband, which information is not being provided.

3. Learned State counsel submits that the personal information of an employee, namely, Veena Kumari cannot be given as the same is barred under Section 8(1) of the 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. The asking of the personal information of an employee relates to the privacy of the employee concerned. Concededly, no information qua the official duties of the employee, namely, Veena Kumari was being sought by the petitioner. Further, the information asked for was with regard to the name of the husband of one of the employee, namely Veena Kumari and during the hearing, the Court has been apprised by the counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is actually the husband of Veena Kumari. Nothing has come on record as to why the husband is seeking the information from the Department about the name and address of the husband of Veena Kumari that is to say that the husband is seeking details about himself, which is surprising.

6. Keeping in view the fact that personal information is not to be made available under 2005 Act, no ground is made out for any interference by this Court.

7. Dismissed.

**February 13, 2025**  
*kanchan*

**(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)**  
**JUDGE**

*Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes*

*Whether reportable : No*