

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

104

CWP-28146-2025

Date of Decision : December 02, 2025

KAMAL KAKKAR

-PETITIONER

V/S

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS.

-RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Ms. Garima Modi, Advocate (Legal Aid Counsel)
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sahil R. Bakshi, A.A.G., Punjab.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (ORAL)

1. The instant writ petition impugns the order dated 03.07.2025, which has been passed by the respondent No.6 on the second appeal preferred by the petitioner under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter referred to as the “R.T.I. Act”).

2. Assailing the impugned order, learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the information furnished to the petitioner is incorrect. It is submitted that the petitioner had sought information regarding the basis on which electricity connections were granted to one Sushma Kumar and Amit Verma. However, the information supplied indicates that the said electricity connections were issued in the years 2012 and 2014 respectively, under a Circular issued in 2016. Therefore, it is argued that the information provided is factually erroneous.

3. This Court is of the view that the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the petitioner are wholly misconceived. The petitioner

sought certain information under the R.T.I. Act, and the same has duly been supplied. If the petitioner believes that the electricity connections issued to the aforesaid individuals are illegal or not in conformity with the Circular of 2016, the remedy for such a grievance lies elsewhere. Moreover, the impugned order dated 03.07.2025 specifically records that the petitioner expressed satisfaction, having failed to point out any deficiency in the information furnished to him. The relevant extract of the impugned order is reproduced below:-

“3. Although the appellant contended that he has not received information through registered post but as a copy of the same, which is on record and a copy of the same is handed over to the appellant and after receipt of the same, no deficiency has been pointed out by the appellant.”

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner is unable to dispute the factual observations recorded by the respondent No. 6 in the impugned order. In view of the above, no ground is made out for interference, and the **writ petition is accordingly dismissed**. However, the petitioner is granted liberty to raise his grievance by instituting an appropriate motion before the competent forum/court.

December 02, 2025
devinder

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No