



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

CWP-5048-2024 (O&M)

Date of decision: 07.04.2026

The Naraingarh Multipurpose Primary Cooperative Credit Service
Society Ltd.Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and othersRespondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. A.D.S. Jattana, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Bhupender Singh, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Rajeev Sharma (Raju), Advocate,
for respondent No.5.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (Oral)

1. Through the instant writ petition, as cast under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, challenge is thrown to the orders dated 19.01.2024 (Annexure P-7), and 10.10.2023 (Annexure P-9), vide which, second appeal preferred by respondent No.5-applicant, under the Right to Information Act, 2005, was disposed of.

2. During the course of hearing, it emerges that, in essence, the petitioner is aggrieved against the following extracted observations recorded in the order dated 10.10.2023:-

“The case has been considered carefully and record of the case file perused. Information furnished is discussed. The Commission observes that in response to the appellant’s RTI application that requisite information has been furnished to the appellant by the respondent SPIO vide letter dated 20.03.2023. The Commission further observes that respondent SPIO responded the appellant’s RTI application with slight delay but it



was not intentional and hence finds no case for penal against the SPIO.

5. In view of the above, the case is decided with the following directions:-

(i) The appellant is at liberty to file a rejoinder to the State Public Information Officers with a copy to the Commission within 15 days from the receipt of information by raising specific observations, if any, that how the furnished information is incomplete & incorrect.

(ii) After receipt of rejoinder from the appellant, the concerned State Public Information Officer shall respond within next 15 days under intimation to the Commission.

(iii) Further, it is made clear that non-compliance of this order would attract the provisions of Section 20(1) of the RTI Act, 2005 against the respondent SPIO.

(iv) The appeal is disposed off accordingly.”

3. Upon being confronted, learned counsel for the petitioner could not satisfy this Court, as to how, in context of the abovesaid observations, the instant writ petition is maintainable, specifically, when neither any penalty has been imposed, nor has any direction been issued against the petitioner, thereby causing any prejudice to it. In such a situation, this Court finds no occasion to grant the asked for relief. Accordingly, the instant writ petition is **dismissed**.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

07.04.2026
Ak Sharma

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