



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

113

LPA-1056-2026 (O&M)

DATE OF DECISION: 20.04.2026

Tripurari Chopra

... Appellant

Versus

State Information Commission, Haryana and others

... Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Prince Goyal, Advocate for the appellant.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (ORAL)

CM-2600-2599 -LPA-2026

Present applications have been filed for condoning the delay of 73 days in filing the appeal and 16 days in re-filing the appeal.

Keeping in view the contents mentioned in the applications the same are allowed.

Delay of 73 days in filing the appeal and 16 days in re-filing the appeal is condoned.

CM-2601-LPA-2026

Present application has been filed for placing on record document Annexure A-1 by way of additional evidence.

Having considered the contents of the application and the nature of the document sought to be produced, this Court is of the considered view that no ground is made out to permit the same, at this stage.

Consequently, the present application is dismissed



Main case

Present appeal has been filed against the order dated 07.11.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge in Civil Writ Petition No. 32906 of 2025, by which the information sought by the appellant has been held to be “No Information” and has been termed only as a “Query”, reply to which cannot be given under Section 2(f) of the Right to Information Act, 2005.

2. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the information sought is in the nature of a question, and hence, an opinion to the same was required to be supplied, which has not been provided.

3. We have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the records of the present case with their able assistance.

4. Keeping in view the fact that the “Query”, answer to which is being sought by the appellant under the Right to Information Act, 2005 is whether the Legal Aid Counsel for the appellant could be changed, which is in the nature of a query and does not amount to seeking of any information as is defined under the Right to Information Act, 2005 hence, the impugned order dated 07.11.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge needs no interference by this Court.

5. Accordingly, the present appeal is dismissed.

6. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

20.04.2026
sapna adhikari

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No