



LPA-1037-2026 (O&M)

1

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

**CM-2543-LPA-2026 & CM-
2544-LPA-2026 in/and
LPA-1037-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision: 17.04.2026**

TRIPURARI CHOPRA

...Appellant

VERSUS

STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION, HARYANA & OTHERS

...Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Prince Goyal, Legal Aid Counsel for the appellant.

Ms. Anu Pal, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Suvir Sidhu, Advocate for respondents No.2 and 3.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (Oral)

CM-2543-LPA-2026 & CM-2544-LPA-2026

Present applications have been filed for condoning the delay of 73 days in filing the appeal and 10 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 10 days in re-filing the appeal is condoned.

CM-2545-LPA -2025

**LPA-1037-2026 (O&M)**

2

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.

LPA-1037-2026

1. Present appeal has been filed against the order dated 07.11.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge in Civil Writ Petition No. 32903 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 same is not framed in question-answer form, and only an opinion to the same was required to be supplied, which has not been provided by the learned Single Judge.
3. We have heard learned counsel for the appellant and have gone through the records of the present case with his able assistance.
4. Keeping in view the fact that the “Query”, answer to which is being sought by the appellant is whether a Legal Aid Counsel, in a criminal case, may appear on behalf of the complainant without obtaining a vakalatnama or request letter for engagement, and without informing the complainant or perusing the case file, particularly in cases involving



LPA-1037-2026 (O&M)

3

heinous offences against women, on the date of final arguments, 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 and 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

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

17.04.2026
Amandeep

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