

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

RA-CW-424-2025 in
CWP-15182-2024
Date of decision: 05.05.2026

Parbhu Dayal

....Petitioner

Versus

State Information Commission and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. R.S. Sangwan, Advocate,
for the applicant-petitioner.

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

None for applicant-respondents No.3 to 5.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (Oral)

1) The applicant-petitioner, through the instant application, seeks review of the order dated 21.08.2025, vide which, the writ petition was disposed of, in terms of the statement made by learned counsel for the applicant-petitioner.

2) Learned counsel for the applicant-petitioner submits that during the course of hearing on 21.08.2025, the information was supplied *qua* points No.1 and 2, but the same is incorrect, apart from incomplete. In such circumstances, the order (*supra*), is required to be recalled/reviewed.

3) No other argument was raised.

4) Having heard learned counsel for the applicant-petitioner, this Court is of the considered view that the application at hand is devoid of any merits, as the information *qua* points No.1 and 2, was provided to the petitioner in the Court itself, which was also retained on record, as

Mark ‘A’. Whereupon, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that he did not intend to pursue the petition any further, being satisfied with the information. Accordingly, the writ petition was disposed of, with liberty to the petitioner to approach the office of the SPIO concerned, *qua* point No.3. The relevant part of the order under review is extracted hereinbelow:-

“3. Today, Mr. Jagdish Manchanda, Advocate, who has caused appearance on behalf respondents no.3 to 5, has placed on record a photocopy of the office report, alongwith the information, as sought, which according to him, has already been provided to the petitioner. The same is ordered to be taken on record as Mark 'A'.

4. In view of the above factual position, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is satisfied as the information qua points no.1 and 2 has been supplied, and does not want to pursue the instant petition any further, however, with liberty to approach the office of the SPIO concerned, qua point no.3.”

5) In view of the abovesaid position, this Court finds no reason to review/recall the order dated 21.08.2025. Accordingly, the application is **dismissed**.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

05.05.2026
Ak Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	Yes/No