



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

CWP-35153-2025

Date of Decision : **14.01.2026**

MAYA DEVI

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

**STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION, HARYANA AND
OTHERS**

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present : Mr. Sunil Goswami, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Bhupender Singh, Addl.AG, Haryana.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J.(Oral)

1. Through the instant petition cast under Article 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India, a challenge is thrown to the order dated 09.04.2025 (Annexure P-1), whereby, the complaint preferred by the petitioner, was disposed of with the observation that the information which is available with the SPIO has already been provided to the petitioner.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits the information as sought, mentioned at serial no.1 and 2 of the application, was necessary and that has not been supplied to her, despite that such an order (*supra*) has been passed.

3. For better appreciation of the arguments of learned counsel for the petitioner, lets have a glimpse upon the information sought by the petitioner and the reply thereto, given by the SPIO concerned, which is

extracted hereinafter:-

Sr. No.	Details of Information sought	Answer
1.	Provide photocopies of the allegations made against Maya	Such specific information is not available in the records of this office.
2.	Please provide a photocopy of the authentic proof of Rs. 20,000 taken by Jagdish son of Shri Sher Singh.	As per records, no such information is available in the records of this office.
3.	Name the officer/employee who gave Rs 20,000.	As per records, no such information is available in the records of this office.
4.	Please provide a copy of the pen drive enclosed with Annexure 01 to 11. (CMOFF/N/2023/049751 dated 26-04-2023)	A copy of the information related to this point is enclosed from page number 1 to 22 and a copy of the pen drive (DVD) is enclosed along with the copy of the same.

4. Fetching grievance from the above reply, an appeal was preferred. The petitioner was asked to join the proceedings by the learned first Appellate Authority, but, she preferred to remain absent, therefore, the first appeal was disposed of accordingly. Thereafter, the petitioner preferred second appeal. The Information Commissioner, finding that the information which is mentioned at sr.no.1, 2 and 3, are not available in the desired form, therefore, the SPIO has rightly answered the same in negative.

5. This Court has put a specific query as to why a vague information has been sought, whereas the petitioner can sought the specific document from the SPIO concerned, to which learned counsel for the petitioner unable to satisfy this Court, rather agrees that information sought is, in fact, vague and ambiguous.

6. In view of the above, this Court finds that since the information as sought by the petitioner is vague and ambiguous, and is

not being maintained by the SPIO in the same form, has rightly been denied, and there is no illegality in the impugned order, warranting interference of this Court. Consequently, the instant petition, is hereby **dismissed**.

7. However, liberty is reserved to the petitioner to file a fresh application before the competent authority seeking specific information, as is required by her.

January 14, 2026
dharamvir

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

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