



CWP-2538-2021

1

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

(208)

CWP-2538-2021

Date of Decision : 01.10.2025

Punjab National Bank

...Petitioner

Versus

Central Information Commission and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Ms. Amrita Arora, Advocate for
Mr. Harsh Garg, Advocate
for the petitioner
(through video-conferencing).

Mr. Arvind Seth, Advocate
for respondent No.1.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J.(ORAL)

1. The petitioner-Punjab National Bank, a body corporate, by filing the instant writ petition, cast under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, has thrown a challenge to order dated 30.12.2020 (Annexure P-1), passed by the Central Information Commissioner (respondent No.1).
2. Perusal of the impugned order reflects that Sh. Binod Kumar Dobhal and Sh. Sunil Khullar, as per Section 20(1) of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter to be referred as the 'Act of 2005'), were found to be liable, being negligent in duty and has deliberately and malafidely delayed in supplying the information sought under the Act of 2005. Consequently, through the impugned order, a penalty of Rs.10,000/- each, was imposed. Furthermore, a direction was passed to deduct the penalty amount from their salaries, in two equal installments.



CWP-2538-2021

2

3. This Court, at the first instance, has posed a specific query to learned counsel for the petitioner, who has caused appearance through virtual platform, as to how, the Bank can maintain the instant writ petition, for the wrongs committed by the CPIO concerned, designated under the Act of 2005, to which, learned counsel for the petitioner answered that they are the officials of the Bank, therefore, it is the duty of the Bank, to protect them. She further submits that even the said officials have been transferred, and therefore, the instant writ petition has been filed by the Bank.

4. This Court has considered the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner and is of the considered opinion that the instant writ petition is a misconceived motion, as no cause of action arises for the petitioner-Bank, to challenge the impugned order. It is the grievance of the CPIO concerned, who were found liable for having committed an offence punishable under Section 20(1) of the Act of 2005, and therefore, the Bank has no cause of action to maintain the instant writ petition.

5. In view of the above, the instant writ petition is **dismissed**. However, liberty is reserved for the CPIO concerned, in case, still have any grievance to avail all remedy(ies), in accordance with law, on the same cause of action.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

October 01, 2025
Manpreet

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