



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

CWP-10247-2023

Date of Decision:05.04.2025

SANJEEV MEHNDIRATTA

...Petitioner

Vs.

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION AND OTHERS

...Respondents

2. **CWP-16517-2021**

STATE BANK OF INDIA AND OTHERS

...Petitioners

Vs.

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION AND ANOTHER

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Kunal Grover, Advocate
 for the petitioner in CWP-10247-2023.

 Mr. Arvind Seth, Senior Panel Counsel
 for the respondent-UOI in CWP-10247-2023.

 Mr. Himanshu Malik, Senior Panel Counsel
 for the respondent-UOI in CWP-16517-2021.

 Mr. Anil Kumar Ahuja, Advocate
 for respondent nos. 3 to 5.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (Oral)

Present set of two writ petitions involve common question of law in the context of common set of facts and thus they are being decided by a common order as both petitions have been filed against the order passed by the Central Information Commission.

2. The petitioner-Sanjeev Mehndiratta is aggrieved that all the information asked for has not been supplied whereas the Bank has come



challenging the order on the ground that despite extending all the information required for, still the penalty has been imposed, which is arbitrary and illegal.

3. After arguing for some time, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as the disciplinary proceedings initiated against the petitioner-Sanjeev Mehndiratta, have not attained finality, the petitioner-Sanjeev Mehndiratta be given liberty to approach the authorities to seek the documents which are relevant for defending the said enquiry proceedings.

4. Ordered accordingly.

5. Learned counsel for the Bank submits that the information available has already been supplied, but, still, the penalty has been imposed under Section 20 of the Right to Information Act, 2005, despite there being no delay.

6. Learned counsel for the complainant-Sanjeev Mehndiratta submits that the imposition of the penalty is between the Court and the SPIO.

7. Keeping in view the totality of circumstances where, the information required was given, in the facts and circumstances of the present case, the imposition of the penalty is unjustified and is set aside.

8. The petitions are disposed of in the above terms.

9. A photocopy of the order be placed on the file of other connected case.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

05.04.2025

kv

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