



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

106

CWP-13122-2026

Date of Decision : May 11, 2026

AMAN KUMAR BANSAL

-PETITIONER

V/S

STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION, PUNJAB AND ORS.

-RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Ms. Amandeep Kaur, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sahil R. Bakshi, A.A.G., Punjab.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (ORAL)

1. The instant writ petition assails the order dated 03.02.2026 passed by the State Information Commission, Punjab, whereby the petitioner's second appeal under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter referred to as "the RTI Act") has been dismissed.

2. Concisely stated, the information sought by the petitioner under the RTI Act has been declined on the ground that the petitioner failed to establish larger public interest involved in the said information.

3. At the outset, this Court posed a specific query to learned counsel for the petitioner as to how respondent No.3 would fall within the ambit of "public authority", as defined under Section 2(h) of the RTI Act. Learned counsel submits that respondent No.3 is a charitable hospital established on land measuring approximately 3360 sq. yards, gifted by Ludhiana Aggarwal Coop. House Building Society Ltd., Ludhiana. It is further submitted that the said hospital is receiving substantial financial



assistance from the exchequer.

4. This Court further queried learned counsel for the petitioner as to whether any material, apart from the above assertions, had been placed before the authorities to establish that respondent No.3 is a “public authority”. She fairly concedes that no such additional material was produced.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the petitioner and upon perusal of the record, this Court is of the considered view that the aforesaid two grounds are insufficient to bring respondent No.3 within the ambit of “public authority”, inasmuch as the land measuring approximately 3360 sq. yards was gifted by a private cooperative society, and there exists no material on record to corroborate the receipt of funds amounting to ₹31,00,000/- from the exchequer by respondent No.3. The reliance placed by learned counsel for the petitioner on certain *inter se* WhatsApp communications lacks any evidentiary weight sufficient for this Court to declare respondent No.3 a public authority, particularly when it remains unclear whether the purported donation of ₹31,00,000/- constitutes “substantial” financing. This Court cannot, on the strength of mere vague averments, declare respondent No.3 to be a public authority.

6. In view of the above, this Court finds no merit in the writ petition, which is accordingly **dismissed**.

May 11, 2026
devinder

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

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