



**RIGHT TO
INFORMATION**

1

**STATE INFORMATION COMMISSION, HARYANA
SCO 70-71 and 114-115, SECTOR 8-C,
Chandigarh.
Website: cicharyana.gov.in**

**Appeal Case No. 2053 of 2010
Appeal Case No. 3042 of 2010
Appeal Case No. 3171 of 2011
Appeal Case No. 4398 of 2012
Appeal Case No. 1602 of 2013
Appeal Case No. 2089 of 2014**

1. Sh. Chander Bhan Saini, #48/14, Kirpal Nagar, Rohtak.
2. Smt. Nirmal Dalal W/o Sh. S.S Dalal, #1148-FF, Sector-17-B, IFFCO Colony, Gurgaon.
3. Sh. Rattan Lal Chokhani, Lohar Bazar, Bhiwani.
4. Sh. Pawan Kumar, Chamber no. 109, Judicial Complex, District Courts, Rohtak.
5. Sh. Jai Pal Gupta, Advocate, Chamber no. 68, District Courts, Kurukshetra.
6. Sh. Harinder Dhingra, D4A/7, DLF, Phase-I, Gurgaon.

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

1. President, Saini Education Society, Rohtak.
2. Principal, Model School, Rohtak & the Deputy Commissioner, Rohtak.
3. Vaish Senior Secondary School, Bhiwani.
4. Principal, Model School, Rohtak.
5. SPIO-cum-Block Education Officer, Ladwa (Kurukshetra).
6. The Principal, Shri Ram School, V-37, Mousari Avenue, Phase II, DLF, Gurgaon and the District Education Officer, Gurgaon.

.....Respondent(s)



This matter has arisen in pursuance of the earlier hearings (expect in Appeal Cases No. 1602 of 2013 and 2089 of 2014) held by different benches of the Commission in these cases and the order of the Hon'ble Division Bench of the Punjab & Haryana High Court disposing of the pending LPAs with the direction to the Commission to evaluate each case individually in the light of the judgement passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Thalappalam Ser. Coop Bank Limited's case. The matter whether, private schools involved in these cases are the public authorities in terms of Section 2 (h) of the RTI Act, 2005 (hereinafter called Act) and fall under the ambit of the Act was under the consideration of the Hon'ble High Court. The Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court while disposing of all such Civil Writ Petitions in LPA No. 1174 of 2011 (O&M) titled Punjab Cricket Association Vs State Information Commission, Punjab and another decided the matter on 12.12.2013 by passing the following order:

8. (i) *The orders passed by the State Information Commission (SIC) and the learned Single Judge in all these appeals are set aside. The matter is remanded to the SIC to decide the same afresh.*
- (ii) *The interim order shall continue till the disposal of the appeals by the SIC.*
- (iii) *All the pleas available to the appellants herein shall be allowed to be raised before the SIC. The SIC shall decide the matter afresh keeping in view the judgement of the Apex Court in **Thalappalam Ser. Coop Bank Limited's case (supra)** within six months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.*



- (iv) *Each case shall be decided separately by referring to the facts involved therein.*
- (v) *The SIC shall not be influenced by anything which has been observed herein while deciding the matter afresh.*

2. The larger bench of the Commission started the proceedings on 20.06.2014. The Bench during hearing noted that the burden to show that a body is owned, controlled or substantially financed or that a non-government organization is substantially financed directly or indirectly by the funds provided by the appropriate Government is on the applicant who seeks information or the appropriate Government. The appellants could not produce any material facts in order to assist the Commission in adjudicating on the issue whether the respondent-schools are public authority in terms of Section 2(h) of the Act or not. Neither the District Education Officers were present to explain the stand on behalf of the appropriate Government, in this regard nor the respondents attended the hearing. The Bench decided to adjourn the matter and directed the Commission's Secretariat to serve the parties a notice, through registered post, asking the District Education Officers of the districts to appear in person with record pertaining to the status of financial assistance if being provided by the State Government to the respondent Schools alongwith their comments on the issue of 'control' on the said Schools.

3. The Bench heard the matter on 04.07.2014. Shri Chander Bhan Saini and Shri Harinder Dhingra, appellants appeared before the Commission. None of the other appellants was present or represented during the proceedings despite the Commission's notices dated 25.06.2014 served on them through registered post. Shri Dharamvir Saini, Principal, Saini Senior Secondary School, Rohtak alongwith Shri Anshumaan, Advocate was present. Dr.

Neeraj Jain, Principal, Model School, Rohtak attended the proceedings alongwith Shri Sudam Singh, Superintendent of the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Rohtak. Shri Rakesh Kumar Jain, Principal, Vaish Senior Secondary School, Bhiwani was also present. Shri Ravinder Rana, Advocate appeared on behalf of Shri Ram School at Gurgaon. The District Education offices at Rohtak, Bhiwani and Gurgaon were represented by the Government officials.

4. Shri Chander Bhan, the appellant in appeal case no. 2053 of 2010 submitted that initially his appeal was decided by this Commission on 14.01.2011 with the direction that the Saini Education Society, Rohtak (hereinafter referred to as Society) shall notify designated officers and shall be liable to furnish the information to the appellant in response to his RTI application dated 23.2.2010. Against this order, the Society preferred CWP no. 3920 of 2011 which was dismissed on 9.5.2011 with costs.

W The respondent Society filed LPA no. 1479 of 2011 in the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court. The Hon'ble Division Bench has given directions dated 12.12.2013 as listed in para 1 of this order. The appellant's main contention is that the Society was registered under the Societies Act, 1860 in the year 1950 and was again registered afresh under the Haryana Registration & Regulation of Societies Act, 2012. Logically, the Society is bound to abide by the provisions of the Acts and Rules while imparting education which is basically Government responsibility. The appropriate Government is providing financial help to the Society through its Manager to meet 75% of the deficit of the sanctioned posts of recognized aided Schools. The appellant submitted that in the financial year of 2009-10, the society received grants from the appropriate Government to the tune of Rs. 43.42 lacs against the salary expenditure of Rs.59.14 lacs. This grant is a substantial funding towards the running of the school. The

AK



Society has continued to receive financial assistance from Government in subsequent financial years also. He further relied on the statement of the District Education Officer, Rohtak which stated that the Government had released approximately Rs. 37 lacs to the Society in the year 2013-14. The appellant further argued that as per Rule 3 and 30 of the Haryana School Education (Amendment) Rules 2007, the school is liable to comply with the directions of the public authority i.e. Director Secondary Education, Haryana. The Society meets the principle laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in **Thalappalam Ser. Coop Bank Limited's case**. Since the schools run by the Society are being controlled and substantially financed by the appropriate Government, hence, the Society is a "Public Authority" in term of Section 2 (h) of the RTI Act, 2005 and is liable to furnish information sought under the RTI Act.

lw

5. Shri Ashok Kumar represented the District Education Officer, Rohtak and submitted that the appropriate Government is providing financial assistance to the Saini Girls High School and Saini High School, Rohtak which are run by the Society. A grant of Rs. 18.91 lacs and Rs. 37.86 lacs respectively was released to the schools in the year 2012-13. Again, a salary grant of Rs. 30.67 lacs was released to the Saini Primary School, Rohtak and Rs. 54.86 lacs to the Saini Girls High School, Rohtak in the year 2013-14 on account of arrears of Sixth Pay Commission.

gk

6. Shri Anshumaan Dalal, learned counsel appeared on behalf of the Society and filed written submissions. He stated that the Society is a private society registered under the Societies Registration Act, 1860. The Society is running eight institutions which are: Saini Primary School (Boys), Saini High School (Boys), Saini Kanya High School. Saini Senior Secondary School (Boys), Saini Girls Senior Secondary School, Saini College (Co-

Ashy



Ed. Degree College), Saini Institute of Girls' Education (B.Ed. College), Saini Public School. Learned counsel submitted that the Society has engaged teaching and non-teaching staff to the tune of 145 persons. The Government of Haryana through its Director, Secondary Education is providing financial assistance to two schools run by the Society, namely; Saini Girls High School and Saini High School, Rohtak. He pointed out that the Society is getting 75% financial aid towards the salary expenses for 20 employees out of 62, working in the Saini Girls High School and Saini High School, Rohtak. No other financial assistance is being received from the Government or its instrumentalities either directly or indirectly. Further, the control of the Society is with the management which is elected by life members of the Society after every three years through vote. The affairs of the Society are in the control of the managing committee headed by President of the Society and eleven elected members. The Society is not under any direct or indirect control of the Government. Learned counsel of the Society emphasized that the appellant has sought information from the Saini Public School which does not get any grant from the Government. The school in question does not have a single aided post. Hence, the said school cannot be categorized a public authority within the meaning of Section 2(h) of the RTI Act, 2005. Each school is a separate entity with a separate bank account. The Society does not have any authority to transfer the funds received from the Government towards any other head. The Learned Advocate concluded that neither the Society is receiving substantial grant from the Government nor the School in question is receiving any Government grant to fall within the purview of the RTI Act, 2005. Again, neither the Society nor the school in question is controlled by the appropriate Government. Hence, neither the Society nor

W

PS

ASH



the school in question can be defined by any stretch of imagination as public authority within the meaning of Section 2(h) of the RTI Act, 2005.

7. Shri Harinder Dhingra, the appellant appeared to defend appeal case no. 2089 of 2014. The appellant objected to the appearance of advocate on behalf of the Shri Ram School, Gurgaon by citing a decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in State of Madhya Pradesh Versus Shobharam and others dated 22.4.1966. The judgement was perused and it was noted that the issue before the Hon'ble Apex court was whether Section 63 of Madhyabharat Panchayat Act, (58 of 1949) violated Article 22 of the Constitution. The RTI Act, 2005 and Haryana Right to Information Rules, 2009 do not debar the appearance of Advocates to defend the parties. Hence, the objection was overruled. The appellant submitted that the respondent school denied the information on the ground that the school in question is not a Public Authority as per Section 2 (h) (d) (ii) of the RTI Act, 2005. He had sought detailed information and relevant data of teachers employed by the school alongwith details of their educational qualifications, their salaries and allowances and list of BPL, EWS, and Poor beneficiaries being provided free education as per law of the land. He argued that a citizen of India has a right to seek information from private schools in order to promote transparency in the education system. Hence, he prayed for directions to the respondent school to furnish information as sought in the RTI application.

8. Shri Ravinder Rana, Learned Counsel represented Shri Ram School, Gurgaon and submitted that it is a private unaided School. It is not receiving any grant from the Government. The school is functioning out of its own funds and the school building has also been acquired out of its own resources. Learned Counsel concluded that the material facts in this case do not measure



upto the yardstick laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in **Thalappalam Ser. Coop Bank Limited's case**. The respondent school does not fall within the definition of "Public Authority" in term of Section 2 (h) of the Act and hence is not liable to furnish information.

9. Smt. Nirmal Dalal, the appellant in case no. 3042 of 2010 was not present during the hearing. Dr. Neeraj Jain, Principal, Model School, Rohtak appeared alongwith Shri Anshumaan Dalal, Advocate. The Learned Counsel submitted that the appellant does not wish to pursue the RTI matter and has given it in writing on 8.8.2011. The application was taken on record. Hence, he prayed to dismiss the matter.

W

10. Shri Pawan Kumar, another appellant who had approached the Commission seeking directions to the Model School, Rohtak for furnishing of information did not appear to defend his case. The grounds and contents of the second appeal were taken for consideration. The appellant has not given any material facts to support his contention that the said school is a public authority and is liable to furnish information as per provisions of the RTI Act, 2005.

Me
AM

11. Shri Sudam Singh, Superintendent represented the Deputy Commissioner, Rohtak. Shri Ashok Kumar appeared on behalf of District Education Officer, Rohtak. The society was set up by Shri H.D Shourie, the then Deputy Commissioner, Rohtak. According to the Memorandum of Society of Model School, Rohtak, the Deputy Commissioner of the District is the designated ex-officio President of the Society and the Administrator, HUDA, Rohtak, Executive Officer, Municipal Council, Rohtak, Superintending Engineer, PWD (B&R), Superintending Engineer, PWD (Public Health), Rohtak and the Director, PGIMS, Rohtak are the ex-officio members of the Society. There are 15 other private



members in the General Body of the Society. The Administrator, HUDA, Rohtak vide letter dated 8.12.2010 allotted a School Building which had been constructed at a cost of Rs. 2.26 crore on HUDA land, to the Society on lease hold basis at nominal lease amount of Rs. 100/- per annum for running a Senior Secondary School.

12. Shri Anshumaan Dalal, Learned Counsel submitted that Model School, Rohtak is a private society registered under Societies Act, 1860. The Society was constituted in May, 1973 primarily with the aim and objective of running an educational institution for imparting education. The Model School, Rohtak was established by the Society for imparting quality education to its students. The school does not take any aid or funds from the Government nor is it controlled by Government. The Rules and Regulations of the Society provide that the fund of the Society shall consist of admission fee, donations, school fees, annual subscriptions and contributions from any other source. Any person above the age of 21 years can become a member of Society by paying a stipulated fee which is very nominal. The affairs of the Society are conducted by the Executive Committee. Deputy Commissioner, Rohtak is the ex-officio member of the Society whereas the President and Secretary of the Society are elected by the Executive Committee from among its members. The President presides over and conducts the meetings of the Society and the Executive Committee. He supervises and superintends the working of the Society and its activities. The Secretary conducts the day to day work of the Society and incharge of all the documents of the Society. Besides, the Deputy Commissioner, Rohtak there are five other officers who are members of the Society in their ex-officio capacity. He further argued that these officials are ipso-facto members of the Society

W

Sh
A



in their ex-officio capacity as per Rule 4 A of the Society. There is nothing in the Rules which would confer any additional responsibility on these members, so as to establish any direct link between the State Government and the Society. The administrative control and function of the Society vests with the Secretary of the Society. Ex-officio members have no specific role to play in the functioning of the respondent-Society. It is admitted that Society has been given a school building by HUDA but the building has been taken on lease by the respondent Society on the rates determined between HUDA and the Society. It cannot be termed as funding of the Society by the Government. Learned counsel further submitted that the Society is functioning since May, 1973 and running a Model School at Rohtak successfully whereas the said building has been delivered in the year 2010. Hence, Society is a non-Governmental organization and not a body owned, controlled and substantially financed by the Government directly or indirectly by any funds or grants.

13. Shri Rattan Lal Chokhani, the appellant in case no. 3171 of 2011 relating to Vaish Senior Secondary School, Bhiwani did not appear despite notice. Shri Rakesh Kumar Jain, Principal, Vaish Senior Secondary School, Bhiwani appeared before the Commission and submitted that the appellant has given in writing that his appeal may be closed. Appellant's letter dated 29.5.2014 was taken on record. Shri Shyam Sunder, Section Officer represented District Education Office, Bhiwani. He submitted that the appropriate Government has issued a grant of Rs.48.88 lacs to the Managing Committee, Vaish Senior Secondary School, Bhiwani in the year 2012-2013 for the salary expenses of aided posts.

14. Shri Jai Pal Gupta, Advocate, the appellant did not appear before the Commission. However, grounds taken in the second



appeal dated 19.11.2012 seeking information relating to Doon Public School, Ladwa have been considered. He has sought list of teaching staff, names of the members of the Management Committee and Society, number of meetings with dates, lease deed of the school building etc.

15. Neither the SPIO-cum-Block Education Officer, Ladwa nor the Private respondent i.e. Principal, Doon Public School, Ladwa appeared before the Commission to make their submissions. The written submissions of the school dated 7.4.2014 were taken on record. It has been submitted that the school is not receiving any grant directly or indirectly from Government. The school is being run out of its own resources and does not fall under the ambit of RTI Act, 2005.

hu
Decision:-

16. The Bench has heard the arguments of the parties put forth during hearing. The Commission has also perused the judgement of the Apex Court dated 7.10.2013 passed in Thalappalam Ser. Coop. Bank Limited and others Vs. State of Kerala and others. The submissions and documents regarding Government aid or grant made by the respondent Schools were also perused. There are two major issues to be decided; (a) whether the schools under consideration are the public authorities within the meaning of Section 2(h) of the RTI Act, 2005 and hence, legally obliged to furnish any information sought by a citizen under the RTI Act and (b) whether the public authority can access information relating to the statutory requirements and obligations of a recognized school under the Haryana School Education Act, 1995 and Haryana School Education Rules, 2003 as amended from time to time.

26
As
17. The material facts which have been placed on record in connection with Saini Education Society, Rohtak, Vaish Senior Secondary School at Bhiwani, Doon Public School, Ladwa and Shri



Ram School at Gurgaon indicate that none of these schools is getting grant or financial assistance, direct or indirect, from the appropriate Government or its instrumentalities which is of such substantial nature that the Commission reaches the conclusion that "but for such funding it would struggle to exist." It would be pertinent to peruse the observations of the Hon'ble Apex Court while deciding the matter in Thalappalam Ser. Coop. Bank Ltd. and others Vs. State of Kerala and others:

"38 Merely providing subsidies, grants, exemptions, privileges etc., as such, cannot be said to be providing funding to a substantial extent, unless the record shows that the funding was so substantial to the body which practically runs by such funding and but for such funding, it would struggle to exist. The state may also float many schemes generally for the betterment and welfare of the cooperative sector like deposit guarantee scheme, scheme of assistance from NABARD etc., but those facilities or assistance cannot be termed as "substantially financed" by the State Govt. to bring the body within the fold of "public authority" under section 2(h) (d) (i) of the Act. But, there are instances, where private educational institutions getting ninety five percent grant in aid from the appropriate government may answer the definition of public authority under Section 2(h) (d) (i)."

18. Saini Girls High School and Saini High School at Rohtak are receiving grant from the Government towards salary of employees but it is not so substantial to make the private body a public authority. Again, none of these schools are being controlled by the Government in a manner that it can be said that the schools in



question are being controlled by the appropriate Government in the sense of the term as used in Section 2(f) of the RTI Act, 2005. None of these schools are either owned, controlled or substantially financed in a manner to make them fall within the definition of public authority as defined in Clause 'h' of Section '2' of the RTI Act, 2005. It is a fact that the schools operating in the State of Haryana are governed by the Haryana School Education Act, 1995 and Haryana School Education Rules, 2003 as amended from time to time. The Haryana School Education Act and Rules regulate education in non-Governmental schools in the State to promote better organization and development of school education, the manner of admission to recognized schools, fee structure, uniform code of service conditions for employees, adequate infrastructural facilities to be provided to pupils and to follow approved course of studies in the State. But this cannot lead to the conclusion that since the schools are governed by the Haryana School Education Act, hence, they are 'public authority' within the meaning of Section 2(h) of the RTI Act, 2005. It is well settled that such regulation and supervision would not mean that the State has a deep and pervasive control over the schools. There is a clear distinction between mere 'supervision' or 'regulation' and 'control'. Powers exercised by the designated authorities under the Act are only regulatory or supervisory in nature which would not amount to controlling the management. This would not mean that the Society or the school is controlled by the appropriate Government. The case is decided in terms of the Commission's order dated 20.8.2014 in appeal Case No. 2566 of 2010 and others.

19. In view of the above discussion and examination of the material facts which have been brought before the Bench, none of these schools in question fits into the definition of public authority under Section 2 of the RTI Act, 2005.



20. The material facts which have been placed on record in case of Model School, Rohtak are different from the other schools under consideration. The school is running in a building, constructed at a cost of Rs.2.26 crore, allotted to the Society by HUDA on a nominal lease rent for 30 years. As per Rules and Regulations of the Society, the Deputy Commissioner is the President of the Society in his ex-officio capacity. In his capacity as President of the Society, he has been assigned the managerial and supervisory responsibilities. Besides the Deputy Commissioner, there are five other senior officers who are member of the Executive Committee in their ex-officio capacity. However, learned counsel, while admitting all these material facts placed on record, argued that the school is not a public authority as it does not fulfill the criteria laid down in Thalappalam Ser. Coop Bank Limited's case. He argued that it is private registered body which has been running the school since 1973. The school was operating even before HUDA allotted its school building on lease to the Society. The school building has been delivered to the Society only in 2010. The situation in the instant case is not that had this building not been given to the Society, it would not have been possible to run the school. The school was already in existence. The learned counsel argued that the school building is not to be treated as indirect financial assistance of substantial nature to the Society from the appropriate Government. The School is not getting any financial grant from the Government. Hence, it does not fulfill the criteria of 'will struggle to exist'. The Commission further noted that the School is managed by an Executive Committee which is headed by President who is none other than the Deputy Commissioner of the District in his ex officio capacity. There are five senior Government officers who are on the Executive Committee of the Society in their ex-officio capacity. Learned counsel argued that the school was set up by Mr. Shourie,

Wh

JK
AKM



the then Deputy Commissioner of the District. Mr. Shourie was a distinguished civil servant who set up the school to promote modern school education in Rohtak. Historically, the Deputy Commissioner and other senior officers have been associated with the school management. However, there is no bar that the rules cannot be changed by the general body or its executive. Ex-officio members do not enjoy special status or veto power on the decisions of the executive committee of the Society. There is a position of Secretary who runs the day to day administration under the overall supervision of the executive committee. The rules provide that any citizen of 21 years and above is eligible to become member of the society which elects the executive committee. The ex-officio members do not enjoy special position or powers. The learned counsel concluded that there is no evidence to show that the school is 'controlled' by the appropriate Government as defined under the RTI Act, 2005.

lh

The Commission observed that there are various instances of successful initiatives taken by distinguished civil servants in the field of education and development which promoted public welfare. The mere association or mentoring the working of such projects cannot be classified as 'control'. Mentoring cannot be confused with control. Nothing on record has come to show that the appropriate Government issued any formal orders appointing the Deputy Commissioner as the President of the Society in his ex-officio capacity or other senior officers as members of the executive committee of the Society. There are no Government orders which provide any powers to these Government officials with reference to the working of the school. Patronage or mentoring is different from control. Mere association of senior Government officials cannot make a private body take the form of public authority within the meaning of Section 2 of the RTI Act, 2005. The Commission further

sl

ASH



noted that the Model School, Rohtak is not getting any grant from the appropriate Government to run its activities and the school was running much before HUDA allotted building to the Society on lease basis on a nominal rent. After considering all the facts and the arguments of the learned counsel, the Commission observed that it does not fulfill the criteria of 'will struggle to exist', in case support is withdrawn. Hence, Model School Rohtak is not a public authority as defined under Section 2 of the RTI Act, 2005.

21. The second issue whether the public authority can access information relating to the statutory requirements and obligations of a recognized school under the Haryana School Education Act, 1995 and Haryana School Education Rules, 2003 as amended from time to time. The Commission has already noted that the schools are supervised and regulated by the appropriate Government under the Haryana School Education Act, 1995. It has already been noted that Haryana School Education Act and Rules regulate education in non-Governmental schools in the State to promote better organization and development of school education, the appropriate Government regulates the manner of admission, fee structure, uniform code of service conditions for employees, infrastructural facilities and approve course of studies in the private recognized schools in the State. Education plays an important role in the mental growth and development of a child. Hence, State has to intervene to govern and regulate in the interest of development and in order to bring accountability and transparency in the working of private recognized schools. To implement the right to free and compulsory education as enshrined in Article 21 of the Constitution of India, the Act has made certain provision towards equity. Rule 134 A as inserted vide notification dated 19.1.2007 and further amended in 2013 lays down that *the recognized private schools shall reserve 10% seats for meritorious poor students. The school shall charge fee from*



these students at the rate as charged in Government schools. The deficit of difference of fee shall be charged from the other students of the school. A combined reading of Section 2(f) of the RTI Act, 2005 and Haryana School Education Act, 1995 does establish that the public authority has the requisite powers to access the information from the recognized private schools which fall within the purview of the Haryana School Education Act. It would be pertinent to refer to Section 2(j) of the Act:

"right to information" means the right to information accessible under this Act which is held by or under the control of any public authority and includes the right to-

- i) Inspection of work, documents, records;*
- ii) Taking notes, extracts, or certified copies of documents or records;*
- iii) Taking certified samples of material;*
- iv) Obtaining information in the form of diskettes, floppies, tapes, video cassettes or in any other electronic mode or through printouts where such information is stored in a computer or in any other device;"*

'Information' means any material in any form relating to any private body which can be access by a public authority under any other law for the time being in force. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in "Khanapuram Gandaiah Vs. Administrative Officer & others" has held that under Section 6 of the RTI Act, an applicant is entitled to get only such information which can be accessed by the public authority under any other law for the time being in force. A private body need not be a public authority in such a case. Thus, information which a public authority is entitled to access under any law, from private body, is information as defined under Section 2(f)



of the RTI Act and has to be furnished. The Commission holds that the public authority in cases under consideration can access information from the private recognized schools in question as can be accessed by the public authority under the Haryana School Education Act, 1995 and Rules thereunder or any other law for the time being in force.

The above cited appeals are decided accordingly.

Order reserved and pronounced on the 12th day of September, 2014.

To be communicated.

Place: Chandigarh

Date: 12.9.2014


(Yoginder Paul Gupta)

State Information Commissioner


(Sajjan Singh)

State Information Commissioner.


(Naresh Gulati)

State Chief Information Commissioner