



CGHC010185762026

2026:CGHC:31361

NAFR



HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

REVP No. 167 of 2026

1 - Amarchand Pahare S/o Late Shri Ramavtar Pahare, Aged About 57 Years Presently Working As - P I O And Deputy Director, Employment And Self Employment Guidance Centre, Koni, Bilaspur, Tahsil And District Bilaspur (C.G.), R/o Green Park Colony, Jarhabhata, Tahsil And District Bilaspur (C.G.).

... Petitioner(s)

versus

- 1** - Chhattisgarh State Information Commission Through - Sector - 19, North Block, Nava Raipur, Atal Nagar, District Raipur (C.G.).
- 2** - First Appellate Authority And Deputy Director, Directorate, Employment And Training, Indrawati Bhawan, 4th Block, 1th Floor, Nava Raipur, Atal Nagar, District Raipur (C.G.).
- 3** - Public Information Officer, Directorate, Employment And Training, Indrawati Bhawan, 4th Block, 1th Floor, Nava Raipur, Atal Nagar, District Raipur (C.G.).
- 4** - Shri Arun Patel Mahamaya Chowk, Sarkanda, Bilaspur (C.G.) Tahsil And District - Bilaspur (C.G.).

... Respondent(s)

For Petitioner(s)	: Ms. Meena Shastri, Advocate.
For Respondent(s) No. 2	: Mr. Shayam Sunder Lal Tekchandani, Advocate.

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Amitendra Kishore Prasad

Order on Board

22/07/2026

1. By way of this petition, the petitioner has prayed for following reliefs:-

“It is, therefore prayed that the Hon'ble Court be pleased to modify the order dated 06-04-2026 passed in W.P. (C) No. 5223/2021, as per correction of typographical errors pointed out in the Petition, and the Petitioner may be released from liability to provide information mentioned in "Point no.01" (Para No. 01) of the Application sought by the Respondent No.04, in the interests of justice.”

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner, being the Public Information Officer, had declined to furnish the information sought under the Right to Information Act, 2005, on the ground that the application was vague and composite in nature, involving multiple subject matters which would require extensive collection, compilation, and creation of voluminous information. It is submitted that the information sought is not maintained in the manner in which it has been requested, and furnishing the same would require creation and collation of information, which is beyond the scope and ambit of the Right to Information Act, 2005. It is further submitted that the order passed by this Court in the earlier writ petition contains certain inadvertent typographical errors with regard to the dates of the impugned

orders, which deserve to be corrected. It is, therefore, prayed that the typographical errors in the order be suitably corrected and appropriate clarification be issued to the effect that the petitioner shall consider and pass appropriate orders on the application submitted by the information seeker in accordance with law.

3. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for respondent No. 2 opposes the submissions advanced on behalf of the petitioner.
4. Having considered the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the record, this review petition is **disposed of** by directing that the typographical error with regard to the date of the impugned order be corrected, and the date "25.06.2021", wherever occurring in the relief clause of the writ petition as well as in paragraph No. 3 at page No. 3 of the order dated 06.04.2026, shall be read as "21.07.2021". It is further observed that the petitioner shall be at liberty to consider the application submitted by the information seeker and pass an appropriate order thereon strictly in accordance with law.

Sd/-

(Amitendra Kishore Prasad)

Judge

Raghu Jat