



CGHC010259712026



2026:CGHC:28385

Digitally
signed by
RAVVA UTTEJ
KUMAR RAJU

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPC No. 3557 of 2026

Saheb Lal S/o Lt. Shri Munshiram Aged About 65 Years R/o Dongridih, Post Lawan, Dist. Balodabazar- Bhatapara (C.G.)

... Petitioner

Versus

1 - Central Information Commission Cic Bhawan Baba Gangnath Marg, Munirka, New Delhi, 110067.

2 - First Appeal Authority S.E.C.L., Coal Mines, Khongapani, South Jhagdakhad Colory, Dist. M.C.B. (C.G.).

3 - Public Information Officer S.E.C.L., Coal Mines, Khongapani, South Jhagdakhad Colory, Dist. M.C.B. (C.G.)

... Respondents

(Cause title is taken from CIS Periphery.)

For Petitioner : Mr. Md. Sohail Khan, Advocate.

For Respondents No. 2 & 3 : Mr. Pankaj Agrawal, Advocate.

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Amitendra Kishore Prasad

Order on Board

09/07/2026

1. The petitioner has filed the instant petition for following reliefs:-

“10.1 That, this Hon’ble Court pleased to allow this petition and direct to respondent No. 1 to decide the second appeal which is filed under Right to Information Act, 2005 by petitioner which is pending since 2025 (Annexure P-4).

10.2 That, directed respondents to pay suitable compensation to the petitioner.

10.3 Any other relief as deemed fit by this Hon’ble Court in circumstances of this case.”

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has preferred a Second Appeal before respondent No. 1, namely the Central Information Commission, on 24.06.2025, and the same is presently pending consideration.
3. Learned counsel for respondents No. 2 and 3 submits that, from a perusal of the documents placed on record, it appears that certain defects/defaults were pointed out in the Second Appeal, and the petitioner was accordingly directed either to remove the said defects/defaults or to withdraw the Second Appeal pending before the Central Information Commission. In support of his submission, he refers to page No. 40 of the documents filed by the petitioner.
4. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the defects which has been pointed out by the Central Information Commission has already been removed.
5. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.
6. Having considered the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the material available on record, this Court finds that, if the Second Appeal preferred by the

petitioner before respondent No. 1, namely the Central Information Commission, is still pending and has not yet been adjudicated, the ends of justice would be served by directing its expeditious disposal. Accordingly, respondent No. 1, the Central Information Commission, is directed to consider and decide the said Second Appeal, if it is still pending, strictly in accordance with law, preferably within a period of 60 days from the date of communication of this order.

7. With this observation and direction, the petition stands **disposed of.**

Sd/-
(Amitendra Kishore Prasad)
Judge