



2026:CGHC:26694

NAFR

## HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

PAWAN  
KUMAR  
JHA  
Digitally  
signed by  
PAWAN  
KUMAR JHA

### WPC No. 10 of 2020

- Bholanath Bagh S/o Biro Bagh Aged About 37 Years R/o Village- Manapali, Tahsil- Saraipali, District- Mahasamund, Chhattisgarh.

--- **Petitioner(s)****versus**

1. Chhattisgarh State Information Commission Through Its Secretary Sector- 19, North Block, Atal Nagar, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. Information Officer Village Panchayat (Secretary) Putka, Tahsil- Saraipali, District- Mahasamund, Chhattisgarh

--- **Respondent(s)**

### WPC No. 34 of 2020

- Bholanath Bagh S/o. Biro Bagh Aged About 37 Years R/o. Village- Manapali, Tahsil- Saraipali District- Mahasamund Chhattisgarh

---**Petitioner****Versus**

1. Chhattisgarh State Information Commission Through Its Secretary Sector-19, North Block, Atal Nagar, District- Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. Information Officer Village Panchayat (Secretary) Putka, Tahsil- Saraipali District- Mahasamund Chhattisgarh

--- **Respondent(s)**

### WPC No. 35 of 2020

- Bholanath Bagh S/o Biro Bagh Aged About 37 Years R/o Village Manapali, Tahsil Saraipali, District Mahasamund, Chhattisgarh.

---**Petitioner**

**Versus**

1. Chhattisgarh State Information Commission Through Its Secretary Sector-19, North Block, Atal Nagar, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. Information Officer Village Panchayat (Secretary) Putka, Tahsil Saraipali, District Mahasamund, Chhattisgarh.

**--- Respondent(s)**


---

|                      |   |                                                                        |
|----------------------|---|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| For Petitioner       | : | Mr. Krishna Tandon, Advocate on behalf of Mr. Sanjay Agrawal, Advocate |
| For Respondent No. 1 | : | Mr. Shyam Sunder Lal Tekchandani, Advocate                             |
| For Respondent No. 2 | : | Mr. Sunil Sahu, Advocate                                               |

---

**Hon'ble Shri Parth Prateem Sahu, Justice****Order on Board****30/06/2026**

1. Since the common reliefs have been prayed in these writ petitions, it would be appropriate to heard and dispose of these writ petition by this common order. However, for the purpose of this order, pleadings made in WPC No. 10/2020 are being referred hereinafter.

2. Petitioner has filed writ petition seeking following common reliefs.

“10.1 This Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to issue appropriate writ/ direction and direct to the respondent No. 2 to provide information sought by the petitioner and award appropriate compensation as per law to the petitioner.

10.2 This Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to issue appropriate writ/ direction and impose penalty on the respondent No. 2 as per law.

10.3 To grant any other relief which may suitable in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be allowed.

10.4 Cost of the petition may kindly award to the petitioner.”

3. Brief facts of the case are as follows: Petitioner-Bholanath Bagh has filed an application under Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter referred to as “RTI

Act”) on 30.12.2017 before Respondent No. 2/ Public Information Officer, village panchayat, Putka, Tahsil Saraipali, District Mahasamund with prescribed fee seeking information of expenditure of grant allotted by 14<sup>th</sup> Finance Commission, made under the Swachh Bharat Mission since 2016 till date. When the prescribed information was not supplied, petitioner preferred First Appeal and further when the order of First Appellate Authority was not complied with by the Public Information Officer, then Second Appeal was filed before Respondent No. 1/ C.G. State Information Commission. Respondent No. 1 vide order dated 25.05.2019 has ordered for payment of compensation of Rs. 300 under Section 19(8)(B) of the RTI Act, further ordered to pay compensation under Section 20(1) of the RTI Act of imposing penalty of Rs. 250/- per day, maximum to be Rs. 25,000 and further that it be intimated to the competent authority to initiate disciplinary proceedings under Section 20(2) of the RTI Act. After passing off this order, writ petitions are filed.

4. Respondent No. 1 submitted its reply pleading therein that second appeal was allowed by Respondent No. 1 with a direction to furnish requested complete information; show-cause notice under Section 20(1) and 20(2) of the RTI Act was issued to the Public Information Officer and order was passed thereafter. He contended that after issuance of show-cause notice when case was taken up by Respondent No.1 on 19.12.2019, the Public Information Officer-cum-Secretary, village panchayat, Putka submitted his compliance reply. The Public Information Officer also submitted two letters evidencing that requested information comprising of three pages had been furnished to petitioner and further that compensation awarded by the Respondent No. 1/ Commission has been paid to him. The Commission thereafter accepted the compliance report and explanation submitted by Public Information Officer and closed the proceedings vide order dated 24.12.2019.
5. From the pleadings made in the writ petitions, it appears that petitioner’s grievance on the date of filing of writ petitions was that the Public Information Officer has not complied with the direction issued by Respondent No. 1/ Commission of not furnishing any information or paying compensation.

6. From the proceedings enclosed along with reply, it is reflecting that on 24.12.2019, Respondent No. 1 has recorded that the compensation awarded is paid to petitioner and further that the information which is sought for is already supplied and closed the proceedings.
7. Initially writ petition was filed on 24.12.2019 and thereafter other two petitions on 02.01.2020, from which it appears that when petitioner approached his counsel, the order dated 24.12.2019 was not passed, but it was subsequently. The pleadings made in the reply and the contents of the order are not controverted in specific terms even though reply was received by counsel for petitioner on 23.06.2026.
8. In the aforementioned facts of the case and the pleadings made in the writ petitions as also reliefs sought, in view of the proceedings drawn by Respondent No. 1/ Commission that the information sought for has been supplied to petitioner, I do not find any merit in these writ petitions, accordingly writ petitions are dismissed.

**Sd/-**

**(Parth Prateem Sahu)**

**JUDGE**