



CNR: KAHC010510132026

NC: 2026:KHC:46100-DB
WA No. 1815 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 27TH DAY OF AUGUST, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. VIBHU BAKHRU, CHIEF JUSTICE

AND

THE HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE K.S. HEMALEKHA

WRIT APPEAL NO.1815 OF 2026 (GM-RES)

BETWEEN:

SRI. MATHEW THOMAS
AGED ABOUT 88 YEARS OLD,
RESIDING AT #02,
'ARISTOS', 'SOBHA CITY',
THANISANDRA MAIN ROAD,
BENGALURU - 560 077.

...APPELLANT

(BY MS. ANN MARY TOMY, ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. NITIN A.M., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION
REPRESENTED BY
CHIEF INFORMATION COMMISSIONER
CIC BHAWAN, BABA GANGNATH MARG,
MUNIRKA, NEW DELHI - 110067.
2. ELECTION COMMISSION OF INDIA
REPRESENTED BY CHIEF COMMISSIONER
NIRVACHAN SADAN,
ASHOKA ROAD,
NEW DELHI - 110001.

...RESPONDENTS

Digitally signed
by
MAHALAKSHMI
B M

Location: High
Court of
Karnataka



CNR: KAHC010510132026

NC: 2026:KHC:46100-DB
WA No. 1815 of 2026

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO ALLOW THE PRESENT WRIT APPEAL AND SET ASIDE THE ORDER DATED 10.06.2026 PASSED BY THE LEARNED SINGLE JUDGE IN W.P.NO.9460/2025 (GM-RES) AND TO CONSEQUENTLY ALLOW THE WRIT PETITION.

THIS APPEAL, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING, THIS DAY, JUDGMENT WAS DELIVERED THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. VIBHU BAKHRU, CHIEF JUSTICE
and
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE K.S. HEMALEKHA

ORAL JUDGMENT

(PER: HON'BLE MR. VIBHU BAKHRU, CHIEF JUSTICE)

1. The appellant has filed the present appeal impugning the order dated 10.06.2026 passed by the learned Single Judge of this Court in W.P. No.9460/2025 (GM-RES). The appellant had filed the said petition, *inter alia*, impugning the order dated 05.09.2024 passed by the Central Information Commission [CIC], whereby the second appeal/complaint along with the documents came to be returned.

2. The appellant filed a second appeal (vide Diary No.633441/2024). The CIC returned the second appeal. The appellant resubmitted under Diary No.128461/2024. The CIC issued the formal facilitation order returning the appeal/complaint.



CNR: KAHC010510132026

A plain reading of the order dated 05.09.2024 indicates that the appellant had filed a single second appeal against two distinct orders passed in respect of two separate RTI applications filed under the Right to Information Act, 2005 [**Act**]. Since the second appeal related to more than one RTI application, the same was not entertained and the appellant was advised to resubmit the same in respect of each RTI application.

3. The learned Single Judge has noted that the order passed by the CIC did not dismiss the second appeal, but merely returned the second appeal, while reserving liberty to the appellant to file separate appeals. Since the learned Single Judge did not find any fault in the order passed by the CIC, the writ petition was disposed of.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the appellant submits that filing of a consolidated appeal against separate orders passed on different RTI applications is permissible under the applicable Rules. She contended that, although there is no specific rule to the said effect, an appeal can be returned only on limited grounds and the fact that the second appeal is a consolidated appeal is not one



CNR: KAHC010510132026

NC: 2026:KHC:46100-DB
WA No. 1815 of 2026

such ground. Hence, she submits that the prescribed format of the appeal also refers to the orders impugned.

5. The appellant had preferred the second appeal before the CIC under Section 19 (3) of the Act. Sub-Sections (1), (2) and (3) of Section 19 of the Act are relevant and are set out below:

"19. Appeal.-(1) Any person who, does not receive a decision within the time specified in sub-section (1) or clause (a) of sub-section (3) of section 7, or is aggrieved by a decision of the Central Public Information Officer or State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, may within thirty days from the expiry of such period or from the receipt of such a decision prefer an appeal to such officer who is senior in rank to the Central Public Information Officer or State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, in each public authority:

Provided that such officer may admit the appeal after the expiry of the period of thirty days if he or she is satisfied that the appellant was prevented by sufficient cause from filing the appeal in time.

(2) Where an appeal is preferred against an order made by a Central Public Information Officer or a State Public Information Officer, as the case may be, under section 11 to disclose third party information, the appeal by the concerned third party shall be made within thirty days from the date of the order.

(3) A second appeal against the decision under sub-section (1) shall lie within ninety days from the date on which the decision should have been made or was actually received, with the Central Information Commission or the State Information Commission:

Provided that the Central Information Commission or the State Information Commission, as the case may be,



CNR: KAHC010510132026

**NC: 2026:KHC:46100-DB
WA No. 1815 of 2026**

may admit the appeal after the expiry of the period of ninety days if it is satisfied that the appellant was prevented by sufficient cause from filing the appeal in time."

6. A plain reading of the aforementioned sub-sections of Section 19 of the Act indicates that the appeals contemplated under Section 19 are against a "decision" or an "order". Section 19 of the Act does not contemplate the filing of a consolidated appeal against several orders or several decisions arising out of separate RTI applications. There is nothing in the rules which would also indicate that a consolidated appeal can be filed.

7. In view of the above, we find no infirmity with the impugned order passed by the learned Single Judge. The appeal is, accordingly, dismissed.

8. Pending interlocutory application also stands disposed of.

**Sd/-
(VIBHU BAKHRU)
CHIEF JUSTICE**

**Sd/-
(K.S. HEMALEKHA)
JUDGE**