



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 30TH DAY OF JUNE, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURAJ GOVINDARAJ

WRIT PETITION NO.371 OF 2024 (GM-RES)

BETWEEN:

SRI. DALESH A.L.
S/O LAKSHMANEGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS,
RANGE FOREST OFFICER,
KANAKAPURA RANGE,
C.B CIRCLE,M.G ROAD,
KANAKAPURA, RAMANAGARA-562 117.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. SANJAY KRISHNA V., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. KARNATAKA INFORMATION COMMISSION
REPRESENTED BY THE STATE INFORMATION
COMMISSIONER,
MAHITI SOUDHA, AMBEDKAR BEEDI,
BENGALURU-560 001.
2. SRI. B.R ANANTHARAMU
FATHER NAME UNKNOWN TO THE PETITIONER,
AGED MAJOR,
RESIDING AT: BALIGHATTA VILLAGE,
MELUKOTE HOBLI, PANDAVAPURA TALUK,
MANDYA DISTRICT-571 434.
3. FIRST APPELLATE AUTHORITY
AND CHIEF CONSEVATOR OF FORESTS
BENGALURU CIRCLE,
BENGALURU – 560 001.

...RESPONDENTS

Digitally signed
by SHWETHA
RAGHAVENDRA
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



(VIDE ORDER DATED 19.06.2025,
BY SRI.K.RAJASHEKAR, ADVOCATE FOR R1,
SMT.SARITHA KULKARNI, AGA FOR R3,
R2-SERVED)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASHING THE ORDER DTD 11.10.23 PASSED BY THE HONBLE KARNATAKA INFORMATION COMMISSIONER, R1 IN APPEAL IN SO FAR AS IT HOLDS THAT THE PETITIONER HAS WANTONLY CAUSED THE DELAY IN SUPPLYING THE INFORMATION TO THE APPLICATION AND IMPOSING THE PENALTY OF RS. 25,000/- VIDE ANNEXURE-A.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING IN 'B' GROUP, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURAJ GOVINDARAJ

ORAL ORDER

1. Petitioner is before this Court seeking for the following reliefs:-

- i. *"Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of certiorari or any other writ or order in the like nature quashing the Order dated 11.10.23 passed by the Hon'ble Karnataka Information Commissioner, (1st Respondent) in Appeal No.ಕಮಾಇ/26089/ಎಪಿಎಲ್/2022 in so far as it holds that the petitioner has wantonly caused the delay in supplying the information to the application and imposing the penalty of Rs.25,000/- vide **ANNEXURE-A**; and*
- ii. *Grant such other reliefs that the Hon'ble Court deems fit and proper in the facts and*



circumstances of the case in the interest of justice and equity."

2. Respondent No.2 had submitted an application on 16.06.2022 seeking for certain information. The said application had been submitted to the Deputy Conservator of Forests. It was forwarded by the Deputy Conservator of Forests to the Assistant Conservator of Forests on 01.07.2022 and the Assistant Conservator of Forests forwarded it to the petitioner, who is the Public Information Officer on 16.07.2022.
3. The petitioner claims that the petitioner has supplied certain documents and information on 30.01.2023 at Annexure - F. Some of the documents namely, the measurement book not being available with the petitioner was not so furnished. The measurement book being received by the petitioner on 31.03.2023. The details were furnished on 26.07.2023. On that ground, it is contended that the petitioner having furnished all the necessary information, the penalty



of ₹25,000/- imposed by the respondent No.1 vide the impugned order is required to be quashed.

4. The dates are clear inasmuch as the application was filed on 16.06.2022. The information was required to be furnished within one month i.e., by 15.07.2022. The petitioner has contented that the file was forwarded by the Deputy Conservator of Forests to the Assistant Conservator of Forests on 01.07.2022 and the Assistant Conservator of Forests to the petitioner on 16.07.2022. Even if it were to be considered that from the date on which the petitioner received the application, is required to submit the information within one month, the information furnished by the petitioner is not within the timeframe prescribed. In as much as partial information was initially furnished on 30.01.2023 and the next set of information was furnished on 26.07.2023 i.e., nearly more than a year after the file was sent to the petitioner.



5. In so far as the information furnished on 30.01.2023, the said information was already available with the petitioner. The petitioner could not have delayed furnishing of such information by a period of 5 months. Insofar as the information furnished on 26.07.2023, the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the information was received by the petitioner on 30.01.2023 and thereafter, furnished to the respondent No.2. Even if that date were to be taken into consideration, there is a delay of 4 months in furnishing the information by the time the petitioner received the measurement books.
6. The timelines for furnishing of details under the RTI Act are required to be adhered to by the Public Information Officer. The net effect in the present matter is that an application has been filed on 16.06.2022. The final information was made available only on 26.07.2023 i.e. more than a year after the application was filed. The reasons furnished



by the petitioner are not acceptable to condone the said delay.

7. Insofar as a direction with regard to an entry in the service register, considering that the information has been furnished, that portion of the order stands quashed.

8. This Court does not find any infirmity in the order passed by the respondent No.1 imposing a penalty. No grounds being made out, the petition stands ***partly allowed.***

**Sd/-
(SURAJ GOVINDARAJ)
JUDGE**

MH/-
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 39