

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPC No. 779 of 2015

1. Ashok Kumar Sinha S/o Late Jailal Sinha Aged About 50 Years Prantiya Sangathan Mantri, Chhattisgarh Karmachari Congress, Kumhar Para, Gariyaband, District Gariyaband, (Chhattisgarh)

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. Chhattisgarh State Information Commission Through Chief Information Commission, Office At Miradatar Road, Shankar Nagar, Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
2. Appeal Officer & Chief Conservator Of Forest, Raipur Circle, District Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
3. Public Information Officer & Divisional Forest Officer, Office At Forest Division Balodabazar (Chhattisgarh) (Wrongly mentioned in the name of the authority)
4. Forest Range Officer, Office At Range Mainpur (General), District Gariyaband, (Chhattisgarh)

---- Respondent

For Petitioner	Shri Ajay Chandra, Advocate
For Respondent No.1	Shri S.S. Tekchandani, Advocate
For Respondent/State	Shri Bhaskar Payasi, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra

Order On Board

30/10/2015

1. Petitioner is aggrieved by order Annexure – P/1 passed by the Chief Information Commissioner dismissing his appeal, which, in turn, was preferred against the order dated 13-10-2014 (Annexure – P/6)

passed by the First Appellate Authority under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (for short 'the RTI Act').

2. Petitioner had sought some information/document under the RTI Act vide Application (Annexure – P/2). The said information was supplied to him vide letter dated 14-8-2014, however, without opening the envelope in which informations were contained, the petitioner moved the first appeal on submission that the information was supplied by an ante-dated letter.
3. In course of hearing , learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would admit that the information sought has already been supplied, but there was delay in supplying the information, therefore, in order to avoid penalty, etc. the covering letter was made ante dated.
4. Once information has been supplied and the petitioner's first appeal and second appeal have subsequently been dismissed by the appellate authorities under the RTI Act, this Court does not deem it appropriate to exercise its extraordinary powers under Article 226 of the Constitution of India because the object of RTI Act has been achieved by providing the information to the petitioner.
5. Accordingly, the writ petition, being devoid of merit, is liable to be and is hereby dismissed. No order as to costs.

Sd/-

Judge

Gowri

Prashant Kumar Mishra