

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPS No. 3386 of 2016

Narsingh Rathore S/o Shri S. S. Rathore, Aged About 60 Years Presently Working As Executive Engineer, Directorate Of Urban Administration And Development, Indravati Bhawan, Raipur, P. S. Rakhi, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh)

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through : Secretary, Department Of Urban Administration And Development, Mahanadi Bhavan, Capital Complex, New Raipur, P. S. Rakhi, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
2. Municipal Corporation, Korba, Through - Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Korba, District Korba (Chhattisgarh)
3. Anti Corruption Bureau Through Suptd. Of Police, Near Raj Bhawan, Raipur, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
4. State Bank Of India Through Branch Manager, Rampur Branch, Korba, District Korba (Chhattisgarh)
5. State Bank Of India Through Branch Manager, Collectorate Branch, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh)
6. State Bank Of India Through Branch Manager, Kosabadi Branch, Ghanta Ghar Chowk, Korba, District Korba (Chhattisgarh)
7. Bank Of Maharashtra, Through Branch Manager, Madhyanagri Chowk, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh)

.....Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Shri Vivek Kumar Agrawal, Advocate
For State/ Respondents No.1 & 3	:	Shri S.P. Kale, Dy. Advocate General, on Advance copy
For Respondent No.2	:	Mr. Pankaj Agrawal, Advocate, on advance copy
For Respondents No.4 to 6	:	Mr. P.R. Patankar, Advocate, on advance copy

S.B.:Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava

Order On Board

09/08/2016

Heard on admission.

1. The grievance of the petitioner, as ventilated through this petition, is that

though the petitioner sought specific information, those records and documents, as demanded by the petitioner, has not been supplied and stated to be in possession of respondents No.2 & 3.

2. On petitioner's own showing, some of the information have been supplied to the petitioner but not all demanded by him.

3. This is not a service matter. Essentially, the petitioner is only seeking information which can be enforced in accordance with the provision contained under the Right to Information Act. If the petitioner is not satisfied with the information supplied to him, his remedy lies in filing statutory appeal under the Right to Information Act.

4. There is no reason why this writ Court should entertain this petition when there is a remedy of seeking information through various statutory legal remedies available to the petitioner under the Right to Information Act.

5. With the aforesaid liberty, the petition is dismissed.

Sd/-
(Manindra Mohan Shrivastava)
Judge