

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WP227 No.808 of 2015**

Harendra Mishra S/o Late Shri Styannarayan Mishra, Aged About 64 Years R/o
8/18, Yaman, Sahara State, Gorakhpur, (Utter Pradesh) 273001.

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Chief Information Commissioner, Raipur
(Chhattisgarh)
2. First Appellate Authority And Upper Commissioner, Nagar Palika Nigam,
Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
3. Public Information & Zone Commissioenr, Nagar Palika Nigam, Raipur,
(Chhattisgarh)

---- Respondent

Petitioner in person.
For Respondent No.1: Ms. K. Tripti Rao, PL
For Respondent No.2 & 3: Shri S. S. Tekchandani, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava**Order On Board****24/02/2016**

Heard.

2. This petition is directed against order dated 10-07-2015 passed by the Information Commissioner. The petitioner in person argued that the information with regard to leave details of respondent -Santosh Pandey is liable to be disclosed in public interest because son of the petitioner was married to the daughter of Shri Santosh Pandey and daughter of Santosh Pandey has lodged false criminal case against the son and other relatives and therefore, disclosure of information is necessary to support the life of 7 persons, who are facing criminal case.

3. There is neither any material on record nor any other specific reason assigned in the petition as to how disclosure personal information of Santosh Pandey is in public interest within the meaning of the provision contained in Right to Information Act, 2005. The Information Commissioner has relied upon the decision of Supreme Court in the case of ***Girish R. Deshpande vs. C.I.C. And Others***¹, wherein the Supreme Court has held that the performance of an employee/officer in an organization is primarily a matter between the employee and the employer and normally those aspects are governed by the service rules which fall under the expression “personal information”, the disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or public interest. The disclosure of such information could cause unwarranted invasion of the privacy of that individual.

4. The petitioner seems to have personal scores to settle with Santosh Pandey. Therefore, the impugned order passed by the Chief Information Commissioner warrants no inference.

5. In the result, the petition is dismissed.

Sd/-
Manindra Mohan Shrivastava
Judge

¹ SLP (C) No.27734/2012, decided on 03-10-2012