

\$~1 to 3

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 2908/2007, CMs No.5453/2007 (for stay) & 7219/2007 (of
R-1 for vacation of stay)
UNION OF INDIA Petitioner

Through: Mr. Dev P. Bhardwaj, Adv.

Versus

SUBHASH CHANDRA AGARWAL & ANR. Respondents

Through: Mr. Omanakuttan K.K., Adv. for Mr.
Prashant Bhushan, Adv.

AND

W.P.(C) 4234/2008 & CM No.8252/2008 (for stay)

UNION OF INDIA Petitioner

Through: Mr. Dev P. Bhardwaj, Adv.

Versus

SHRI A.N. TIWARI Respondent

Through: Mr. Omanakuttan K.K., Adv. for Mr.
Prashant Bhushan, Adv.

AND

W.P.(C) 7309/2009 & CM No.3071/2009 (for stay)

UNION OF INDIA Petitioner

Through: Mr. Dev P. Bhardwaj, Adv.

Versus

SUBHASH CHANDER AGRAWAL Respondent

Through: Mr. Omanakuttan K.K., Adv. for Mr.
Prashant Bhushan, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW

ORDER

%

06.01.2016

1. The counsel for the petitioner Union of India (UOI) as well as the counsel for the respondents in all the three petitions state that the issues entailed in these petitions are subject matter of Civil Appeal No.10044/2010 of the Supreme Court and which is still pending and these matters be adjourned awaiting the judgment of the Supreme Court.

2. A perusal of the order sheets shows that these petitions are being adjourned on similar requests since the year 2010.
3. As such, considering that the petitions are with respect to the orders of the Chief Information Commissioner under the Right to Information Act, 2005 and after such long lapse of time, information sought may not even be relevant, it has been proposed to both the counsels that these petitions be disposed of with liberty to the parties to seek revival thereof after the pronouncement of the judgment of the Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No.10044/2010 and if need for revival is felt.
4. The counsels have fairly agreed to the same.
5. The petitions are accordingly disposed of, continuing the interim orders passed therein and with liberty to the parties to apply for revival thereof after the judgment of the Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No.10044/2010 and in case any need for revival is felt.

No costs.

RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW, J

JANUARY 06, 2016

‘gsr’..