

\$~18

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ W.P.(C) 3610/2013

RK JAIN

..... Petitioner

Through Mr.J.K.Mittal with Mr.Rajveer Singh
and Mr.Vikas Gupta, Advocates.

versus

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION THROUGH ITS
SECRETARY

..... Respondent

Through Dr.L.C.Singhi, Advocate for R-
1/CIC.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANMOHAN

ORDER

%

22.03.2016

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that there is inordinate delay on the part of the Information Commissioners in pronouncing their judgments/orders. In support of his contention, he relies upon annexure P-7, which shows that there has been inordinate delay in pronouncement of judgments and orders by one of the Information Commissioners. He submits that the principle of law laid down by the Supreme Court in ***Anil Rai Vs. State of Bihar, 2009 (13) STR 465*** should be made applicable to the Information Commissioners also.

On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondent-CIC states that the facts and figures mentioned in Annexure P-7 are incorrect. He contends that this Court while hearing a writ petition challenging a particular order cannot pass a general direction laying down the time limit for pronouncement of the judgments/orders by

the Information Commissioners.

This Court is in agreement with the learned counsel for the respondent-CIC that the issue raised by the petitioner should be agitated by way of a public interest litigation. It is pertinent to mention that the data mentioned in Annexure P-7 does not pertain to the case at hand.

Consequently, the present writ petition is dismissed with liberty to the petitioner to agitate the issue raised in the present writ petition by way of a public interest litigation.

MANMOHAN, J

MARCH 22, 2016

KA