

\$~2

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

+ **W.P.(C) 9530/2016**

RAJU SANKARAN

..... Petitioner

Through : Mr Arshdeep Singh, Mr Manish Jha
and Mr Aditya Chopra, Advocates.

versus

CENTRAL PUBLIC

INFORMATION OFFICER & ORS

..... Respondents

Through : Mr Sanjeev Narula and Ms Vinita
Sasidhar and Lt. Vikrant Singh,
Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

ORDER

% **08.12.2016**

CM No.38120/2016(exemption)

Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

**W.P.(C) 9530/2016 & CM Nos.43075/2016(additional documents),
38121/2016(synopsis and list of dates)**

The petitioner is aggrieved by order dated 28.12.2015, whereby the complaint of the petitioner under Section 18 of the Right to Information Act, 2005, has been rejected.

The petitioner had filed an application dated 11.08.2011, *inter alia*, seeking the following information:-

“Please confirm that the Chain of Custody Certificate, shown in Court in UK by CPS (Crown Prosecution Service) and produced by your Naval Attache Cmde Bannerjee and

CBI SP Ramnish, consisting of 2 pages titled “CPU(OI), Make – Maxtor, Model No.-SATA Sr. No.E-HO-111023427, allegedly as per CBI, seized from the residence of Cdr V.Rana on 12 June 2005 was genuine?

Reading of the said application shows what the petitioner seeking is really an opinion as to whether the certificate produced is genuine or not.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that since contradictory stands have emanated from the Naval Authorities as well as the CBI, in as much as one authority has said that no such certificate exists and the other authority has produced such a certificate. The petitioner really wants the copy of the certificate, if it exists in the record of the Naval Authorities.

Prima facie, I am of the view, that the query, *inter alia*, of the petitioner, by its application dated 11.08.2011, is in the nature of an opinion and not information covered under the Right to Information Act.

Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks leave to withdraw the petition with liberty to file a fresh application under the Right to Information Act seeking information and/or copies of documents available in their records.

In view of the above, the petition is dismissed as withdrawn reserving liberty of the petitioner, as prayed.

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

DECEMBER 08, 2016

‘sn’