



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 17.11.2017

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.MAHADEVAN

W.P (MD) No.21194 of 2017

and

WMP (MD) No.17456 of 2017

R.Thennarasai

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Chief Information Officer,
State Information Commission,
No.2, Thiyagaraya Salai,
Tenampet,
Eldams Road Junction,
Chennai - 600 018.

2.The Appellate Authority,
The Registrar,
Manonmaniam Sundaranar University,
Abishekapatti,
Tirunelveli - 627 012.

3.The Public Information Officer,
The Assistant Registrar,
Manonmaniam Sundaaranar University,
Abishekapatti,
Tirunelveli - 627 012.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ of Mandamus, directing the Respondents 2 and 3 to provide information sought for by the Petitioner vide her letter dated 15.06.2016.

For Petitioner : Mrs.D.Geetha
For Respondents : Mr.K.K.Senthil


ORDER

This writ petition has been filed, seeking to direct the Respondents 2 and 3 to provide information sought for by the Petitioner.

2.Heard both sides.

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>

3.By consent, the writ petition is taken up for final disposal at the stage of admission itself.



4.The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner sought some information under the RTI Act, before the first and second respondents. Having dissatisfied with the reply given by them, the petitioner approached the first respondent on 24.10.2016. Though the first respondent, vide proceedings No.SA11831 of 2016, dated 10.01.2017, directed the second and third respondents, to provide the information sought for by the petitioner, she has not been provided with the same. Hence, the petitioner is before this Court, seeking an appropriate direction to the respondents.

5.The learned counsel appearing for the respondents would submit that the information sought for by the petitioner would be provided within the time stipulated by this Court.

6.This Court is of the view that though the appellate authority directed the third respondent to provide the information sought for by the petitioner, the third respondent has not complied with the same, which cannot be countenanced at all. Therefore, the third respondent is directed to comply with the order of the first respondent, forthwith.

7.The writ petition is disposed of on the above terms. No costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS-II)

/True Copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

+1cc to M/s.D.GEETHA Advocate in SR. No. 87845

+1cc to M/s.K.K.SENTHIL Advocate in SR. No. 87985

DSK

JS/SKN.RSK/SAR.2/27.11.2017/2P-3C

**ORDER MADE IN
W.P(MD)No.21194 of 2017
17.11.2017**