

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR****WPC No.1858 of 2018**

Vipin Punjabi S/o Late G.D. Punjabi, aged about 57 years,
Occupation-Advocate, High Court, R/o Beladula Sindhi Colony,
Tahsil Raigarh, District Raigarh (CG)

----Petitioner**Versus**

1. General Manager, S.E.C.L., Raigarh Area, behind Collectorate, Chhote Atarmuda, Tahsil & Dist.-Raigarh (CG)
2. Area Sales Manager, S.E.C.L., Raigarh Area, behind Collectorate, Chhote Atarmuda, Tahsil & Dist. Raigarh (CG)
3. Central Public Information Office – General Manager, S.E.C.L., Raigarh area, behind Collectorate, Chhote Atarmuda, Tahsil & Dist.- Raigarh (CG)
4. First Appellate Authority, Office-General Manager, S.E.C.L., Raigarh area, behind Collectorate, Chhote Atarmuda, Tahsil & Dist.-Raigarh (CG)

---- Respondents**And****WPC No.1866 of 2018**

Vipin Punjabi S/o Late G.D. Punjabi, aged about 57 years,
Occupation-Advocate, High Court, R/o Beladula Sindhi Colony,
Tahsil Raigarh, District Raigarh (CG)

----Petitioner**Versus**

1. General Manager, S.E.C.L., Raigarh Area, behind Collectorate, Chhote Atarmuda, Tahsil & Dist.-Raigarh (CG)
2. Area Sales Manager, S.E.C.L., Raigarh Area, behind Collectorate, Chhote Atarmuda, Tahsil & Dist. Raigarh (CG)
3. Central Public Information Office – General Manager, S.E.C.L., Raigarh area, behind Collectorate, Chhote Atarmuda, Tahsil & Dist.- Raigarh (CG)

4. First Appellate Authority, Office-General Manager, S.E.C.L.,
Raigarh area, behind Collectorate, Chhote Atarmuda, Tahsil &
Dist.-Raigarh (CG)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner : Mr.Vipin Punjabi, petitioner-in-person.
For Respondents : Mr.Vaibhav Shukla, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal
Order on Board

12/07/2018

1. These batch of writ petitions have been filed by the petitioner against the order of the First Appellate Authority under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereinafter called as "RTI Act")
2. Petitioner-in-person would submit that the First Appellate Authority has not acted in accordance with law by not providing relevant information.
3. On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondents would submit that order is appealable under Section 19(3) of the RTI Act and second appeal would lie before the State Information Commission.
4. Since, the order is appealable and efficacious alternative remedy is available to the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to entertain these writ petitions.
5. Accordingly, the writ petitions are dismissed. However, the petitioner is at liberty to prefer second appeal before the appellate authority under Section 19(3) of the RTI Act. No cost(s).

Sd/-

(Sanjay K.Agrawal)
Judge