

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (C) No. 1867 of 2018**

Girvar Singh Rathour, S/o Late Laxman Singh Rathour, aged about 61 years,
R/o Village – Sadha (Lormi), Tahsil – Lormi, Distt. Mungeli (C.G.)

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State of Chhattisgarh, through Secretary, State Information Commission, Nirmal Chhaya Bhavan, Meera Dataar Road, Shankar Nagar, Raipur, Distt. Raipur (C.G.)
2. Commissioner, Chhattisgarh State Information Commission, Raipur (C.G.)
3. District Information Officer, District Education Officer, Bilaspur, now District – Mungeli (C.G.)
4. Block Education Officer, Lormi, Distt. Mungeli (C.G.)
5. Public Information Officer, Division Coordinator, Block Development – Lormi, Rajiv Gandhi Shiksha Mission, Lormi, Distt. Mungeli (C.G.)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	: Shri R.K. Pali, Advocate.
For State	: Shri Avinash Singh, Panel Lawyer.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal

Order On Board

10/07/2018

Heard.

(1) On the second appeal preferred by petitioner before the State Information Commission, on 3.2.2012 the State Information Commission directed the refund of record fee of Rs.20,000/- to the petitioner; and also granted compensation of Rs.3,000/- under Section 19(8)(b) of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (for short "Act, 2005"); and also recommended departmental enquiry against Public Information Officer under the Act, 2005. Thereafter, certain information was supplied to the petitioner on 20.08.2015

and the amount of record fee was returned to the petitioner and damages were also paid to the petitioner.

(2) By the impugned order dated 4.4.2018, the State Information Commission has recorded a finding that order of Commission has already been complied with and the information has been duly supplied to the petitioner, as such, closed the complaint case, against which, instant writ petition has been filed questioning the same.

(3) Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that complete and correct information was not provided to him as per order of the State Information Commission.

(4) Per contra, counsel for the State submits that order impugned is strictly in accordance with law, which does not call for any interference in the instant writ petition.

(5) The State Information Commission, by its impugned order, has clearly recorded a finding that order of the Commission has been complied with; complete & correct information has been provided to the petitioner; and record fee and damages have also been returned to the petitioner, and, thus, no action is warranted against the Public Information Officer. I do not find any merit in the instant writ petition.

(6) Accordingly, the writ petition, being devoid of merit, is liable to be and is hereby dismissed.

Sd/-
(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
Judge

D/-

