

\$~44

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

+ W.P.(C) 497/2017

NEERAJ PANT

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr Vishal K. Panwar, Advocate.

versus

PUBLIC WORK DEPARTMENT & ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Ms Jyoti Dutt Sharma and Mr Iram
Majid, Advocates with Mr Suresh Pal,
EE (OP-I), PWD.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

%

16.02.2018

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition, *inter alia*, praying as under:-

- “1. Pass the Direction to the Government Body i.e. Central Information Commission Respondent no 4 to Decide the Application under Section 20 of Right to Information Act as 2005, which is filed by the Petitioner.
2. Direct the Respondent no 1 & 2 to provide the information which was sought by the Petitioner in his application under the Right to Information Act 2005.
3. Direct the Respondents to compliance the order of Central Information Commission and provide the information in written, which was sought by the Petitioner under Right to Information Act.”

2. It is seen that the application dated 07.04.2014 made by the petitioner under the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereafter ‘the Act’) is in

extremely wide and general terms inasmuch as the petitioner had requested for “*perusal of all documents and construction (Mandoli Jail and Mandoli Jail Housing Complex)*”. Admittedly, the petitioner has been granted inspection of the files on more than one occasion.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the respondents has also handed over certain documents which indicate that large number of documents had been provided to the petitioner on 06.05.2015 and on 17.06.2016.

4. In view of the above, this Court is not inclined to entertain the present petition. However, the learned counsel appearing for the respondents states that certain files pertaining to construction of Mandoli Jail and construction of Vikas Bhawan-II are available with “Other Projects, Division-I”. She states that if the petitioner approaches Sh. Suresh Pal, Executive Engineer, the inspection of those files would be provided to him.

5. In view of the above, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner seeks to withdraw the present petition with liberty to take inspection as voluntary by the learned counsel for the respondents.

6. The petition is dismissed as withdrawn with the aforesaid liberty.

FEBRUARY 16, 2018
RK

VIBHU BAKHRU, J