

\$~30

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

% ***Date of Order : February 13, 2018***

+ **W.P.(C) 1327/2018 & CM No.5532/2018**

ASHWANI KUMAR SHARMA Petitioner
Through: Mr.Rajat Arora and Mr.Niraj Kumar,
Advocates

versus

THE CHIEF INFORMATION
COMMISSIONER AND ORS. Respondents
Through: Mr.Sanjeev Narula, CGSC and Ms.Adrija
Thakur, Advocate

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL GAUR

ORDER

(ORAL)

1. Recommendations of Internal Complaints Committee of first respondent rendered on 23rd September, 2016 are assailed in this petition on the ground that the complaint of sexual harassment lodged against petitioner who was then Deputy Registrar to the Information Commissioner is a counterblast to petitioner's prior complaint against the complainant. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that against the impugned recommendations (*Annexure P-16*), petitioner had filed a representation on 17th November, 2016 which stands declined vide impugned order (*Annexure P-17*) on 1st December, 2016.

2. Upon hearing and on perusal of impugned order and the recommendations (*Annexure P-16*), I find that rejection of petitioner's representation is by a cryptic order. No doubt, the recommendations do not

have any statutory basis but it certainly casts a stigma upon petitioner and so respondent is required to re-consider petitioner's representation of 17th November, 2016 and is directed to pass a speaking order thereon within a period of four weeks and the fate of this representation be conveyed to petitioner within a week thereafter, so that petitioner may avail of the remedy as available in law, if need be.

3. With aforesaid directions, this petition and the application are disposed of.

(SUNIL GAUR)
JUDGE

FEBRUARY 13, 2018
mamta