

\$~1

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

+ LPA 82/2018

DR SYED AHMED Appellant
Through Mr.T.D.Yadav, Advocate.

versus

THE DIRECTOR (E1) FIRST APPELLATE AUTHORITY &
ORS Respondents
Through Mr.Prasanta Varma, Sr.Standing
Counsel with Ms.Shalu Goswami, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S. RAVINDRA BHAT

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A. K. CHAWLA

ORDER

% **10.04.2018**

The appellant's grievance that the information sought by him to state reasons for his regularization by the department of the Union w.e.f. a later date (2000) instead of when he became eligible i.e. in 1987, was rejected.

Learned Single Judge was appropriate in holding that there was no infirmity in the finding of the Central Information Commission (CIC) having regard to the RTI Act. Counsel for the appellant took this Court through various correspondences and also the Office Memorandum issued by the Department of Personnel and Training on 01.7.1991 highlighting that the instructions in the said office memorandum are irrelevant and the

rationale for preferring the latter date for regularization was, despite several reminders and demands, never furnished.

This Court has considered the documents on record. The RTI queries were framed by the appellant in such a manner that he elicited information with respect to the office memorandum *inter se* and internal correspondences with the Department of Ayush etc. It does not appear to be a formulated query, which could have been dealt with within the framework of the RTI Act. Instead, he appears to have proceeded under the impression that the authorities under the RTI Act includes the Central Information Commission and that, it could resolve his basic grievance with respect to the date of his regularization, that was beyond the scope and the jurisdiction of the Central Information Commission.

There is no infirmity in the impugned order. The appeal is dismissed.

S. RAVINDRA BHAT, J

A. K. CHAWLA, J

APRIL 10, 2018

ndn