

\$~55

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CONT.CAS(C) 190/2018, CM Nos. 9983/2018 & 9997/2018**
ANOOP KUMAR SHARMA

..... Petitioner

Through: In person

versus

A FANI RAO

..... Respondent

Through:

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. KAMESWAR RAO

ORDER
% **14.03.2018**

CM No. 9997/2018

Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

Application stands disposed of.

CONT.CAS(C) 190/2018 & CM Nos. 9983/2018

The present contempt petition has been filed alleging violation of order dated January 23, 2018. The order dated January 23, 2018 reads as under:-

“1. Mr J. J. Eshwara Prasad, who is a technical officer of the petitioner is present and he states that the marks awarded to the respondent against each question number can be provided to the respondent. However, it would take some time to access the said data. He states that about four weeks would be required to make a necessary programme to access the same.

2. Ms Biji Rajesh, the learned counsel appearing for the

petitioner also states that the information as sought for can be provided to the respondent within a period of six weeks.

3. In view of the above, the present petition and the pending application are disposed of by directing the petitioner to provide the same within a period of six weeks from today as stated by the learned counsel for the petitioner.”

The petitioner, who appears in person primarily makes two submissions; (i) the respondent has not granted the petitioner the inspection of the record of which information was sought and; (ii) the information given at page 10 of the contempt petition is a hard copy of the marks and even the age depicted therein is incorrect.

On the submission made at serial no. (i) above, it was put to the petitioner that the direction was only to provide the marks secured by the petitioner against each of the question and as such there is no violation of order dated January 23, 2018; the petitioner draws my attention to his application filed under the RTI Act to contend that his request in the said application was for inspection of the record. If that be so, the remedy for the petitioner is to seek modification of order dated January 23, 2018. Insofar as the submission at (ii) above, that his age has been depicted incorrectly, cannot be a subject matter of contempt. I close this contempt petition with liberty to the petitioner to approach the Writ Court by way of an application for modification of order dated January 23, 2018, if so advised.

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J

MARCH 14, 2018/ak