

\$~67

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

+ **W.P.(C) 5354/2018**

RAJPAL P

..... Petitioner

Through: Dr. Prabhas Kumar, Adv.

versus

**CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSION
AND ORS.**

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Jagjit Singh with mr. Preet Singh
and Mr. Narayan Dev Parashar, Advs.
for Railways.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

ORDER

%

18.05.2018

CM. APPL. No.20704/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) No.5354/2018

2. Via this writ petition, the following reliefs are sought:

- “(a) Set aside the order dated 28.12.2017 of Central Information Commission, New Delhi;*
- (b) Issue a direction to the respondents to provide concerned information to the petitioner so that the son of the petitioner can approach the authorities concerned for getting the job in compliance of several Acts and Rules issued by Railway Board, New Delhi;*
- (c) Issue directions to the respondents to provide compensation for petitioner for the mental tension, agony and sufferings caused due to illegal, unjust, arbitrary action of the respondents;”*

3. A perusal of the petition would show that, in effect, the petitioner seeks to challenge the order of the Central Information Commission (CIC), dated 28.12.2017. By virtue of the impugned order dated 28.12.2017, the CIC has rejected the petitioner's appeal.

4. The petitioner had filed an application dated 29.12.2016 before the PIO. A close perusal of the application would show that instead of eliciting information, he asked questions from the Railways, that is, petitioner's erstwhile employer. The record shows that the petitioner was given Voluntary Retirement from Service (VRS) and, perhaps, is not happy with the same. The petitioner, it appears, wanted his son to be employed on compassionate grounds.

5. Given these circumstances, the PIO vide order dated 3.1.2017, dismissed the application of the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner had raised queries and not sought information. This order of the PIO was confirmed by the first appellate authority on 2.2.2017. The CIC via the impugned order dated 28.12.2017 has also reached the same conclusion.

6. Having perused the record and orders of the authorities below, I find no reason to interfere with the order of the CIC dated 28.12.2017.

6.1 Furthermore, the other reliefs sought for in the writ petition as encapsulated in prayer clauses (b) and (c) also, cannot be granted to the petitioner in these proceedings.

7. The writ petition is, accordingly, dismissed.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

MAY 18, 2018/pmc