

\$~10

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

+ W.P.(C) 6752/2018

ADISHWAR JAIN

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr Vishal Gohri, Advocate.

versus

CENTRAL INFORMATION COMMISSIONER
& ANR

..... Respondents

Through

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

%

02.07.2018

CM No.25650/2018

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(C) 6752/2018

2. The petitioner has filed the present petition impugning an order dated 26.12.2017 passed by the Central Information Commission (hereafter 'the CIC'). By the impugned order, the CIC has rejected the petitioner's second appeal preferred under Section 19(3) of the Right to Information Act, 2005 (hereafter 'the RTI Act').

3. The petitioner had filed an application under the RTI Act seeking information regarding 23 articles that were stated to have been dispatched by speed post to the petitioner and his family members by companies belonging to the Indiabulls Housing Finance Limited group of companies.

4. It is the petitioner's case that the said articles were not delivered to the

petitioner and/or his family members.

5. The petitioner's application under the RTI Act was rejected by a communication dated 11.04.2017 on the ground that the said articles were stated to have been dispatched on 22.09.2011 and the records pertaining to delivery of speed post articles was not required to be maintained for a period in excess of six months.

6. Aggrieved by the aforesaid order, the petitioner preferred an appeal under Section 19 of the RTI Act, which was also rejected by an order dated 02.08.2017.

7. Aggrieved by the aforesaid order, the petitioner preferred a second appeal (CIC/POSTS/A/2017/154628) which was disposed of by the impugned order. The petitioner's second appeal has also been dismissed on the ground that the postal department was not required to maintain records pertaining to deliveries made by speed post beyond the period of six months from the date of posting.

8. This Court finds no infirmity with the aforesaid order. Clearly, if the records have been weeded out, it is impossible for the same to be provided to the petitioner.

9. The petition is, accordingly, dismissed.

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

JULY 02, 2018

MK