

\$~46

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 1112/2018, CM No. 4657/2018
MOHD NAEEM AHMED Petitioner
Through: Mr. Bharat Bhushan Bhatia, Adv.

versus

DIRECTOR OF INCOME TAX AND ORS. Respondents
Through: Mr. Zoheb Hossain, Sr. Standing
Counsel for Revenue.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. KAMESWAR RAO

ORDER

% **27.03.2019**

1. Heard the learned counsel for the parties. The grievance of the petitioner is with regard to an order dated July 29, 2016 passed by the CIC on an appeal filed by the petitioner herein challenging the order dated May 12, 2015 passed by the first Appellate Authority.
2. It is stated that the petitioner had filed an application dated February 25, 2015 with the respondent seeking information as regards progress of the subject investigation / proceeding. The information sought was as under:
 - “1. Whether application dated 27.01.2015 was assign to some officer for investigation.
 2. Provide the name of the officer who worked on application dated 27.01.2015.
 3. Whether your office called Shaheen Rustam or her family members to your office for investigation.

4. Provide the dates on which Shaheen Rustam and her family members attended your office.
5. Whether you asked Shaheen Rustam and her family members that what is their source of income, if yes, what is Shaheen Rustam and her parents source of income.
6. Whether your officials visited Shaheen Rustam's residence for investigation.
7. Provide all details you investigated in the application dated 27.01.2015 files by me.
8. Whether you investigated from Shaheen Rustam that to whom she gave Rs. 5 Lac for PRT+B Ed. Training, as she alleged in her list of documents filed by her in the CAW cell.
9. Whether you investigated from Shaheen Rustam, to whom she gave Rs. 3 Lac for DSSB as alleged by her.
10. Whether you investigated from the complainant that form where she arrange the money of Rs.12 Lacs for Shadimeinkhana.”

However, the said application was not replied to by the PIO except stating that the information is with the other Ward. Be that as it may, the CIC has finally held that as the matter at hand is under investigation / assessment by the CPIO / ITO Ward 56(1) and that he should disclose the broad outcome of the TEP to the petitioner as soon as the assessment is completed.

3. Mr. Bharat Bhushan Bhatia, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, during his arguments stated that he would be satisfied if the petitioner is informed the ultimate outcome of the investigation / assessment. It goes without saying that in terms of the direction of the CIC, the CPIO / ITO of the Ward concerned is / are required to disclose the broad outcome of the TEP to the petitioner herein. There is no reason to disbelieve that they shall not disclose the same after the investigation / assessment is over.

4. Mr. Zoheb Hossain, learned Senior Standing Counsel appearing for the respondents assures the Court that the said procedure shall be followed in this case. Taking the statement on record, I am of the view no further orders are required to be passed in this writ petition.

The writ petition is disposed of.

CM No. 4657/2018

Dismissed as infructuous.

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J

MARCH 27, 2019/aky