

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPC No. 466 of 2017

1. Sharad Dewangan S/o Late Shri Sunder Lal Dewangan, Aged About 48 Years R/o Beladula Behind Of Stadium, Opposite Of Carrier School, Raigarh, District Raigarh Chhattisgarh. ---- **Petitioner**

Versus

1. Chhattisgarh State Information Commission Through Its Chief Information Commissioner, Indrawati Khand, 1st Floor, Shastri Chowk, Raipur, Chhattisgarh Pin 492001, Chhattisgarh
2. Chief Executing Officer, Janpad Panchayat Sakti, District Janjgir Champa Chhattisgarh,
3. Secretary, Village Panchayat Ragja Janpad Panchayat Sakti, District Janjgir Champa, Chhattisgarh. ----- **Respondents**

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Sharad Dewangan, in person.
For Resp. No.1	:	Mr. Shyam Sunder Lal Tekchandani, Adv.
For Resp. No. 2 & 3	:	Mr. Ranbir Singh Marhas, Adv.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

30.09.2020

1. The grievance of the petitioner in the present writ petition is the order passed by the respondent No. 1 State Information Commission dated 22.12.2016 whereby they have rejected the second appeal preferred by the petitioner under the Right to Information Act.
2. The grievance of the petitioner, what could be understood during the course of hearing was that the information which has been provided to the petitioner under the RTI was not complete. According to the petitioner, he had asked for the various informations which have been rejected by the concerned authorities on the ground that multiple information can not be sought in one application and the first information which has been sought for has to be provided to the petitioner and which is said to have been provided. However, according to the petitioner, even the entire of the first information

which was sought, have not been provided, only few piece meal documents have been provided.

3. At this juncture, on a query being put to the petitioner in person so also to the counsel for the respondents No. 2 & 3, it was accepted that whatever information from the first information that he had sought for, if it has not been provided let the petitioner make a list of those documents and information and may again move an application before the concerned PIO, who intturn shall immediately process the same and if those informations sought for are available with them, the shall be provided to the petitioner. So far as the other information which have not been provided on account of multiple informations being asked, the petitioner would be at liberty to move appropriate individual applications for each of the information.
4. In the light of the aforesaid observation/direction, the present writ petition at this juncture is disposed of directing the petitioner to move a fresh application to the PIO, giving specific details of the informations which have not been provided to him under the first information that the respondent had earlier processed while granting information to the petitioner. The concerned PIO shall provide the same to the petitioner within a period of 30 days in accordance with the provision of RTI Act from the date of receipt of the application from the petitioner.
5. With the aforesaid direction, the present writ petition stands disposed off.

Sd/-

**(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge**