NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION (C) No. 2370 of 2020

Deepak Sonkar S/o Shri Kallu Ram Sonkar Aged About 46 Years R/o Ward No. 13, Pali Police Station Pali, District Korba Chhattisgarh.

---Petitioner(s)

Versus

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Forest Department , Mantralaya , Mahanadi Bhawan , Nawa Raipur , Atal Nagar , Raipur , District Raipur Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Chief Conservator Of Forest Bilaspur Circle Bilaspur, Office Sindhi Colony, Jarhabhatha , District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.
3. Divisional Forest Officer Katghora, Forest Division Kathora , District Korba Chhattisgarh.
4. Regional Forest Officer Jatga, Forest Division Katghora, District Korba Chhattisgarh.
5. Regional Forest Officer Pali Region, Forest Division Katghora , District Korba Chhattisgarh.
6. Regional Forest Officer Katghora, Regional , Forest Division Katghora , District Korba Chhattisgarh.
7. Regional Forest Officer Aitmanagar Region , Forest Division Katghora , District Korba Chhattisgarh.
8. Regional Forest Officer Pasan Region, Forest Division Katghora, District Korba Chhattisgarh.
9. Regional Forest Officer Kendai Region, Forest Division Katghora, District Korba Chhattisgarh.
10. Regional Forest Officer Chaitma Region, Forest Division Katghora, District Korba Chhattisgarh.

---Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Shri Dharmesh Shrivastava, Advocate.
For State	:	Shri Raghvendra Verma, Govt. Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

15.10.2020

1. The present writ petition seems to be filed alleging inaction against the respondents No.4 to 10 who are not supplying the informations which have been sought under the Right to Information Act.

2. Perusal of record it appears that the petitioner had already preferred an appeal before the authorities in the department i.e. respondents No.2&3 and who have passed an order in favour of the petitioner, however, till date the petitioner has not yet received the informations. On the contrary, the

respondents No.4 to 10 have not provided the informations though directions were issued by the respondents No.2&3.

3. At the outset, this court is of the opinion that the application moved by the petitioner was under the provisions of the Right to Information Act which in itself is a complete Code and has separate mechanism provided even in the event of the Public Information Officer not providing the informations. Accordingly, the writ petition at this juncture would not be sustainable.

4. Reserving the right of the petitioner to take appropriate recourse available under the Right to Information Act, the writ petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge

inder